
3D

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Literacy Performance Assessments Field Test Results and Adoption

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents an update on the development and field testing of the Literacy Performance Assessments (LPA) created by CalTPA, edTPA, and FAST, the three Commission-approved teaching performance assessment models. Additionally, this item presents the results and analysis of the field tests and recommended next steps.

Recommended Actions: That the Commission 1) adopt the CalTPA Literacy Cycle for MS, PK-3 ECE, and EdSp-MMSN, ESN, ECSE, DHH, and VI; the edTPA Multiple Subject, Literacy with Mathematics and edTPA Education Specialist, Literacy: MMSN/ESN Assessments; and the FAST 3.0 Site Visitation Project for MS, MMSN, and ESN for operational administration beginning in the 2025-26 academic year, and 2) approve the recommended passing standards for each assessment.

Presenters: Juliet Wahleithner, Special Consultant, Office of Policy and Continuous Improvement; Marissa Luna Lopez and Heather Kennedy, Consultants, Performance Assessment; Lori Kroeger, edTPA, Evaluation Systems

Strategic Plan Goals

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

Continuous Improvement

- **Goal 7:** The Commission's work is grounded in research, informed by the voices of practitioners and communities of interests, and supports continuous improvement in educator preparation and licensure.
 - O. Strengthen the Commission's capacity to collect and analyze survey and assessment data related to quality in preparation of the education workforce

Literacy Performance Assessments

Field Test Results and Adoption

Introduction

This agenda item presents an update on the development of the CalTPA Literacy Cycle, field test results, and analysis; the development of the edTPA Literacy, field test results, and analysis; and the development of the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) Literacy Performance Assessment, field test results, and analysis. The item concludes with recommended next steps for all three models.

Background

Pursuant to Education Code (EC) sections 44320.2 and [44259\(b\)\(3\)](#), completion of a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) is required of teacher candidates prior to being recommended for a preliminary credential in addition to successfully completing their coursework and clinical practice through a Commission-approved program. The TPA measures candidates' proficiency on Teaching Performance Expectation (TPE) elements observable through a performance assessment prior to being recommended for a preliminary credential.

Candidates pursuing a Multiple Subject (MS) or Single Subject (SS) credential have been required to successfully pass a TPA since 2008. Candidates who enrolled in an Education Specialist: Mild-to-Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) or Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs (ESN) on or after July 1, 2022, must also successfully pass a TPA to earn a credential. In [April 2021](#), the Commission granted an extension on the development of and requirement for a TPA for the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH), and Visually Impaired (VI) credentials to allow the assessments to develop alongside the requirements for a literacy performance assessment, pursuant to SB 488.

Currently there are three Commission-approved TPA models: CalTPA, edTPA, and Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) for Multiple Subject (MS) and Single Subject (SS), and Education Specialist (EdSp)-Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) candidates. In 2019, [a HumRRO](#) conducted a comparison study resulting in the determination that the three adopted teaching performance assessments (CalTPA, edTPA and FAST) were comparable and measured essential TPEs for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and World Language teaching credentials.

Following the passage of [SB 488 \(Chap. 678, Stats. 2021\)](#), Education Code [§44283](#) and [§44283.2](#) were amended and EC [§44259](#) (b) (4) (A) and (B) were added to require the Commission to complete a series of actions related to literacy instruction. For more information regarding SB 488 requirements, see [Item 4E: Report to the Legislature on the Implementation of Senate Bill 488 Teacher Credentialing – Reading Instruction](#). Pursuant to SB 488, all approved Teaching Performance Assessments (TPAs) must include a literacy component that meets the requirement of SB 488 by July 1, 2025, as a replacement for the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) requirement.

Each of the approved TPA model sponsors (the Commission, Evaluation Systems, and California State University, Fresno) requested and was approved by the Commission to pilot and field test revised and new versions of their assessments that aligned with the specifications outlined in SB 488. Within each of those previous agenda items (CalTPA: August 2023, [Agenda Item 4B](#) and August 2024, [Agenda Item 5B](#); FAST: August 2024, [Agenda Item 5C](#); edTPA: December 2024 [Agenda Item 3C](#)) the model sponsor provided details about their proposed models' alignments with the requirements of SB 488 and the Commission's Performance Assessment Design Standards.

This agenda item presents results from the field tests of each model's literacy performance assessments (LPA), to identify next steps for each model, and to present staff recommendations for each model.

This agenda item is organized into four parts:

- Part I: CalTPA Literacy Cycle Overview; Field Test Methodology; Candidate Results; Survey/Focus Group Data; and Revisions for Operational Use
- Part II: edTPA Literacy Model Overview; Field Test Methodology, Candidate Results, Feedback from Candidates, Coordinators/Faculty, and Mentor Teachers; and Revisions for Operational Use
- Part III: FAST Revised Site Visitation Project Overview; Field Test Methodology, Candidate Results, Feedback from Candidates, Coordinators/Faculty, and Mentor Teachers; and Revisions for Operational Use
- Part IV: Staff Recommendations and Next Steps

Part I: CalTPA Literacy Cycle

At the August 2024 Commission Meeting, Commission staff presented [Item 5B](#), which provided an update on the CalTPA Literacy Cycle development, pilot study results, analysis, and next steps. This item also provided an overview of the CalTPA Literacy Cycle design process and the composition of the Literacy Design Team (LDT) (See [Appendix A](#) for summaries of 2024/25 LDT meetings.) Commission staff also presented [Item 5D](#) to seek Commission approval for waivers for candidates participating in the field test and establish field test selection criteria and a minimum passing standard for the CalTPA Literacy Cycle field test. The decision to grant waivers aligns with the previous decision in the pilot in [Item 4B](#) (August 2023).

CalTPA Literacy Cycle: Field Test Version

To develop the CalTPA Literacy Cycle, the LDT used CalTPA Cycle 2: Assessment-Driven Instruction, as the foundational document to begin their work. During the development of the materials, several innovative changes were made to Cycle 2 to create the Literacy Cycle, including changes to the evidence candidates submit and the overall scope and structure to address LDT recommendations, SB 488, feedback from the field, and Bias Review Committee (BRC) findings. These adjustments were incorporated into the pilot version and are available in [Item 5B](#) (August 2024). Additionally, the recommended revisions to the Literacy Cycle based on the findings from the pilot are available in [Appendix B](#).

Bias Review Committee

Prior to field test materials being distributed to the programs and candidates, the CalTPA Literacy Cycle Assessment Guides were reviewed by a Bias Review Committee (BRC) facilitated by Evaluation Systems (ES) in November 2024. The BRC consisted of five California educators who held MS, SS, MMSN, ESN, and DHH credentials. The BRC ensures that the CalTPA Literacy Cycle content is fair and equitable for all candidates and reflects the diversity of California schools.

CalTPA Literacy Cycle Field Test Methodology

The Literacy Cycle Field Test process included recruiting candidates to participate from MS, PK-3 ECE, and EdSp (MMSN, ESN, ECSE, DHH, VI) programs; providing support to those programs and candidates; recruiting and training assessors; conducting distributed and consensus scoring; and soliciting feedback through surveys and focus groups.

Candidate Participation: Credential Area, Pathway, Sector, and Ethnicity

Ultimately, 27 preliminary preparation programs across MS, PK-3 and EdSp credential areas (MMSN, ESN, ECSE, DHH, VI) participated in the field test. From those programs, 282 candidates submitted responses (see [Appendix C](#)). Table 1 outlines the number of candidates and pathways represented in each credential area. The largest group of candidates participating identified as University Interns, and the smallest group of participating candidates came from University Private School Programs. Additionally, of the 282 candidates who submitted responses, 18 completed their submissions in bilingual placements. Data is self-reported.

Table 1: Number of Candidates, Pathways, and Credential Areas in CalTPA Field Test

Credential Area	Pathways Represented	N Candidates
PK-3	District Intern, University Intern, University Student Teaching	29
MS	District Intern, Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Credentialing Program (ITEP), University Intern, University Private School, University Student Teaching	68
MMSN	District Intern, ITEP, Residency, University Intern, University Student Teaching	65
ESN	District Intern, ITEP, Residency, University Intern, University Student Teaching	53
ECSE	District Intern, ITEP, University Intern, University Student Teaching	54
DHH	District Intern, University Intern, University Student Teaching	9
VI	University Intern, University Student Teaching	4
	Total	282

Sectors of preparation programs represented included Private, LEA/County Office of Education, and CSU. Table 2 depicts the candidates in the field test by sector. The largest number of candidates came from CSU programs, while the UC sector did not participate.

Table 2: Number of Candidates by Sector in CalTPA Literacy Cycle Field Test

Sector Type	N
CSU	153
Private/Independent	69
LEA/County Office of Education	60
UC	0
Total	282

Literacy Cycle Support Provided by Commission Staff

Commission staff held webinars for program coordinators and faculty supporting candidates in the Literacy Cycle Field Test beginning in November 2024. Weekly office hour sessions for program faculty were provided from January through April 2025, with individual sessions held upon request. Fifty candidates attended a March 2024 office hour session hosted by the Commission and ES staff.

Commission staff also engaged with cooperating teachers by holding a webinar to introduce them to the field test requirements and templates. Twenty-nine cooperating teachers attended, and the webinar was recorded for those who were unable to attend. All communities of interest had ongoing support through the Commission's [literacy](#) inbox.

Literacy Cycle Field Test Assessor Recruitment, Training and Scoring

ES began recruiting field test assessors in January 2025. Assessors were required to have recent experience and expertise in the credential area being scored, hold a valid California credential, have literacy expertise, maintain confidentiality, and be a California resident. Table 3 shows the number of assessors and number of submissions scored in April and May of 2025. A distributed scoring model was used for MS, MMSN, ESN, and ECSE, and a consensus scoring model was used for PK-3 ECE, DHH, and VI.

Table 3: CalTPA Literacy Cycle Field Test Assessors

Credential Area	PK-12 Assessors	Preparation Program Assessors	Total Assessors	Submissions Scored
PK-3 ECE	10	4	14	29
MS	12	2	14	68
MMSN	7	1	8	65
ESN	8	2	10	53
ECSE	3	1	4	54
DHH	5	1	6	9
VI	1	2	3	4
Total	46	13	59	280

Analytic rubrics were used to score each step of the *Plan, Teach and Assess, Reflect, and Apply* sequence. [Appendix D](#) provides the Rubric Essential Questions and a sample rubric. Each rubric includes five score levels, with Level 3 being the expected level of performance for a teacher candidate. If a candidate scores at a Level 1 or Level 2 on any construct included within the rubric, the candidate cannot receive a score higher than that level on that particular rubric.

Levels 4 and 5 of the rubrics require the candidate to provide additional evidence, demonstrating a more complex and/or comprehensive performance.

Marker Assessors

Marker assessors were identified from trained pilot study assessors and additional applications. They participated in selecting “marker papers,” facilitated by Commission staff and ES, to use for assessor trainings that they facilitated in April and May.

Distributed Scoring and Consensus Scoring

Assessors were provided preselected “marker papers” that represented differing levels of performance across the five rubric score levels. In distributed scoring, assessors were provided the opportunity to independently calibrate and debrief with a marker assessor. Assessors who did not meet the calibration requirement were provided coaching by marker assessors and given the opportunity to calibrate a second time. Once they met the calibration standard, assessors were able to score independently. In consensus scoring, assessors calibrated through reviewing and discussing marker papers and moved into pairs or triads to score remaining candidate submissions.

Field test scoring procedures were implemented in accordance with the CalTPA Scoring Quality Management Plan. Submissions that were at or around the passing standard were double scored (blind scored by new assessor[s]). In the event rubric scores were adjacent, the higher score was reported. If the rubric scores were exact, the rubric score remained the same. If the rubric scores were more than one score point apart, the submission was sent to a marker assessor for adjudication of scores and a final scoring determination was made.

Results from the Literacy Cycle Field Test Analysis

Of the 282 candidates who submitted the Literacy Cycle Field Test, 99% (N=280) of the assessments were scored. Commission staff conducted outreach with programs and candidates regarding the two candidates who did not submit all required pieces of evidence. They were provided with the opportunity to submit missing evidence prior to the conclusion of scoring, but they did not do so. They may still resubmit their missing evidence between June 27 and July 31, 2025. Finally, one additional candidate will submit during this time because of a change in their clinical practice placement close to the field test submission date that did not allow time to complete the assessment.

Overall Pass Rate

At the conclusion of scoring, 279 of the 280 Literacy Cycle Field Test candidates passed (99.6% pass rate), with an overall mean score of 23.3 (passing standard set at 14 points). Candidates and programs were notified of passing status at the end of May. Candidates received rubric level scores and programs received aggregate scores on June 26, 2025. Additional score data related to pass rates by pathway, sector, gender, ethnicity and credential area are available in [Appendix E](#).

Pass Rate by Racial/Ethnic Group

Table 4 identifies pass rates by racial and ethnic sub-groups. Mexican American/Chicano candidates passed at a rate of 99%. All other subgroups passed at a rate of 100%.

Table 4: Pass Rate by Ethnicity in CalTPA Literacy Cycle Field Test

Ethnicity	N Submitted	N Passed	N Unscoreable	N Not Passed	Pass Rate
African American/Black	14	14	-	-	100%
Asian Indian American/Asian Indian	3	3	-	-	100%
Cambodian American/Cambodian	1	1	-	-	100%
Chinese American/Chinese	3	3	1	-	100%
Choose not to response	9	9	-	-	100%
Filipino American/Filipino	8	8	-	-	100%
Japanese American/Japanese	3	3	-	-	100%
Korean American/Korean	2	2	-	-	100%
Latino/Latin American/Puerto Rican/Other Hispanic	59	59	-	-	100%
Mexican American/Chicano	69	68	-	1	99%
Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	2	-	-	100%
Other	9	9	-	-	100%
Vietnamese American/Vietnamese	4	4	-	-	100%
White (non-Hispanic)	95	95	1	-	100%
Total	282	279	2	1	99%

Pass Rates by Credential Area

Table 5 outlines the scoring data by credential area. DHH candidates had the highest mean score (26.8), while ECSE candidates had the lowest mean score (21.4). DHH had the highest score (38) assigned, while VI had the lowest score (9). Due to the small sample size of DHH and VI, the data for this group is not generalizable to the larger DHH and VI population and should be interpreted with caution.

Table 5: Mean Scores by Credential Area in CalTPA Literacy Cycle Field Test

Credential Area	N Candidates	N Scorable	N Unscoreable	Pass Rate	Overall Mean Score	S.D.
PK-3 ECE	29	29	0	100%	24.3	5.7
MS	68	68	0	100%	24.2	4.3
MMSN	65	64	1	100%	22.8	3.9
ESN	53	52	1	100%	23.6	2.5
ECSE	54	54	0	100%	21.4	3.6
DHH	9	9	0	100%	26.8	6.7
VI	4	4	0	75%	24.5	11.1
Total	282	280	2	99.6%	23.3	4.3

Table 6 provides the languages and credential areas represented for bilingual submissions in the field test. Four languages were represented and all candidates who submitted in bilingual placements passed.

Table 6: Bilingual Submissions in CalTPA Literacy Cycle Field Test

Credential Area	N Submissions	Languages Represented	Pass Rate
PK-3 ECE	3	Spanish, Vietnamese	100%
MS	2	Spanish	100%
MMSN	1	Punjabi	100%
ESN	4	Spanish	100%
ECSE	0	N/A	N/A
DHH	8	ASL	100%
VI	0	N/A	N/A
Total	18		100%

Findings from Candidate, Program Coordinator, Mentor Teacher and Assessor Feedback

The field test included broad program representation from PK-3 ECE, MS and EdSp (MMSN, ESN, ECSE, DHH VI) programs. Field test feedback from all credential areas was gathered through surveys and focus groups. Candidates, program coordinators, cooperating teachers, and assessors were invited to respond to surveys about their experiences, and candidates, program coordinators, and assessors participating in consensus scoring were able to invited to share additional feedback through online focus groups. Survey results for selected items are available in [Appendix F](#), and qualitative data excerpts are available in [Appendix G](#). The following points outline key findings from the field test data:

- The revised Learning Segment template and Rubric 2.1 resulted in stronger candidate evidence related to ELA/Literacy and ELD standards and learning goals and the use of student’s assets and/or interests in planning instruction
- The focus student options were clear and representative of the students in cooperating teacher’s classrooms.
- The organization of the Assessment Guide made it easy for candidates, faculty, cooperating teachers, and assessors to find necessary information. Faculty expressed that having the rubrics embedded with step instructions, the hyperlinked glossary with links to resources, and the videos were particularly helpful; however, they would like to see videos with more of a candidate focus in the future.
- Candidates and program coordinators appreciated UDL built into the assessment (e.g., commentary, feedback to students), but they also expressed that sometimes the choices were overwhelming.
- The rubrics, essential questions, and constructs and levels of performance are clear
- Despite the compressed field test timeline, candidates, coordinators, and assessors all felt supported in the field test through the variety of support sessions and technical assistance offered. All groups requested sample submissions moving into operational administration and would like to expand offerings for cooperating teachers.
- Candidates and coordinators requested additional clarity on administering and providing students with feedback on the summative assessment.
- Candidates were able to demonstrate instruction in foundational reading skills; however, program coordinators felt that MS candidates placed in upper grades or EdSp candidates with TK/K or adult education programs may have been at a disadvantage in this area.

Survey Administration

Candidates, program coordinators, cooperating teachers, and assessors were surveyed based on their field test participation and asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements on a 4-point scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree), with the option to indicate Don't Know/Does Not Apply. [Appendix F](#) contains survey results to selected questions.

Of the candidates who participated in the field test, 13% (N=37) responded to the survey, representing the PK3 (N=9), MS (N=6), MMSN (N=10), ESN (N=6), ECSE (N=5), and DHH (N=1) credential areas. Forty-one percent (N=11) of the participating program coordinators responded, with PK3, MS, MMSN, and ESN coordinators represented. Programs distributed the survey to cooperating teachers, and eight responses were received representing PK3 and MS credential areas. Twenty-five percent of the cooperating teachers who responded completed a TPA during their preparation program. Assessors (N=16) from the PK3, MS, MMSN, ESN, and ECSE credential areas responded to the survey, representing 27% of the total assessors.

Focus Group Administration

Following their submission of their Literacy Cycle Performance Assessments, 17 candidates (PK3=3, MS=5, MMSN=3, ESN=5, VI=1) and 24 program coordinators (PK3=2, MS=8, MMSN=13, ESN=8, ECSE=5, DHH=2, VI=1) participated in focus group discussions to share their experiences with the field test. Assessors from PK3 (N=14), DHH (N=6), and VI (N=3) also participated in focus group discussions following the completion of consensus scoring. Extended excerpts from the focus groups discussions can be found in [Appendix G](#).

Key Findings from Candidates

Overall, 84% of candidates reported that the Literacy Cycle was an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and abilities related to literacy. Surveyed candidates (89%) strongly agreed or agreed that the tasks aligned with their coursework and allowed them to demonstrate their abilities to teach foundational reading skills and apply the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework. One candidate expressed preferring the Literacy Cycle over a standardized test. However, some candidates expressed uncertainty about selecting ELA/ELD framework themes and aligning them to skills or grade levels.

Candidates noted that the learning segment template provided opportunities to leverage students' assets, with 89% reporting they were able to do so in their lesson planning. In the focus group discussions, candidates felt confident using students' interests in lessons but found it more challenging to utilize cultural and linguistic assets. While some candidates successfully connected with students by drawing on shared backgrounds or personal expertise, others initially struggled to apply cultural insights until seeking guidance from professors and coursework.

Over 75% of candidates who responded strongly agreed (N=11) or agreed (N=21) that having the choice to provide written, verbal, or ASL commentary was helpful, though others felt that a balance between choice and structured guidance would be helpful. A small group disagreed (5) or strongly disagreed (4) that the Literacy Cycle was a fair measure of their ability to teach literacy, while the remaining candidates strongly agreed (9) or agreed (19). Some of the survey comments expressed concerns related to the developmental levels of the students in their

clinical practice placements for ESN and ECSE in PK/TK and the constraints around the 20-minute video limit.

Key Findings from Program Coordinators

Overall, 91% of program coordinators who responded to the survey strongly agreed or agreed that the Literacy Cycle allowed candidates to authentically demonstrate their literacy instruction. All program coordinators who responded strongly agreed or agreed that the tasks aligned with what candidates had been learning in their coursework and allowed candidates to demonstrate their abilities to teach foundational reading skills and the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework.

Coordinators noted that the Literacy Cycle helped candidates develop self-reflection skills that reinforced their learning and boosted confidence. Examples included candidates reflecting on standards, targeting English learners, student self-monitoring, and understanding the importance of foundational reading skills taught through direct and systematic methods. In the focus groups, coordinators expressed that some candidates understood the concept of how to leverage students' assets and interests and were able gather the information from their clinical practice placements or cooperating teachers, but some candidates struggled when constrained by cooperating teachers' guidance or scripted reading programs.

While program coordinators believed that the Literacy Cycle provided an overall authentic opportunity for candidates to demonstrate literacy instruction, they expressed the need for increased clarity on how to use the ELA/ELD Framework to plan lessons and assessments (27% disagreed or strongly disagreed). In focus group responses, program coordinators were concerned about the impact on candidates of cooperating teachers not teaching foundational reading skills. They also expressed concern about the challenges faced by candidates working with higher grade levels to ensure foundational skills are taught appropriately for different age groups and disability areas.

Key Findings from Cooperating Teachers

Of the cooperating teachers who responded, 75% strongly agreed or agreed that the Literacy Cycle allowed candidates to demonstrate authentic literacy instruction, fairly measured the candidates' abilities to teach literacy, was aligned with typically occurs in their classroom, and saw candidates demonstrate planning and teaching of ELA/literacy and ELD learning goals.

All the cooperating teachers who responded supported their candidates in reviewing literacy assessments and provided support to their candidate with selecting ELA/Literacy and ELD standards, foundational reading skills, and additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework for their lessons and assessments. Additionally, 88% of the responding cooperating teachers strongly agreed or agreed that the learning segment template helped their candidate to plan.

Feedback from Assessors

Assessors indicated that the Literacy Cycle provides evidence of effective literacy instruction, noting the focus on foundational reading skills. Of assessors who responded, 94% strongly agreed or agreed that the amount of evidence required from candidates at each step was sufficient to score the submission. In focus groups, DHH assessors highlighted that the Literacy Cycle is more beneficial for Deaf candidates, allowing them to focus on teaching approaches.

Assessors agreed that candidates were able to teach foundational reading skills and apply them to the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework and were generally able to determine whether a candidate's instruction in foundational reading skills was "direct, systematic, and explicit."

Next Steps for Literacy Cycle Development

Changes for Operational Administration

Based on the results of the field test surveys, focus groups, and candidate scores, Commission staff is finalizing the following adjustments to the Literacy Cycle assessment guides, templates, and rubrics.

Step 1: Plan

- In all versions, the instructions will be clarified for what candidates need to submit for the summative assessment in Part D
- In PK-3, MS, and MMSN, the learning segment template prompt will be revised to address adaptations for students in the group as well as the focus student
- In EdSp-DHH, if the FS is an ASL user, candidates will be asked to select one K-12 ASL Standard and incorporate it into the ELD learning goal

Step 2: Teach and Assess

- In all versions, a commentary prompt will be added related to leveraging student's assets (cultural and/or linguistic) and/or interests to elicit additional evidence from candidates

Step 3: Reflect

- In all versions, instructions will be clarified for the actionable feedback provided to the focus student on the summative assessment
- MMSN/ESN will be revised to align the prompts and rubric related to the candidate providing the focus student's family/guardian(s) with feedback that is specific to the ELA/Literacy and ELD learning goals.

Step 4: Apply

- In all versions, the follow-up activity will be revised to add a prompt asking for the ELA/Literacy and ELD standards and learning goals
- In all versions, the rubric will be revised to ensure candidates understand that their evidence from Steps 1-3 should support their reteach or extension decision

Overall

- All rubrics will be reviewed to ensure clarity and precision between the constructs in Levels 2 and 3 and to address when the candidate is being assessed on evidence related to multiple students or the focus student
- The glossary will be updated with specific terms requested in field test feedback (e.g., individualized strategy, actionable feedback, reteach, extension)
- The faculty/program guide will be revised to clarify clinical practice placements appropriate for performance assessment that aligns with SB 488 and to support fields new to performance assessment
- More robust examples will be added to address the needs of the field for PK-3, ECSE, ESN, and candidates working with older students on foundational reading skills

- EdSp-DHH will have updated guidance around filming in a manner that allows assessors to clearly view the candidate's signing (e.g. filming in landscape, lighting, steady camera)

All rubrics will be reviewed and revised as needed to align with the above changes. Commission staff will continue to work with candidates, program coordinators, cooperating teachers, and assessors to determine the most effective supports for all groups as teacher preparation programs prepare for the operational assessment in the 25/26 academic year.

Timeline for Operational Administration

As a result of the data from the field test, staff maintains that the development timeline for the Commission is on track to begin a 2025-26 operational administration for the Literacy Cycle for PK-3 ECE, MS, and EdSp (MMSN, ESN, ECSE, DHH, VI) programs.

Next Steps

Based on the Literacy Cycle field test results, surveys, and focus group findings, Commission and ES staff will finalize the Literacy Cycle tasks, rubrics, and program guides. Next Steps for development of the Literacy Cycle include the following:

- Finalize operational Literacy Cycle Tasks, Rubrics, Program Guides, and Support Materials
- Align CalTPA Cycle 2 (SS/WL) with Literacy Cycle revision as is appropriate for the credential area and/or content area for the 2025/26 academic year.

Commission staff and ES will convene an additional group of educators for a standard setting study in 2026, with staff bringing forward a recommended passing standard for Commission adoption in June 2026.

Part II: edTPA Literacy Model

The edTPA systematically examines a cycle of teaching aimed at subject-specific student learning goals, using authentic evidence derived from candidates' practice in their student teaching or internship placement. As discussed above, at the December 2024 meeting, the Commission approved edTPA to field test its Multiple Subject, Literacy with Mathematics and edTPA Education Specialist, Literacy: MMSN/ESN assessments. Included within that agenda item ([Agenda Item 3C](#)) was a detailed overview of the revised edTPA for each credential area that demonstrated both the assessments' alignment with the TPEs, including the requirements outlined in SB 488 (Appendix A, page 19) and with the Commission's Performance Assessment Design Standards (Appendix C, page 24).

The edTPA portfolio consists of three tasks that make up a cycle of teaching: Planning for Literacy Instruction and Assessment (Task 1); Instructing and Engaging in Literacy Learning (Task 2); and Assessing Literacy Learning (Task 3). The tasks focus on literacy instruction with an emphasis on foundational skills, meaning making, language development, content understanding, and, for the Education Specialist version, multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS). The literacy learning segment, Task 3, measures candidates' abilities to teach literacy across all disciplines. [Appendix H](#) provides an overview of the edTPA tasks by credential area.

Following the approval by the Commission in December 2024, Evaluation Systems led the field test for the edTPA Multiple Subject, Literacy with Mathematics and edTPA Education Specialist,

Literacy: Mild-moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs (MMSN/ESN) assessments.

Field Test Methodology

The field test for the edTPA Multiple Subject, Literacy and edTPA Education Specialist, Literacy took place in spring 2025 and included program recruitment, registration of candidates, support for programs and candidates, assessor recruitment and calibration, and scoring of candidate submissions.

Field Test Recruitment

Recruitment for the field test began with an Interest Survey provided to Commission-approved educator preparation programs (EPPs) with active and accredited Multiple Subject and/or Education Specialist (MMSN, ESN) programs. Criteria for EPP selection included:

- RICA pass rate at or above 70%
- edTPA pass rate at or above 70%
- Commission-approved literacy program or a review of relevant literacy course syllabi
- Dedicated contact faculty/staff member to support candidates throughout the field test

Nine California EPPs initially applied to participate in the field test. Of those, seven EPPs completed the application review and were formally invited to participate. Three EPPs subsequently withdrew their participation. Of the programs that applied, four ultimately went on to participate in the field test.

Field Test Candidate Registration and Participation

Registration for the field test opened January 26, 2025. Vouchers were distributed to participating EPPs who, in turn, distributed them to their participating candidates. Ongoing registration details were shared with participating faculty to ensure all intended candidates were registered without incident.

In total, 269 candidates registered for the field test, which included 144 Multiple Subjects candidates and 125 Education Specialist candidates. Table 7 provides an overview of participating EPPs, the credential programs at each institution that participated in the field test, and the number of candidates per program who participated. Across all four programs, a total of 27 candidates registered but did not participate (i.e., submit a portfolio) in the field test. This resulted in a total of 242 field test participants. As shown in Table 8, participant pathways included residencies, traditional student teaching, and university interns.

Table 7: Credential Programs and Candidates that Participated in edTPA Field Test

EPP Name	Credential Area	Sector	# of Candidates
California Baptist University	Multiple Subject	Private	16
Loyola Marymount University	Multiple Subject	Private	74
Loyola Marymount University	Education Specialist	Private	64
Saint Mary's College California	Multiple Subject	Private	36
Saint Mary's College California	Education Specialist	Private	14
University of the Pacific	Education Specialist	Private	38
Total Field Test Participants			242

Table 8: edTPA Field Test Participating Candidates by Pathway (n = 242)

Pathway	Participating Candidates
Resident	19
Traditional 5 th Year	77
University Intern	146
Total Participating Candidates	242

Field Test Support for EPP Faculty, Staff and Candidates

Participating faculty were invited to a virtual introductory meeting, during which an overview of the assessments and the field test requirements was provided. Participating program faculty/staff members were given access to all assessment materials prior to the opening of the field test. Bi-weekly meetings were held for participating program faculty and staff throughout the duration of the field test to discuss additional topics, including field test materials, acceptable support, and submission and reporting processes, and to answer questions. Program faculty and staff were thereby equipped with the knowledge to support their candidates who participated in the field test. The Evaluation Systems Customer Contact Center was also available by phone, email, and chat for technical questions and support.

Field Test Assessor Recruitment, Calibration and Scoring

Assessors for the California edTPA Literacy Field Test were recruited both from the current edTPA operational assessor pool and through outreach to the field. All assessors were required to meet established qualifications for the assessment field in which they would score. These qualifications included holding a valid credential for the area which they would be scoring and hold an English Learner authorization or be a faculty or staff member in an educator preparation program.

The three edTPA tasks each consist of five rubrics, with each rubric designed to assess a primary construct associated with the given task. Each rubric includes five score levels, with Level 3 being the expected level of performance for a teacher candidate. [Appendix I](#) provides a sample rubric. Assessors are directed to consider the preponderance of evidence when determining at which level to score a submission. As part of the December 2024 request to field test ([Item 3C](#)), the Commission approved preliminary passing standards for the assessments. For the Multiple Subjects, Literacy assessment, the field test passing score was set at 44; for the Education Specialist, Literacy assessment, the field test passing score was set at 34. These standards were applied during the field test.

Assessor training and calibration included a two-hour webinar with experienced Scoring Lead Trainers from Evaluation Systems, followed by a qualification portfolio that included three submissions scored independently by the assessor. Only if an assessor met the calibration criteria (at least seven exact scores, plus at least 14 exact plus adjacent scores) were they allowed to continue to independent scoring. A total of 35 assessors successfully calibrated and participated in field test scoring. Among those, 21 are active K-12 teachers, while the remaining 14 are faculty or staff in an educator preparation program.

Throughout the duration of the field test scoring, the Evaluation Systems teams held weekly meetings during which the scoring process and scoring resolutions were closely monitored. At the end of the scoring window, the scoring team provided a condition code report and a scoring data report for all portfolio submissions. Using these reports, non-passing portfolios were identified and reported to preparation programs so they could provide guidance and support to their candidates as part of the retake process.

As anticipated, on May 15 scores were securely reported to preparation programs via their edReports accounts and to candidates through their Pearson account. Candidates who did not earn a passing score or whose portfolios were unable to be scored as a result of condition codes were provided with an opportunity to address the errors and resubmit; a voucher was provided to cover the cost of the resubmission.

Results of Field Test

The field test results yielded quantitative data that offered insights into candidate performance. Statistical analyses revealed patterns across rubrics, highlighting areas where candidates excelled as well as areas that may require further clarification or support by preparation programs.

Overall Pass Rate by Credential Area

Table 9 below presents data on the submissions and pass rates of candidates across the Multiple Subject and Education Specialist, Literacy: MMSN/ESN credential areas.

For the Multiple Subject credential area, there were a total of 125 submissions. Of these, 100 candidates passed the assessment, while 4 did not pass. Additionally, there were 21 submissions that were categorized as non-scorable; these submissions received a condition code. For the Education Specialist, Literacy: MMSN/ESN credential area, there were 117 submissions. Among these, 92 candidates passed the assessment, 13 did not pass, and 12 submissions were categorized as non-scorable and received a condition code.

Across both assessments, the condition codes most frequently issued were E9, 11, and 14, all of which related to submitting an incorrect commentary for the Planning, Instruction, or Assessment Task respectively. The G1 condition code was issued for those portfolios that submitted an incorrect template for the associated task. Each of these candidates was provided with a voucher to address their error and resubmit their portfolio for scoring.

The data indicate that the majority of candidates were able to successfully complete the assessment and of those who submitted a scorable portfolio, the majority earned a passing score.

Table 9: edTPA Candidate Submissions and Pass Rate by Credential Area

Credential Area	Number Submissions	Total Passed	Total Not Passes	Total Non-Score
Multiple Subject	125	100	4	21
Education Specialist, Literacy: MMSN/ESN	117	92	13	12

Credential Area Pass Rates by Race/Ethnicity

Table 10 provides a detailed analysis of the edTPA candidate submissions and pass rates, broken down by demographic categories, including ethnicity and gender.

The overall pass rate for MS candidates was 96%, with an overall mean score of 52.33. The highest score achieved was 62, while the lowest was 33, with a standard deviation of 5.01. When examining the data by ethnicity, candidates who identified as Black and Asian had a 100% pass rate, with mean scores of 51.58 and 53.83, respectively. Candidates who identified as Hispanic had a pass rate of 96%, with a mean score of 52.00. White candidates also had a 96% pass rate, with a mean score of 52.25. Multiracial candidates had an 88% pass rate, with a mean score of 53.00. Candidates categorized as "Other" and "Undeclared" had a 100% pass rate, with mean scores of 51.50 and 56.00, respectively.

In terms of gender, the pass rate for female candidates was 97%, with a mean score of 52.22. Male candidates had an 86% pass rate, with a mean score of 52.43. Nonbinary candidates had a 100% pass rate, with a mean score of 61.00. There was one candidate whose gender was not provided, and this candidate also had a 100% pass rate, with a mean score of 53.00.

Overall, the table highlights the strong performance of candidates across different demographic categories in the MS Literacy assessment. The data indicates high pass rates and consistent mean scores, demonstrating the effectiveness of the preparation and support provided to candidates.

Table 10: edTPA Multiple Subject Field Test Pass Rates by Race/Ethnicity

Multiple Subject	N	Passing Status		Total Score			
		N Pass	% Pass	Mean	Min	Max	SD
Total	104	100	96%	52.33	33	62	5.01
Ethnicity							
Black	12	12	100%	51.58	45	60	4.40
Asian	12	12	100%	53.83	47	61	4.59
Hispanic	45	43	96%	52.00	33	61	5.54
White	24	23	96%	52.25	42	58	4.17
Multiracial	8	7	88%	53.00	41	62	6.78
Other	2	2	100%	51.50	50	53	---
Undeclared	1	1	100%	56.00	56	56	---
Gender							
Not Provided	1	1	100%	53.00	53	53	---
Male	7	6	86%	52.43	42	60	5.97
Female	95	92	97%	52.22	33	62	4.94

Multiple Subject	N	Passing Status		Total Score			
Nonbinary	1	1	100%	61.00	61	61	---

Table 11 provides a comprehensive analysis of the Education Specialist candidate submissions and pass rates, disaggregated by the demographic categories of ethnicity and gender.

Overall, 88% of candidates who submitted a scoreable Education Specialist assessment passed, with a mean score of 40.83. The highest score achieved was 53, while the lowest was 25, with a standard deviation of 5.47. When examining the data by ethnicity, candidates who identified as Native American or Other had a 100% pass rate, with a mean score of 46.00 and 46.67, respectively. Candidates who identified as undeclared had the lowest pass rate at 67%.

In terms of gender, the pass rate for female candidates was 90%, with a mean score of 41.06. Male candidates had a 77% pass rate, with a mean score of 40.00. Nonbinary candidates had a 100% pass rate, with a mean score of 36.00. There were three candidates whose gender was not provided, and these candidates had a 67% pass rate, with a mean score of 39.33.

Overall, the table highlights the performance of candidates across different demographic categories in the edTPA assessment for the Education Specialist credential area. The mean scores and pass rates for the Education Specialist candidates were more varied than those of the Multiple-Subject candidates.

Table 11: edTPA Education Specialist Field Test Pass Rates by Demographic

Education Specialist	N	Passing Status		Total Score			
		N Pass	% Pass	Mean	Min	Max	SD
Total	105	92	88%	40.83	25	53	5.47
Ethnicity							
Black	9	7	78%	39.00	29	45	5.32
Native American	1	1	100%	46.00	46	46	---
Asian	20	16	80%	39.95	29	45	5.62
Hispanic	41	38	93%	41.98	27	51	4.70
White	19	17	89%	40.26	25	51	6.34
Multiracial	9	8	89%	39.22	28	43	4.55
Other	3	3	100%	46.67	39	53	7.09
Undeclared	3	2	67%	37.33	30	45	7.51
Gender							
Not Provided	3	2	67%	39.33	30	44	8.08
Male	13	10	77%	40.00	30	50	6.26
Female	88	79	90%	41.06	25	53	5.32
Nonbinary	1	1	100%	36.00	36	36	---

Score Distributions and Means Scores by Rubric

As discussed above, edTPA utilizes a five-point rubric, with Level 3 indicating Proficient Performance. For Multiple Subject, Literacy with Mathematics, across nearly all rubrics, a majority of candidates scored at Level 3, indicating a consistent demonstration of competency.

Very few candidates received a score of Level 4, and no Level 5 scores were recorded, suggesting room for growth in achieving exemplary performance. Level 1 scores were also rare, indicating that most candidates were performing at or above basic expectations.

For Education Specialist, most rubrics show a concentration of scores at Level 3, indicating that the majority of candidates met expectations at the proficient level. Level 4 scores are present but sparse, and no Level 5 scores were recorded, suggesting that while performance is solid, few candidates demonstrated exemplary practice. Level 1 scores are minimal in most rubrics, except for Rubric 11, which shows a significant cluster of low scores.

Tables displaying the full distribution of scores by rubric for each assessment are available in [Appendix J](#).

Feedback on Field Test

Feedback on the edTPA Literacy field tests was gathered from candidates, program coordinators and faculty, cooperating teachers, and assessors through surveys. Additionally, focus groups were conducted with candidates and program coordinators and faculty.

Survey Results

Candidate, program coordinator, and cooperating teacher surveys had three sections: Opportunity to Demonstrate Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities; Clarity and Ease of Use; and Field Test Information and Support. The assessor surveys had two sections: Clarity and Ease of Use and Field Test Assessor Training. Additionally, responders were invited to elaborate on their ratings in open-ended responses. [Appendix K](#) provides the results for each survey, along with selected responses to the open-ended items.

Candidate Survey Feedback

In their responses to the survey, Multiple Subject candidates (n=24) described the experience as both challenging and rewarding. While some found the process overwhelming, tedious, or stressful, others appreciated the opportunity for self-reflection and professional growth. Several noted that the experience helped them re-evaluate their teaching practices and become more intentional in planning and assessment.

Despite the challenges, 83% (20) of the Multiple Subject and 80% (12) of the Education Specialist participants who responded indicated they agreed the edTPA allowed them to demonstrate their literacy instructional practice in an authentic way and that the tasks aligned with what they had been learning in their coursework. Similarly, 79% (19) of Multiple Subject and 93% (14) of Education Specialist responders indicated that the tasks allowed them to demonstrate their abilities to teach foundational skills and the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework. Candidates also reported gaining deeper insights into instructional planning, differentiation, and assessment practices—particularly through Task 1. The process encouraged them to align their teaching more closely with standards and student needs.

In their open-ended responses, candidates highlighted the duality of “challenging but rewarding” when describing their experiences with the edTPA, with calls for redesign to better reflect the realities of teaching and reduce unnecessary stress. Suggestions included better

communication, more preparation time, and support tailored to diverse teaching contexts. Despite these concerns, many survey participants emphasized the value of the edTPA in promoting intentional teaching and noted growth in their ability to plan, instruct, and assess with greater purpose and clarity.

Program Coordinator and Faculty Survey Feedback

Overall, faculty and supporting staff (n=7) viewed the Literacy version of the edTPA as an improvement over previous iterations of the assessment. Responders agreed (n=4) and strongly agreed (n=3) that the assessment was a fair measure of candidates' abilities to teach literacy. Similar to the candidates, all responders also agreed that the edTPA allowed candidates to demonstrate their abilities to teach foundational reading skills and the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework. In their open-ended responses, responding faculty and staff indicated that, while the inclusion of foundational skills was seen as a positive shift—especially in aligning with the science of reading—several respondents noted a lack of depth and clarity in how to implement and assess these skills effectively.

There was general appreciation for the rubrics' alignment with TPE 7 and their broader scope, but some found them vague or confusing without discussion or support. Despite the challenges, many noted that candidates benefited from the literacy focus and the structured reflection on teaching practices. The process helped them better understand comprehensive literacy instruction and evidence-based practices. Still, two (29%) of the responders disagreed that the commentary prompts helped candidates fully describe what they were doing and why, suggesting this may be an area for improvement with the guide.

Cooperating Teacher Survey Feedback

Cooperating Teachers (n=24) largely indicated a lack of clear guidance and preparation for mentors. Several survey participants were unaware of their expected role in supporting candidates or felt under-informed about the edTPA process. Suggestions included: providing mentors with an overview session or training before the candidate begins, offering exemplars and walkthroughs of rubrics and expectations, clarifying the scope of mentor responsibilities early in the process. Still, a majority of responding cooperating teachers (n=17; 85%) agreed or strongly agreed that the way the edTPA handbook was organized made it easy to find the information I needed to support my candidate.

Despite challenges, many cooperating teachers acknowledged the edTPA's value in helping candidates grow professionally, with 95% (21) of responders indicating the edTPA allowed their candidate to demonstrate their literacy knowledge, skills, and abilities in an authentic way.

Focus Group Results

Following the close of the initial submission period, candidates were invited to one of two separate focus groups based on credential area before score reporting. A focus group was also held with program coordinators and faculty who supported candidates during the field test. For individuals who were unable to attend, the focus group questions were provided so they could respond via email.

Candidate Focus Group Feedback

Evaluation Systems facilitated two separate candidate focus groups based on credential area. Multiple Subject candidates (n=2) emphasized the need for clearer guidance throughout the edTPA process, suggesting that more structured and detailed instructions would help candidates navigate the assessment more effectively. This would be especially significant for candidates who may not have access to strong facilitators or mentors, as this can significantly impact their ability to successfully complete the edTPA.

Education Specialist candidates (n=7) indicated the need for clearer instructions on how to incorporate MTSS into lesson plans and how to speak about it, overall, throughout the edTPA process. They mentioned the confusion around whether to explain their understanding of MTSS or how they support their students' needs through MTSS. They shared that this was likely confusing for them because planning and implementing supports for their focus learner is something they do regularly without framing it as MTSS; they were unclear what specifically they should explain about this in their edTPA commentary. In addition, participants discussed the difficulty of capturing foundational reading skills within the limited time frame of the edTPA, with one participant adding that there was a challenge of translating these skills to a high school setting.

Program Coordinator and Faculty Focus Group Feedback

Feedback from the program coordinator and faculty focus group (n = 6) was largely centered around accessibility of instructions. Participants viewed the handbooks as more streamlined than previous versions, but they still felt that the handbooks were overly wordy and contained redundant prompts. Suggestions included simplifying commentary prompts, aligning prompts more clearly to rubrics, using consistent terminology, and clarifying expectations for modeling, student engagement, and application in video clips.

Next Steps Based on Field Test Results

edTPA staff will use the field test results to guide revisions. To begin, staff will use the feedback collected from surveys and the focus groups to identify areas for improvement in the literacy assessments.

Targeted revisions to the assessments include updates to enhance clarity and strengthen alignment with learning objectives. The goal is to ensure the assessments are both rigorous and responsive to stakeholder input. Assessment directions will be revised to provide more clarity on specific areas, including the use of MTSS in the Education Specialist handbook.

Once revisions are complete, the focus will shift to finalizing all assessment materials. This includes preparing administration guides, scoring rubrics, and any supporting documentation needed to ensure smooth implementation and consistent evaluation across settings. Evaluation Systems will also provide assessment overviews and preparation webinars for the field.

Upon approval from the Commission, the updated literacy assessments will become operational on August 26. At this point, they will be fully integrated into the program and ready for use in educational settings. All stakeholders will be informed and supported to ensure a successful rollout.

In the spring of 2026, a formal standard setting process will be conducted, which will involve establishing performance benchmarks and cut scores to interpret student results meaningfully. The outcomes will guide future instructional planning and policy decisions.

Part III: FAST 3.0 Site Visitation Project

FAST, the Commission's third approved teaching performance assessment, is owned by and approved for administration at California State University, Fresno (Fresno State). As discussed above, at its August 2024 meeting ([Agenda Item 5C](#)), the Commission approved Fresno State to pilot a revised version of the FAST for Multiple Subject, FAST 3.0, which consists of the Site Visitation Project (SVP) and the Teaching Sample Project (TSP). The Agenda Item presents an overview of the revised FAST's alignment with the TPEs, including the elements of TPE 7 required by SB 488 (Appendix A, page 11) and the Commission's Performance Assessment Design Standards (Appendix C, page 25). The revised SVP consists of three parts with three corresponding rubrics: Foundational Skills, Meaning Making, and Instructional Decision Making and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy. Both the Foundational Skills and Meaning Making rubrics consist of three sections: Planning Reading Pedagogy; Implementation: Daily Progress Notes; and Reflecting on Reading Pedagogy. The Instructional Decision Making and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy rubric also consists of three parts: Instructional Decision Making; Next Steps; and Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy. [Appendix M](#) provides an overview of the FAST 3.0 SVP, and the Multiple Subject Foundation Skills rubric is provided in [Appendix N](#).

Following the revision and Commission approval of the Multiple Subject version of FAST, faculty and staff at Fresno State then revised the Education Specialist—Mild-to-Moderate Support Needs (ES-MM) and Education Specialist (ES-ESN) versions of FAST to align with the requirements of SB 488. The revised versions were reviewed by the Commission in December 2024 ([Consent Calendar GS 1C-92](#)) and approved to be field tested in Spring 2025 on consent.

Field Test Methodology

Because the FAST is embedded within Fresno's teacher credential programs, all candidates typically complete their SVP during their first semester of clinical practice and the TSP during their second semester of clinical practice. As such, all Multiple Subject and Education Specialist candidates enrolled in their first semester of clinical practice participated in the appropriate field test.

Candidate Participation

In total, 38 Multiple Subject candidates enrolled in their first phase of clinical practice initially participated in the field test for the revised Multiple Subject SVP. Additionally, eight candidates enrolled in the dual credential program, which includes Multiple Subject, Education Specialist—Mild-to-Moderate Support Needs, and Education Specialist—Extensive Support Needs, who were completing their general education clinical practice, also participated in the field test for the revised Multiple Subject SVP. Six teacher candidates who did not pass the pilot study in Fall 2024 completed the Multiple Subject SVP field test in their second phase of clinical practice. In total 52 MS SVPs were attempted in the Spring 2025 field test.

Fresno State's Education Specialist credential program is offered as a dual program that allows candidates to earn both their Mild-to-Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs credentials simultaneously. Typically, candidates complete their first semester of clinical

practice in an Extensive Support Needs classroom. As such, the six candidates enrolled in their initial phase of clinical practice participated in the field test for the revised ES-ESN SVP. One individual enrolled in the program enrolled in their initial phase of clinical practice was placed in a Mild-to-Moderate Support Needs classroom and so participated in the field test for the revised ES-MM SVP. In total, seven ES SVPs were attempted in the Spring 2025 field test.

Candidate Support

During the field test, the FAST Coordinator hosted two seminars for candidates. The first seminar was co-hosted with literacy faculty and focused on the literacy assessment component of the revised SVP. Candidates were re-introduced to the Words Their Way Spelling Inventory and the Narrative Comprehension Task. The seminar also supported candidates in analyzing the data gathered from these assessments to determine common literacy needs for a small group of students. Candidates were instructed to take the next few weeks to administer the assessments and organize their findings before the second seminar.

The second seminar supported candidates in developing a three-day instructional sequence based on their analysis of the results of the assessment. Candidates were instructed how to complete the Lesson Planning Table for both Foundational Literacy skills and Meaning Making. Seminar two also supported candidates in completing the Reflection-in-Action Table that was to be completed after teaching each of the three lessons to determine changes needed for the next day's instruction. Finally, candidates were provided support in the reflection portion of their SVP, which requires candidates to reflect on their instruction, their decision making, and the connection between literature they select and students' engagement.

During the month prior to submission, the FAST Coordinator held drop-in office hours for candidates.

Assessor Selection & Calibration

Traditionally, the SVP portion of FAST has been scored by credential-specific coaches who supervise candidates during their initial phase of clinical practice. As such, all individuals who score the SVP meet the minimum qualifications for serving as a clinical practice coach, which includes holding a credential in the area in which the individual is coaching or holding an administrative services credential. Additionally, coaches must hold a Master's Degree in a closely aligned field and must have a minimum of three years of classroom experience.

For the Multiple Subject field test, 23 Multiple Subject coaches participated in a two-part calibration session. Similarly, eight Education Specialist coaches participated in a two-part calibration session. Both the Multiple Subject SVP calibration and the Education Specialist SVP calibration included an overview of the revised assessment and collaboratively scoring a sample assessment. Coaches were then required to score a sample assessment individually and score within one score point of the official score.

Coaches scoring any version of the revised SVP were invited to join an in-person scoring session to allow for collaboration during the scoring process.

Field Test Results

Table 12 provides an overview of the results of the FAST 3.0 SVP field tests for the Multiple Subject and ES-MM and ES-ESN SVPs.

Table 12: FAST 3.0 SVP Field Test Submissions and Results by Credential Area

Credential Area	Number Submitted	Total Pass First Attempt	Total Pass Second Attempt	Total Not Passed to Date
Multiple Subject	52	46 (88%)	2 (4%)	4 (8%)
Education Specialist: Mild-to-Moderate	1	1 (100%)	N/A	N/A
Education Specialist: Extensive Support	6	4 (66%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)

Multiple Subject Field Test Results

Of the 52 Multiple Subjects candidates who submitted an SVP as part of the field test, 46 passed on their first attempt.

Of the six Multiple Subject candidates who did not pass the SVP, three earned scores of one on all three SVP rubrics; two earned one earned scores of one on two of the three rubrics; and one earned a score of one on the Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy/Instructional Decision Making rubric. Two of the individuals who did not pass on their first attempt revised their submissions and passed on the second attempt; two submitted a second attempt and still did not pass; and two have not yet completed a revision. The four who have not yet passed will re-do their SVP in the initial part of their second semester of clinical practice (Fall 2025).

Table 13 provides an overview of the average score candidates in each credential area scored on each rubric included within the FAST Revised SVP.

Table 13: FAST 3.0 SVP Average Rubric Scores by Credential Area

Credential Area	Literacy Foundations	Meaning Making	Instructional Decision Making & Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy
Multiple Subject	2.54	2.46	2.4
Education Specialist	2.42	2.28	2.42

Education Specialist Field Test Results

Seven candidates pursuing Education Specialist credentials participated in the field test.

The one candidate who submitted an ES-MM SVP passed on their first attempt.

Five of the six candidates who submitted an ES-ESN SVP passed on their first attempt. The one candidate who did not pass received a score of one on the Foundational Skills rubric. The candidate revised their submission and passed on the second attempt.

Feedback from Candidates, Assessors, and Mentor Teachers

Following the completion of the field test, feedback, through online surveys, was solicited from candidates who submitted assessments and program support providers (coaches who assessed the submissions and mentor teachers who provided support to candidates in their clinical practice). Survey items focused on each group's level of preparation to either complete the revised SVP (candidates) or support candidates with their submission (support providers). Responses will allow Fresno State to plan future activities to better support candidates with the SVP in the future.

Additionally, during the collaborative scoring session, data were collected from assessors about points of confusion within the rubrics and/or guides.

Candidate Feedback

The candidate survey consisted of 8 close-ended items and 11 open-ended items. Of the 42 candidates who participated in the SVP field tests, 15 responded to the survey requesting feedback on their experience. Eleven of those who responded indicated they were enrolled in the Multiple Subjects credential, and four indicated they were enrolled in the Education Specialist credential program. Responders represented both traditional and residency pathways. See [Appendix O](#) for tables summarizing responses to the close-ended items and selected responses to the open-ended items.

Overall, 13 of the 15 candidates who responded indicated they agreed (n=6) or somewhat agreed (n=7) they felt prepared to complete the SVP. All the candidates who responded indicated they agreed (n=11) or somewhat agreed (n=4) that they had the literacy knowledge needed to instruct in each of the foundational and meaning making skills. To items asking candidates to rate their level of preparation for specific tasks on the SVP on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high), over half the responders selected 4 or 5 for each task.

Coach Feedback

Coaches who scored the revised SVP also had the opportunity to respond to a survey that consisted of six close-ended and ten open-ended items. In total, 19 coaches responded; 15 of those scored MS candidates' submissions, and 4 scored ES candidates' submissions. Coaches also provided support to candidates during the semester as they completed their SVP. Most of the survey items focused on their ability to provide support to the candidates. [Appendix P](#) provides tables summarizing responses to the close-ended items and selected responses to the open-ended items.

Overall, 52.6% (10) indicated they felt prepared to support their candidates, while 36.8% (7) indicated they felt somewhat prepared, and 10.5% (2) indicated they were not prepared. All responders indicated they attended at least one of the support sessions provided to them. Seventeen of the responders rated the effectiveness of the support sessions in preparing them to score the SVP at a level of 4 or 5 on a five-point scale.

Coaches were also asked to rate their level of preparation for scoring specific sessions of the SVP on a scale of 1 (not prepared) to 5 (very prepared). Sixteen of the coaches who responded rated their level of preparation to score the Foundational Skills section at a 4 or 5; three coaches rated their level of preparation at a 3. In the area of Meaning Making, 18 of the

coaches rated their level of preparation at a 4 or 5; 1 coach rated their level of preparation at a 1. When asked about what would help them to be better prepared, coaches asked for sample submissions at each score point and closer alignment between the tasks and the rubrics.

Mentor Teacher Feedback

Twenty-one mentor teachers responded to the survey asking them to provide feedback on the revised SVP. Of these, 18 supported MS candidates, and 5 supported ES candidates. The survey included six close-ended items and two open-ended items. [Appendix Q](#) provides tables summarizing responses to the close-ended items and selected responses to the open-ended items.

Overall, 63.6% (14) of the mentors stated that they felt prepared to support candidates with the tasks included in the literacy SVP, while 22.7% (5) indicated they felt somewhat prepared and 13.6% (3) indicated they were not prepared. When asked to elaborate on their responses, mentors highlighted their experience as Multiple Subjects teachers and the clarifications they received from candidates' coaches. Some did ask for more specific information to be provided from the university.

Over 80% of the responding mentor teachers indicated they believed they had the knowledge to support their candidates in specific foundational skills, including phonemic awareness, grapheme/phoneme correspondence, fluency, decoding/encoding, irregular words, and concepts about print. The two areas mentor teachers believed they had the least amount of knowledge were grapheme/phoneme correspondence and concepts about print.

The survey also asked mentor teachers how they could be better supported to support their candidates. Key themes in their responses were more communication from the university about the assessment and professional development opportunities focused on foundational literacy skills.

Next Steps Based on Field Test

Based on the Field Test results, Fresno State is working to implement multiple revisions to the revised SVPs themselves and to the overall administration of the FAST and the Multiple Subject and Education Specialist programs.

In particular, findings from the Field Test indicated that more specificity is needed within the directions and templates for the Instructional Decision Making sections. For example, charts need to have a space for candidates to state what grade level students they are teaching. Additionally, coaches scoring candidates' submissions highlighted the need for rubrics to include a descriptor that literacy development activities implemented are appropriate for the focal skill and that the candidate provides appropriate justification for why the activity supports development in that focal area.

Specific revisions have included strengthening the alignment between task instructions and rubrics. In particular, the rubrics now include language to address the alignment between instructional decisions and students' literacy development.

Programmatically, findings from the field test indicated candidates' desired more explicit instruction in both foundational skills and meaning making so that they would be more prepared for the assessment. Feedback from the mentor teachers indicated a desire for more transparency in candidate expectations on the FAST in general and the revised SVP. Moving forward, the program plans to implement monthly newsletter for mentor teachers as a way to keep them informed of what is required of candidates.

Part IV: Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt each of the Literacy Teaching Performance Assessments described above and listed here for operational use beginning in the 2025-26 academic year:

- CalTPA Literacy Cycle for all credential areas (PK-3 ECE, MS, MMSN, ESN, ECSE, DHH, VI)
- edTPA Multiple Subject, Literacy with Mathematics and edTPA Education Specialist, Literacy: MMSN/ESN Assessments
- FAST Site Visitation Project for MS, MMSN, and ESN

Staff also recommends that the Commission approve the following passing standards for each model for the first year of operation, with the direction that each model will conduct a standard setting for each credential area in spring 2026 and present proposed passing standards based on the results to the Commission in June 2026.

CalTPA:

- Passing standard of 16 points across the 8 rubrics for the CalTPA Literacy Cycle for all credential areas (PK-3 ECE, MS, MMSN, ESN, ECSE, DHH, VI) until a standard setting study can be held. This recommended score represents a passing score of 2 points per rubric.
- Secondary passing standard of 14 points
- No side conditions imposed for either standard

edTPA:

- Multiple Subject, Literacy
 - Passing Standard of 47
 - Represents -1.0 SEM from current passing standard
 - Secondary Passing Standard of 44
 - Represents -2.0 SEM from current passing standard
- Education Specialist, Literacy
 - Passing Standard of 35
 - Represents -1.0 SEM from current passing standard
 - Secondary Passing Standard of 34
 - Represents -2.0 SEM from current passing standard

FAST:

- Passing Standard of Level 2 on each rubric
- Aligns with current passing standard and passing standard used in field test

Appendix A

Summary of CalTPA Literacy Design Team Meetings

Meeting Date(s)	Summary
	*For Meetings 1-10, see Appendix B of Item 5D (August 2024)
Meeting 11: October 29, 2024	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of field test information related to participating programs, waivers, passing standard, timeline Analysis of the updated Assessment guide and rubrics, along with updated TPE mapping to align with the revisions for the Field Test Revisions to the Program/Faculty Guide to align with Field Test updates
Meeting 12: January 28, 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on the field test information related to participating programs, pathways and credential areas, and summary of webinars Presentation from ES staff on the training(s) the assessors will complete, the role of marker assessors, consensus scoring and distributed scoring, input/feedback from assessors, and the Quality Management Plan Preview the MS templates that candidates will use in the Field Test Review and input on potential updates for the web-based guide, Condition Codes, Annotated Bibliography and Glossary that align with the CalTPA Literacy Cycle
Meeting 13: March 11, 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of data from the pilot regarding bilingual submissions and focus student data, and updates for the field test (Spanish and other languages, submission requirements) Generation of ideas for PD/Digging Deeper sessions to support the field as they transition to the Literacy Cycle next year Preview of the templates for PK-3 and EdSp that candidates will use in the Field Test. Review of the Building the Dream TPA Activity created at the first meeting to apply thoughts/ideas to the field test version
Meeting 14: July 17, 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Design Team Meeting Review of Field Test data and outcome of June Commission Meeting

Appendix B

Changes to the CalTPA Literacy Cycle for the Field Test

Based on the results of the pilot surveys, focus groups, candidate scores, and the LDT feedback, the following adjustments were made to the Literacy Cycle assessment guides, templates and rubrics.

Step 1: Plan

- The Learning Segment template was be reformatted and edited to elicit a more robust response from candidates surrounding ways in which they plan to leverage students' cultural and/or linguistic assets and/or interests.
- The Learning Segment Template was revised to include a section for candidates to reference ELA/Literacy and ELD standards and the larger scope and sequence that their lessons fit into to demonstrate systematic instruction.
- Page limits for the 3 to 5 lessons and assessments required in the Learning Segment were addressed.

Step 2: Teach and Assess

- Additional guidance was provided for the verbal/ASL commentary option.
- Candidates in all commentary formats were asked to provide timestamps to align their commentary to the video evidence of their teaching practice submitted.
- Commission staff addressed inaccuracies in lesson delivery within the rubrics.
- In the EdSp versions, the requirement to see the instructional support personnel in the video clip(s) was removed. The requirement to plan for them remained in Step 1.

Step 3: Reflect

- Additional upload slots were added to allow the candidate to provide the rubric or performance criteria, feedback to the focus student, and the assessment response from the focus student.

Step 4: Apply

- Rubric 2.8, specifically Levels 4 and 5, were adjusted to move toward the full range of scores being applied in this rubric in the field test.
- Candidates were given the option to provide verbal or ASL commentary in Step 4.

The Literacy Cycle reflects the structure of all CalTPA cycles and requires candidates to:

- **Step 1:** Review recent literacy assessments for their students, select one focus student, and provide contextual information. Describe three to five literacy lessons, including corresponding assessments, that include the selected foundational reading skill(s) and the selected additional theme(s) from the ELA/ELD Framework.
- **Step 2:** Conduct and video record the lessons and assessments and provide commentary for each video clip.
- **Step 3:** Analyze and reflect on student summative assessment results and provide the students with specific, actionable feedback on the assessment. Reflect on the students' progress and the effectiveness of your literacy instruction.
- **Step 4:** Plan a re-teaching or an extension activity to support the focus student's literacy and language development. Video record the follow-up activity and provide commentary.

MS Evidence Table

Cycle Step	What You Need to Do	Evidence to Be Submitted
Step 1: Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the guidance of your cooperating teacher and/or supervising faculty, review recent, available literacy assessments, screenings, literacy and/or language profiles, and/or other information for your students. • Select one focus student (FS). • Provide contextual information for your students, including the FS. • Describe three to five literacy lessons, including corresponding assessments, that include the selected foundational reading skill(s) and the selected additional theme(s) from the ELA/ELD Framework. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part A: Written Narrative: Contextual Information (no more than 4 pages) • Part B: Learning Segment Template (no more than 5 pages per lesson) • Part C: Written Narrative: Description of Assessments (no more than 5 pages) • Part D: Description or Blank Copy of One Summative Assessment and the Rubric and/or Performance Criteria
Step 2: Teach and Assess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct and video record the lessons and assessments. • Select video clip(s). • Provide commentary for each video clip. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part E: Video Clip(s) (1 to 4 video clips, totaling no more than 20 minutes) • Part F: Commentary (written commentary, no more than 8 pages; OR verbal/ASL commentary, up to 10 minutes of video)
Step 3: Reflect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage students in the summative assessment. Score and determine student progress. • Analyze and reflect on student results and provide students with specific, actionable feedback on the assessment. • Submit the FS summative assessment response, the scored rubric and/or performance criteria, and specific, actionable feedback. • Reflect on the students' progress and the effectiveness of your literacy instruction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part G: Focus Student's Summative Assessment Response and Scored Rubric and/or Performance Criteria • Part H: Focus Student's Summative Assessment Actionable Feedback • Part I: Written Narrative: Reflection and Analysis of Summative Assessment Results (no more than 4 pages)
Step 4: Apply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan a re-teaching or an extension activity to support the FS's literacy development. • Video record the follow-up activity. • Provide commentary for the video clip. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part J: Written Narrative: Re-Teaching or Extension Activity Description (no more than 5 pages) • Part K: 1 Video Clip (up to 5 minutes) of Follow-Up Activity • Part L: Commentary (written commentary, no more than 2 pages; OR verbal/ASL commentary, up to 5 minutes of video)

CalTPA Literacy Cycle Learning Segment Template-Field Test

Multiple Subject

Step 1: Plan—Part B: Learning Segment Template

Directions: Type your responses within the brackets following each prompt. Do not delete or alter the prompts. You may provide up to 5 pages per lesson. For more information, see pages 9–13 of the Literacy Performance Assessment Guide.

Across the 3–5 literacy lessons:

Scope and Sequence	
Explain how your 3–5 lessons fit into the larger scope and sequence of the unit (systematic instruction).	[]
Summarize how your 3–5 lessons apply findings from previous literacy assessments. ¹	[]
Identify the selected foundational reading skill(s) ² students will learn and/or apply within a lesson and/or across your lesson activities.	[]
If you are providing supplemental support for students for the selected foundational reading skill(s), explain why these skills are needed.	[]
Identify the selected additional theme(s) ³ from the ELA/ELD Framework you plan to teach within a lesson and/or across your lesson activities.	[]
Explain how your lessons align with one another to create a progression of learning.	[]

Lesson 1

Grade Level: []

Lesson Topic: []

Strands/Standards and Learning Goals	
Grade-level CA ELA/Literacy ⁴ strand(s)/standard(s)	[]
ELA/Literacy learning goal(s)	Students will be able to...[]
Grade-level CA ELD strand(s)/standard(s) ⁵	[]
ELD learning goal(s)	Students will be able to...[]

Lesson Activities and Delivery	
Describe how you plan to leverage the students' cultural and/or linguistic assets and/or interests during the lesson.	[]
Summarize the lesson activity(ies).	[]
Describe how you plan to use a direct and explicit approach for teaching the selected foundational reading skill(s).	[]
Summarize formative assessment(s).	[]
Describe how you plan to use integrated English language development (ELD).	[]
Describe how you plan to use adaptations to address the focus student's assets, interests, and/or learning needs.	[]

Appendix C

CalTPA Literacy Cycle Field Test Submissions¹

PK-3 ECE Programs	Pathway(s)	N
Riverside County Office of Education	District Intern	14
San Jose State University	District Intern, University Intern, University Student Teaching	12
Vanguard University	University Student Teaching	3
Total		29

Multiple Subject Programs	Pathway(s)	N
Azusa Pacific University	University Intern, University Student Teaching	3
Cal Poly Pomona	ITEP, University Student Teaching	16
CSU Bakersfield	District Intern, University Intern, University Student Teaching	5
CSU Fullerton	University Student Teaching	5
CSU San Marcos	University Student Teaching	9
Concordia University	University Student Teaching	5
The Master's University	University Student Teaching	6
University of San Francisco	University Intern, University Student Teaching	14
Vanguard University	ITEP, University Private School, University Student Teaching	5
Total		68

EdSp-MMSN Programs	Pathway(s)	N
Cal Poly Humboldt	Residency, University Student Teaching	4
CSU Bakersfield	District Intern, University Intern	2
CSU East Bay	District Intern, University Intern	5
Chapman University	University Student Teaching	2
Concordia University	University Student Teaching	3
LAUSD– Intern, Credentialing, and Added Authorization Program (iCAAP)	District Intern	4
National University	District Intern, University Intern	5
Placer County Office of Education	District Intern	2
Riverside County Office of Education	District Intern	10
San Diego State University	Residency, University Student Teaching	10
Sonoma State University	ITEP, University Intern, University Student Teaching	9
University of San Diego	Residency	9
Total		65

¹ Pathway data is self-reported by candidates

EdSp-ESN Programs	Pathway(s)	N
Azusa Pacific University	District Intern, University Intern, University Student Teaching	4
CSU Bakersfield	District Intern, University Intern	3
CSU East Bay	District Intern, Residency, University Intern, University Student Teaching	5
CSU Stanislaus	District Intern, University Intern, University Student Teaching	6
Chapman University	University Intern	2
Point Loma Nazarene University	District Intern, Residency, University Intern, University Student Teaching	7
Riverside County Office of Education	District Intern	6
San Diego State University	District Intern, ITEP, Residency, University Intern, University Student Teaching	8
Sonoma State University	District Intern, ITEP, Residency, University Intern, University Student Teaching	11
Total		52

EdSp-ECSE Programs	Pathway(s)	N
CSU Fullerton	District Intern, University Student Teaching	11
CSU Northridge	District Intern, ITEP, University Intern, University Student Teaching	14
LAUSD– Intern, Credentialing, and Added Authorization Program (iCAAP)	District Intern	10
Sacramento State University	University Intern, University Student Teaching	8
San Diego County Office of Education	District Intern, University Intern	5
Santa Clara County Office of Education	District Intern	6
Total		54

EdSp-DHH Programs	Pathway(s)	N
CSU Northridge	University Intern, University Student Teaching	6
San Diego County Office of Education	District Intern	3
Total		9

EdSp-VI Programs	Pathway(s)	N
San Francisco State University	University Intern, University Student Teaching	4
Total		4

Appendix D

CalTPA MS Literacy Cycle Field Test- Rubric Essential Questions

Step 1: Plan	
Rubric 2.1	How does the candidate's planning leverage students' assets, include assessments, align lessons to create a progression of learning, and address strand(s)/standard(s)-based ELA/Literacy and ELD goals that are grade-level specific and developmentally appropriate?
Rubric 2.2	How does the candidate apply findings from recent assessments to plan for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the selected foundational reading skill(s) using a direct, systematic, and explicit approach to support students' literacy and language development? the selected additional theme(s) from the ELA/ELD Framework using integrated ELD to support students' literacy and language development?
Step 2: Teach and Assess	
Rubric 2.3	How does the candidate provide instruction in the selected foundational reading skill(s) using a direct and explicit approach to actively engage students and support their progress toward meeting the ELA/Literacy and ELD goals?
Rubric 2.4	How does the candidate provide instruction in the selected additional theme(s) from the ELA/ELD Framework and use integrated ELD to actively engage students and support their progress toward meeting the ELA/Literacy and ELD goals?
Rubric 2.5	How does the candidate use assessment(s) to monitor student learning and adjust instruction to support students in progressing toward meeting the ELA/Literacy and ELD goals?
Rubric 2.6	How does the candidate use assessment results to provide specific, actionable feedback to students related to literacy about what they did well and/or their misconceptions/gaps in knowledge to support students' literacy and language development?
Step 3: Reflect	
Rubric 2.7	How does the candidate identify students' understandings, gaps in knowledge, and/or misconceptions; provide specific, actionable feedback; and determine what was effective and what instructional changes they would make if they taught the learning segment again?
Step 4: Apply	
Rubric 2.8	How does the candidate apply the analysis of student assessment results (formative and summative) to plan, provide an explanation for, and teach a follow-up activity (referring to evidence from Steps 1, 2, and/or 3)?

CalTPA Sample Rubric

Rubric 2.1 — Step 1: Plan

Essential Question: How does the candidate’s planning leverage students’ assets, include assessments, align lessons to create a progression of learning, **and** address strand(s)/standard(s)-based ELA/Literacy **and** ELD goals¹¹ that are grade-level specific **and** developmentally appropriate?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate’s planning does not include ELA/Literacy and ELD goals that are grade-level specific and/or developmentally appropriate for students.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate’s planning does not leverage students’ assets (cultural and/or linguistic and/or interests).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Assessments are not connected to ELA/Literacy and ELD goals.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate’s lessons and assessments are misaligned and do not provide a progression of learning.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate’s planning contains inaccuracies in content.</p>	<p>Candidate’s planning includes ELA/Literacy and ELD goals that are not clearly grade-level specific and developmentally appropriate for students.</p> <p>Candidate describes students’ assets (cultural and/or linguistic and/or interests) but does not clearly connect them in their lessons and/or assessments.</p> <p>Candidate includes assessments that have a minimal connection to the ELA/Literacy and ELD goals.</p> <p>Candidate’s lessons and assessments minimally align with one another, resulting in an unclear progression of learning that will support students in making progress toward meeting the ELA/Literacy and ELD goals.</p>	<p>Candidate’s planning includes strand(s)/standard(s)-based ELA/Literacy and ELD goals that are grade-level specific and developmentally appropriate for students.</p> <p>Candidate’s planning leverages students’ assets (cultural and/or linguistic and/or interests).</p> <p>Candidate includes assessments (formative and summative) that determine students are making progress toward meeting the ELA/Literacy and ELD goals.</p> <p>Candidate’s lessons and assessments align with one another to create a progression of learning that will support students in making progress toward meeting the ELA/Literacy and ELD goals.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate’s plans for intentional differentiation and/or adaptations are developmentally appropriate to the learning needs of the students and facilitate equitable access to the ELA/Literacy and ELD goals.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate’s learning activities and assessments clearly reflect the relationship between the selected foundational reading skill(s) and the selected additional theme(s) allowing for integrated literacy instruction.</p>

Sources of Evidence:

- **Part A:** Written Narrative: Contextual Information (no more than 4 pages)
- **Part B:** Learning Segment Template (no more than 5 pages per lesson)
- **Part C:** Written Narrative: Description of Assessments (no more than 5 pages)
- **Part D:** Description or Blank Copy of One Summative Assessment and the Rubric and/or Performance Criteria

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 1, 3, 4; TPE 2, Element 2; TPE 3, Elements 1, 2, 3, 5, 6; TPE 4, Elements 1, 2, 4; TPE 5, Element 1; TPE 7, Elements 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 11

Appendix E

CalTPA Literacy Cycle Field Test Pass Rate by Pathway and Demographic*

Pathway Type	N Submitted	N Passed	N Unscoreable	Pass Rate
University Student Teaching Program	121	120	-	99%
District Intern	85	85	1	100%
University Intern	47	47	1	100%
Residency Program	19	19	-	100%
ITEP	9	9	-	100%
University Private School Program	1	1	-	100%
Total	282	279	2	99.6%

Sector Type	N Submitted	N Passed	N Unscoreable	Pass Rate
CSU	153	152	1	99%
Private/Independent	68	68	1	100%
LEA/County Office of Education	60	60	-	100%
UC	0	-	-	N/A
Total	282	279	2	99.6%

Gender	N Submitted	N Passed	N Unscoreable	Pass Rate
Decline to State	4	4	-	100%
Female	244	244	1	100%
Male	33	32	1	97%
Total	282	279	2	99.6%

Ethnicity	N Submitted	N Passed	N Unscoreable	Pass Rate
African American/Black	14	14	-	100%
Asian Indian American/Asian Indian	3	3	-	100%
Cambodian American/Cambodian	1	1	-	100%
Chinese American/Chinese	3	3	1	100%
Choose not to response	9	9	-	100%
Filipino American/Filipino	8	8	-	100%
Japanese American/Japanese	3	3	-	100%
Korean American/Korean	2	2	-	100%
Latino/Latin American/Puerto Rican/Other Hispanic	59	59	-	100%
Mexican American/Chicano	69	68	-	99%
Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native	2	2	-	100%
Other	9	9	-	100%
Vietnamese American/Vietnamese	4	4	-	100%
White (non-Hispanic)	95	95	1	100%
Total	282	279	2	99%

* Demographic data is self-reported

CalTPA Literacy Cycle Summary of Credential Area Performance

Credential Area	N Candidates	N Scorable	N Unscorable	Pass Rate	Overall Mean Score	S.D.	Min	Max
PK-3 ECE	29	29	0	100%	24.3	5.7	14	33
MS	68	68	0	100%	24.2	4.3	15	35
MMSN	65	64	1	100%	22.8	3.9	15	35
ESN	53	52	1	100%	23.6	2.5	19	32
ECSE	54	54	0	100%	21.4	3.6	14	29
DHH	9	9	0	100%	26.8	6.7	15	38
VI	4	4	0	75%	24.5	11.1	9	33
Total	282	280	2	99.6%	23.3	4.3	9	38

Credential Area	Rubric 1 Mean	Rubric 2 Mean	Rubric 3 Mean	Rubric 4 Mean	Rubric 5 Mean	Rubric 6 Mean	Rubric 7 Mean	Rubric 8 Mean
PK-3 ECE (N=29)	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.2	2.8	3.3	2.7
MS (N=68)	3.0	3.2	2.7	2.8	3.0	2.6	3.2	2.9
MMSN (N=64)	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.9
ESN (N=52)	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8
ECSE (N=54)	2.8	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.7
DHH (N=9)	2.2	3.3	3.6	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.2	3.2
VI (N=4)	3.3	2.5	2.5	3.5	3.3	2.8	3.5	3.3
Overall (N=280)	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.8	3.1	2.9

Credential Area	Rubric 1 Min.	Rubric 1 Max.	Rubric 2 Min.	Rubric 2 Max.	Rubric 3 Min.	Rubric 3 Max.	Rubric 4 Min.	Rubric 4 Max.
PK-3 ECE (N=29)	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5
MS (N=68)	2	5	1	5	1	5	1	5
MMSN (N=64)	1	5	1	5	1	5	2	4
ESN (N=52)	1	5	2	4	2	5	2	5
ECSE (N=54)	1	4	1	4	2	4	1	4
DHH (N=9)	1	4	1	5	1	5	2	5
VI (N=4)	1	4	1	4	1	4	1	5
Overall (N=280)	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5

Credential Area	Rubric 5 Min.	Rubric 5 Max.	Rubric 6 Min.	Rubric 6 Max.	Rubric 7 Min.	Rubric 7 Max.	Rubric 8 Min.	Rubric 8 Max.
PK-3 ECE (N=29)	2	5	1	4	2	5	1	5
MS (N=68)	1	5	1	4	2	5	1	5
MMSN (N=64)	2	5	2	5	2	5	1	5
ESN (N=52)	2	4	1	4	1	5	2	4
ECSE (N=54)	2	4	2	4	1	4	1	4
DHH (N=9)	2	5	3	4	1	5	2	5
VI (N=4)	1	4	1	4	2	4	1	4
Overall (N=280)	1	5	1	5	1	5	1	5

Appendix F

CalTPA Candidate, Program Coordinator, Cooperating Teacher, and Assessor Responses to Selected Survey Items

Candidate Survey Responses (N= 37)

Candidate Survey Responses (N=37)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Does Not Apply
Opportunity to Demonstrate Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities					
The LPA allowed me to demonstrate my literacy instructional practice in an authentic way	9	22	3	2	1
The LPA was a fair measure of my ability to teach literacy	9	19	5	4	0
The tasks associated with completing the LPA align with what I have been learning in my educator preparation coursework	13	20	2	2	0
The LPA allowed me to demonstrate my ability to teach foundational reading skills	14	19	1	3	0
The LPA allowed me to demonstrate my ability to teach the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework	13	20	1	3	0
Clarity and Ease of Use					
Overall, the Assessment Guide directions in the LPA guide were clear	11	18	6	2	0
The directions for how to identify my focus student were clear	12	22	1	2	0
The directions on how to write an ELD learning goal were clear	8	20	7	2	0
The directions for administering a summative assessment were clear	10	17	7	2	1
The directions for how to provide students with feedback from the summative assessment were clear	9	18	8	2	0
The way the LPA guide was organized made it easy to find the information I needed (e.g., rubrics embedded with step instructions, glossary, links to resources)	14	19	2	1	1
Focusing on one student made it easier for me to understand the student's literacy learning needs	18	16	2	0	1

The learning segment template helped me plan my literacy activities/lessons and assessments	14	18	2	1	2
I understood how to leverage students' cultural and/or linguistic assets and/or interests to plan my literacy activities/lessons.	9	24	3	0	1
I had enough information about my focus student's assets, interest and/or learning needs to plan adaptations for my literacy activity/lesson	12	21	3	1	0
Having the choice to provide either a written, verbal, or ASL response to commentary was helpful	11	21	0	0	5
Literacy Cycle Field Test Information and Support					
My program faculty/instructors provided me with sufficient support during the LPA field test	17	16	2	2	0
The LPA materials provided sufficient information to assist me throughout the field test process	12	20	3	2	0
My program prepared me to be able to plan ELA/literacy learning goals	14	21	0	2	0
My program prepared me to be able to plan ELD learning goals	14	19	2	2	0
My program provided sufficient guidance to help me understand the LPA rubrics	13	19	3	2	0
My program encouraged me to self-assess using the rubrics	14	18	3	2	0
My program provided sufficient guidance to help me understand the evidence I needed to submit for the LPA	12	22	1	2	0
My program provided guidance on how to register and upload my submission (e.g., video, templates).	17	17	1	2	0
My program prepared me to be able to teach foundational reading skills for the LPA field test	15	18	2	2	0
My program prepared me to assist students in applying foundational reading skills to the themes from the ELA/ELD framework	14	19	2	2	0
The office hours sessions hosted by the Commission were a helpful resource for me during the LPA field test	12	12	6	1	6

Program Coordinator Survey Responses (N=11)

Program Coordinator Survey Responses (N=11)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Does Not Apply
Opportunity to Demonstrate Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities					
The LPA allowed candidates to demonstrate their literacy knowledge, skills, and abilities in an authentic way	5	5	0	1	0
The tasks associated with completing the LPA aligned with what candidates have been learning in their educator preparation coursework	5	6	0	0	0
The LPA allowed candidates to demonstrate their ability to teach foundational reading skills	4	7	0	0	0
The LPA allowed candidates to demonstrate their ability to teach the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework	5	6	0	0	0
Clarity and Ease of Use					
The directions for how to identify the focus student were clear	6	5	0	0	0
The directions for how to use the ELA/ELD Framework to plan lessons and assessments were clear	5	3	2	1	0
The directions on how to write an ELD learning goal were clear	5	5	0	1	0
The directions for how to select video clips of candidates' literacy instruction were clear	5	3	2	1	0
The directions for how to provide students with feedback from the summative assessment were clear	5	3	2	1	0
Focusing on one student made it easier for candidates to understand the student's literacy learning needs	10	1	0	0	0
Candidates understood how to leverage students' cultural and/or linguistic assets and/or interests to plan the literacy activities/lessons	5	2	3	0	1
Candidates had enough information about the focus student's assets, interest and/or learning needs to plan adaptations for the literacy activity/lesson	5	5	1	0	0
Having the choice to provide either a written, verbal, or ASL response to commentary was helpful	6	4	0	0	1
The LPA essential questions for each of the 8 rubrics were clear	5	5	1	0	0

The different levels of performance for each rubric were clear	5	5	1	0	0
Literacy Cycle Field Test Information and Support					
The program support webinars were valuable to me as I prepared for my field test responsibilities	5	6	0	0	0
The Commission-hosted webinar for cooperating teachers helped communicate expectations for candidates participating in LPA field test	4	4	0	0	3
The coordinator office hours hosted by the Commission were a helpful resource for me during the LPA field test	4	5	0	0	2
Cooperating teachers provided candidates with sufficient support during the LPA field test	3	5	2	1	0

Cooperating Teacher Survey Responses (N=8)

Cooperating Teacher Survey Responses (N=8)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Does Not Apply
Opportunity to Demonstrate Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities					
The LPA allowed my candidate (student teacher, intern) to demonstrate their literacy knowledge, skills, and abilities in an authentic way	2	4	1	1	0
The LPA was a fair measure of candidates' abilities to teach literacy	2	4	1	1	0
The tasks associated with completing the LPA aligned with what typically occurs when planning and implementing literacy instruction in my classroom	2	4	2	0	0
The LPA allowed candidates to demonstrate their ability to plan for and teach ELA/literacy and ELD learning goals	2	4	2	0	0
Clarity and Ease of Use					
The way the LPA guide was organized made it easy to find the information I needed to support my candidate (e.g., rubrics embedded with step instructions, glossary, links to resources)	1	7	0	0	0
I was able to support my candidate with reviewing available, recent, literacy assessments that were used in my classroom or school	2	6	0	0	0

The learning segment template helped my candidate plan their literacy learning segment (i.e., lessons and assessments)	2	5	0	0	1
The options provided for my candidate to select a focus student were representative of the students in my classroom	2	6	0	0	0
Focusing on one student made it easier for my candidate to understand their literacy learning needs	4	1	1	1	1
The LPA essential questions for each of the 8 rubrics were clear	1	6	0	0	1
The different levels of performance for each rubric were clear	1	6	0	0	1
Field Test Information and Support					
I discussed the LPA materials (Assessment Guide, Templates, and/or Rubrics) with my candidate	0	6	2	0	0
I provided support to my candidate to select the ELA/Literacy Standards for their lessons and assessments	0	8	0	0	0
I provided support to my candidate to select the ELD Standards for their lessons and assessments	0	8	0	0	0
I provided support to my candidate to select the foundational reading skills for their lessons and assessments	0	8	0	0	0
I provided support to my candidate to select the themes (meaning making, language development, effective expression, content knowledge) from the ELA/ELD Framework for their lessons and assessments	0	8	0	0	0
The LPA materials provided sufficient information to assist my candidate throughout the field test process	1	6	0	0	1
The Commission-hosted webinar for cooperating teachers helped communicate expectations for candidates participating in the LPA field test	1	4	0	0	3
Program faculty provided my candidate with sufficient support during the LPA field test	1	3	0	1	3

Assessor Survey Responses (N=16)

Assessor Survey Responses (N=16)	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know/ Does Not Apply
Clarity and Ease of Use					
The Assessment Guide directions provided in the LPA were clear	8	7	0	1	0
The LPA templates were clear	7	7	1	1	0
The LPA essential questions were clear	7	8	0	1	0
The different levels of performance were clearly stated in the LPA rubrics	6	9	0	1	0
The constructs in the LPA rubrics were clear	6	8	1	1	0
Rubric 2.1: Plan - constructs were clear and helped me make a score judgment	4	10	1	1	0
Rubric 2.2: Plan - constructs were clear and helped me make a score judgment	5	9	1	1	0
Rubric 2.3: Teach and Assess - constructs were clear and helped me make a score judgment	4	10	0	2	0
Rubric 2.4: Teach and Assess - constructs were clear and helped me make a score judgment	6	8	0	2	0
Rubric 2.5: Teach and Assess - constructs were clear and helped me make a score judgment	6	9	0	1	0
Rubric 2.6: Teach and Assess - constructs were clear and helped me make a score judgment	6	8	1	1	0
Rubric 2.7: Reflect - constructs were clear and helped me make a score judgment	6	8	1	1	0
Rubric 2.8: Apply - constructs were clear and helped me make a score judgment	6	8	1	1	0
There was sufficient data/evidence to determine whether a candidate's foundational reading skills instruction was "direct, systematic, and explicit"	5	7	3	1	0
Overall, the amount of evidence required of candidates for each step is sufficient to score the submission	6	9	0	1	0

The organization of the LPA guide made it easy to find the information I needed (e.g., rubrics embedded with step instructions, glossary, links to resources)	7	8	0	1	0
Literacy Cycle Field Test Assessor Training					
The dyslexia module I completed for assessor prework prepared me to assess candidate submissions	5	9	1	1	0
The review of the ELA/ELD Framework I completed for assessor prework prepared me to assess candidate submissions	4	11	0	1	0
The review of the TPEs, including TPE 7 (Effective Literacy Instruction) I completed for assessor prework prepared me to assess candidate submissions	4	11	0	1	0
The Implicit Bias training I completed for assessor prework prepared me to assess candidate submissions	9	5	0	1	1
I understood the training I received for making LPA scoring judgments	7	8	0	1	0
The training I received adequately prepared me for the task of assessing candidates' LPA submissions	8	7	0	1	0
Overall, I am satisfied with the training I received to score candidates' LPA submissions	10	5	0	1	0
I am confident that I applied the rubrics to consistently score candidates' evidence for each of the four LPA steps	9	6	0	1	0
I am confident in the scores I assigned to candidates' LPA submissions	8	7	0	1	0

Appendix G

CalTPA Literacy Cycle Field Test Study Qualitative Data

The following is additional information gathered from the surveys and focus groups that will inform operational revisions. Statements provided below are a selection of successes and challenges from candidates, program coordinators, cooperating teachers, and assessors.

Successes:

Candidate

- “A success was that the rubrics were very clear. The LPA rubrics were easier to understand than the CalTPA operational rubrics.”
- “One success was one of my students was able to read a full sentence for the first time. I also had great support from my program. Our professor helped break everything down for us.”
- “One success was actually making my lessons. Also the support that I got from both Fullerton, my classmates and my mentor teacher was extraordinary. So I felt like I had a really good support system set up for me to complete it on time.”
- “I had a wonderful professor who really helped break things down for me. She also helped guide me so I wasn't overwhelmed.”

Program Coordinators

- “One success would be we finally had our teachers understand how to write a good solid learning goal.”
- “Candidates liked the templates, the prompts were straightforward and intentional in trying to elicit information that the candidates needed to produce to score well on the rubric.”
- “Response time to questions was really quick which really helped a lot. So that really helped my candidates feel like their voice is heard, at the same time their questions are answered right away.”
- “What went well in the LPA compared to Cycle 2 was the openness to create lessons that weren't tied to specific clips. It was open ended and allowed their teaching to blossom more.”

Challenges:

Candidate

- “One challenge was getting my videos to upload. I was able to but had to compress them.”
- “One challenge was I was placed in an all GATE class. I struggled to find a focus student. No students with EL, IEP, or 504.”
- “A challenge was the length of the guide and the amount of information that had to be filled out for my submission.”
- “It was difficult to get everything done on time, but I think it was more of a time management issue on my end. I didn't anticipate the reteach part. Last minute things with school would pop up which would take up the time and it made me feel rushed.”

Program Coordinators

- “One challenge was the amount of time candidates had for the LPA. Spring is always a difficult time for them because they have to work around state testing and spring breaks.”
- “Another challenge was foundational reading skills in Grade 4-6 classrooms. They were able to get it done, but it was difficult for them to think of foundational skills for those upper grades.”
- “A challenge was the time and managing the candidates’ anxiety.”
- “One challenge for a couple of candidates was understanding part H for whatever reason. We're not sure if they just didn't go and read, or if there could be something that could be clearer.”

Based on your recent experience completing the LPA, describe one discovery (e.g., aha moment, learning, surprise) about your literacy instruction that will impact your practice.

Candidates

- “Reflecting was a big thing, a big takeaway was the importance of reflecting and applying what I learned to my teaching.”
- “Teaching literacy is hard, and this proved that. This helped me know what I need to work on. I enjoyed this over a standardized test.”
- “I enjoyed looking at the foundational skill with the theme at the same time. It forced you to look deeper at those things.”
- “As a first year teacher my proud moment is that seeing my student read for the first time and seeing it on video it was great to see that. I just keep watching it back 'cause it's just like a proud teacher moment in that sense. I think that is probably my biggest thing that I liked about the LPA, probably the only thing.”

Do you feel candidates learned something of value about their instructional practice by completing the LPA field test? Please explain.

Program Coordinators

- “I think it is just so overwhelming and feels high stakes, especially with the \$150/cycle price tag (thank you for the free LPA!). I am not sure candidates will realize the value of their TPA experience until they're into their first year of teaching.”
- “I've been working with TPA candidates for a long time. I also work with induction. One of the thing I've seen is the affect the TPA has on candidates going into induction. It helps candidates look at their practice and identify things.”
- “I think the TPA in general can have mixed reviews from candidates. I know that their ability to self-reflect and think deeply about their instructional practices is positively impacted by the TPA process”
- “From my candidates and multiple subject, it felt like it was things that they were currently doing in their classrooms. I don't know if an assessment is anything of their favorite, but the idea that they could see that it was something they're currently doing was a good assessment tool.”

The LPA was designed to provide candidates with options to fulfill submission requirements. For example, the LPA provides multiple options for selecting a focus student, a choice of providing written or video commentary, flexibility in the number of lessons taught, options for the number and length of video clips submitted, etc. Did including these elements of candidate choice within the LPA seem helpful or challenging for you? Please explain.

Candidate

- Most of the flexibility was helpful, the options to select focus student with an IEP. I'm paired with an education specialist, so it was helpful to for me to be able to select a focus student with an IEP.
- I also thought the flexibility for the number of lessons was helpful. But the options for the number of videos was confusing. The open-ended flexibility with the number and length of the videos was not helpful for me."
- For me when it came to recording the videos it was challenging to keep it under 20 minutes. I found it challenging to pick the best part in each video and keep it under 20 minutes.
- When it came to the number of lessons, I would prefer to be told the number of lessons needed. I spent too much time over thinking if it was too much or too little.

Program Coordinators

- "We ran a practice TPA Cycle 1. Initially candidates were underprepared and overwhelmed with the flexibility. We talked through design options and what would work best for their context. So, I think it was beneficial to provide the options but it was different from having a more prescriptive approach."
- "I think that's why we felt LPA was a better format/easier, the choices."
- "My candidates only did the written commentary, but they appreciated the choice. They said that if we're gonna really stress having UDL and multimodal choices for our students, that they really appreciated that we were doing walk in the walk."
- "Yes. The multiple options were very helpful (UDL in action!!!). Choice in the number of video clips was a big one. Also, the flexibility in who the focus student could be was helpful."

Tell us more about how the LPA allowed you to authentically demonstrate literacy instruction. If you did not feel it provided you with authentic opportunities to demonstrate your literacy instructional practice, then what recommendations do you have for improvement? Please be specific. Include examples and reference the LPA tasks and rubrics, as appropriate.

Candidates

- "It also taught me more about the students' linguistic and cultural assets, which helped me plan the lessons and teach them based on their assets. To help students learn, I used more visuals, color coding in words, and chants...I used exit slips as a fun way of assessing my students. At the end of every lesson, they were eager to work on the exit ticket."
- "This was extremely not fit for my students who are of young age and have extensive support needs."

- “The LPA instruction didn't feel authentic because the lesson recordings needed to adhere to a rigid timeframe (20 min.). The lessons felt scripted because I had to cover all the points outlined in the rubric.”
- “The Literacy Performance Assessment (LPA) authentically allowed me to demonstrate literacy instruction by providing a real-time teaching experience that was responsive to actual student needs. Through the lesson on identifying CVC words with the short ‘a’ sound, I was able to apply instructional strategies that aligned with the Common Core Standard RF.1.3b, focusing on decoding regularly spelled one-syllable words.”

Program Coordinators

- “This was my first time guiding students through the LPA and I felt like it was a really authentic assessment. I’ve been the TPA coordinator at two universities for several years, and I personally love the TPA as someone with a background in teaching/instructional coaching/C&I and I really felt like the LPA gave the students the ability to demonstrate their literacy skills authentically but with flexibility.”
- “Completing the LPA allowed candidates to authentically demonstrate their literacy instruction through the requirements and required templates of the LPA. The template questions guided candidates in their literacy instruction. Another attribute was that the candidates were in a classroom with students of varying reading ability and with a veteran teacher who could model literacy instruction rather than in a exam center (RICA).”
- “I believe it did allow them to demonstrate literacy instruction - but this was particularly difficult for the ESN candidates as many of the candidates had mostly non-verbal students and/or very young (4-5 years) students.”
- “Because our candidates were in 4th - 6th grade placements, the opportunity to authentically demonstrate their literacy instruction in early literacy foundational skills was limited. They were forced to teach morphology or fluency for these older readers and were not assessed in early literacy skills.”

Does this cycle elicit authentic evidence of what teachers should know and be able to do related to effective literacy instruction (SB 488)?

Assessors

- **PK-3 ECE:** The Literacy Cycle aligns well with the requirements of SB 488, noting a strong focus on foundational skills.
- **DHH:** The Literacy Cycle is more beneficial for Deaf candidates, allowing them to focus on teaching approaches rather than just completing a process for credentialing. Candidates get to practice what they learn.
- **VI:** The Literacy Cycle elicits authentic evidence of effective literacy instruction. There was a discussion about the number of lessons required, due to the potential repetition required in Braille instruction.

Step 1: Were the LPA instructions clear about how to plan your literacy activity/lesson related to foundational reading skills and the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework?

Candidate

- “I thought it was clear. It helped having our mentor explain how it worked as well since if I had read through it alone I might not have had the same clarity. The mentor helped

show the connection between the foundational reading skills and the framework which really made a difference for me.”

- “I struggled with it. More with foundations of reading – how am I creating these lessons all based off a foundational reading skill? I had not learned about that in my classes and had to lean on my professor. I work with a range of upper grades but ended up choosing younger students in third grade because it was easier to hit the foundational reading skills.”
- “I struggled with the alignment of the ELA and ELD framework and the concept I was teaching. I was not sure if I used the correct ELD framework. I worked with 1st grade, and was able to identify a foundational reading skill, but I felt like I did not use the correct theme. We touched on how to do this kind of work in my program but not in depth.”
- “Yes, it was clear in the handbook. I also liked that it was reiterated in each of the steps in those little boxes.”

Program Coordinators

- “I loved how it was laid out with definitions and buttons to click on. The instructions were very clear.”
- “Reading the instructions was not a problem. I think they struggled to interpret what it looked like in context given the curriculum and where they were. Rubric 2.2 – they drilled down on that rubric which was helpful. Our candidates understand the concept and plan but the details in where they get bogged down but that rubric gave the details which helped.”
- “The assessment is much better than the ones in the past. The candidates struggled with the additional themes. I struggled with how to make that more clear/obvious as to what is being looked for.”
- “The white paper on the foundational skills was very helpful, but I feel there needed to be examples on the foundational skills and the cross-cutting themes, especially for the ed specialist candidates who then have to modify these skills to meet the needs of their students. The additional themes were a challenge to integrate for some of the students.”

Step 1: Plan: Did you have enough information about your focus child’s/student’s learning needs, assets, and/or interests to plan adaptations for your literacy activity/lesson?

Candidate

- “I felt like I did. I’ve been working with these students from the beginning of the year, and I had access to all the information such as their cumulative folders, IEPs, their gen-ed teacher, and parents.”
- “Yes. I’ve been working with the students since January and attended all their IEP meetings. I’ve also been in contact with the parents and the teacher showed me all that they have been working on and their progress. Working in small groups also helped me learn more about what their needs were.”
- “We started student teaching three weeks before it was due and there was also spring break so I had a short period of time to get all the lessons done. I wish I had more time to really get to know my focus student. It would have helped with my lessons as well.”
- “For me it was a little difficult because the way the school did it, we had 3 weeks of Cycle 1 and then the LPA. I just got my placement and I had barely met the students.”

Program Coordinators

- “Yes, they had plenty of information about their focus student to plan the adaptations.”
- “I had 2 candidates working one-on-one in home visits who had a little difficulty with it.”
- “One of our candidates had trouble getting access to IEP. We told supervising teachers to make this information available.”
- “Many of my candidates are interns so they were able to select a FS they have been working with all year fairly easily.”

Given your experience with consensus scoring, were candidates able to teach foundational reading skills and apply them to the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework?

Assessors

- **PK-3 ECE:** The Learning Segment template was well-written, making it easier for both assessors to find data and candidates to articulate their plans and connections.
- **DHH:** Assessors were impressed with the candidates' ability in this area, noting the positive impact on teaching methods and curriculum development.
- **VI:** Candidates did a very good job in this area.

Step 2: What insights did you gain from reviewing your video recorded teaching practice?

Candidate

- “When I went back and watched my video, I was like oh my gosh, how did I not realize they're sitting there? Like not paying attention or whatever. So I think that was probably the biggest thing and just trying to reflect on if my students aren't engaged, what can I do next time to change that?”
- “I learned there are things I miss. With some students as I was watching back, I was like, wait, when did that happen? Or when did that student start doing their own little thing on their paper? It reminded me to be more aware of all my students and not just the ones struggling.”
- “I took those videos as a reflection of my lessons and it helped me understand that my lesson structure was not perfect. I'm good with objectives and presentation, but I need to work on how to finish and make it more efficient for the students. It was helpful to watch the video after and analyze how to improve my teaching.”
- “I felt like I had room for improvement. I got nervous when I watched and realized I wasn't giving specific positive reinforcement. It has changed the way I navigate through the classroom. Instead of saying, oh, good job knowing this phonics. I would say the job knowing that the sound of the letter P.”

Step 2: Did you understand how to leverage children/student's cultural and/or linguistic assets and/or interests for your literacy activity/lesson?

Candidate

- “Yes, I did. Leveraging interests was a lot easier and I felt like it tied in well with literacy activities to have a passage that was about their interest. That made it more concrete to them and helped them understand. Linguistics was harder. That was more me trying to think how to do my lessons. I did not have a lot of knowledge of linguistics so doing linguistic assets was harder.”
- “For me a big difference was the amount of wiggle room your mentor teacher gives you makes a difference. The first time my mentor teacher gave me a lot more leeway. This time my mentor teacher wanted me to stick to the book. So it was a little bit more of a

struggle for me. I had less creative freedom in the lesson plans this time, and so that affected my ability to do the lesson exactly how I would have liked to.”

- “This is where I struggled the most. It was like, you know where they live, where they come from, you know, their ethnic background. And I’m like, Oh my gosh. Like, how am I going to be able to include this into my work? But after our professor broke it down I understood what to do. I thought that connecting to their interests would be best so I did that and they enjoyed the lessons”
- “I think so. Trying to find the students’ culture is not as available as it used to be without having to go into their cumulative files. I had to go to my district’s website to find the amount of culture at our school. We bring parents in to share cultural things ... cooking, etc. It was a learned thing for me to discover that our district could be better at it.”

Program Coordinators

- “Most candidates leverage interests but difficult with leveraging cultural and linguistic assets.”
- “I appreciate the way it was worded. It makes it appear that this is something you need to do, not choose to do. If they didn’t learn it in their instructional design class, then they learned it in my TPA class.”
- “Sometimes the teacher candidates have less control over what they might teach due to their mentor teacher or the given grade’s curriculum, etc.”
- “Leveraging the assets also difficult because many are basing lessons off of scripted reading programs (OG, etc) and those materials can be challenging to personalize for newer teachers.”

Step 4: Did you have enough evidence from the formative and summative assessments to help you determine if you should re-teach or extend the ELA/literacy and ELD learning goals? Please explain.

Candidate

- “I had enough info from the assessment to know I needed to do a reteach. I already had a small group so my reteach was with my focus student and I had my assessment info to back up why I retaught with just the one student.”
- “I felt like I did have enough evidence. I definitely had to reteach the lesson given the results from the assessments. I did the reteach with a small group.”
- “That part was unclear. I think I could have done a re-teach or an extension. I didn’t know which way I should go. I probably could have used more time, more than 5 lessons because they needed more time to get it.”
- “My GATE students grasped concepts immediately so I kind of knew beforehand that I would need to do an extension. But it was hard. How do I extend this for someone who already knows everything about it?”

Program Coordinator

- “Yes, they had enough evidence and our candidates were very clear in what they were going to do.”
- “They didn’t seem to struggle about deciding which way to go. I think again it was ‘How do I justify my decision?’ And you know, I think they felt they had enough data to make that decision.”
- “Yes, but they tend not to put evidence from steps 1-3.”

- “It was clear to me, but my candidates didn’t understand why they needed another video.”

Rubrics: How did your program support you in understanding the rubrics as you completed the LPA?

Candidate

- “She outlined each one for us and the main keywords and parts to focus on. It was pretty brief. We also had one workshop at the end before we submitted to kind of go back through the rubrics independently and make sure we felt like we had hit them.”
- “I really would have liked to have had an in person class lesson where we presented the work and maybe worked with a partner to figure out where we could improve. They had one class where they broke it down, but it was not enough information for me. It was not the rubrics that were not clear. It was the method that was lacking.”
- “My professor was amazing through all this, so I won't be able to get throughout without her. We also got to work in our cohort so we could look over the rubrics with our peers.”
- “I would like to credit my professor for the way she broke everything down. My supervisor teacher also attended the webinar and was able to give me wonderful feedback.”

Program Coordinators

- “We tell candidates anytime you see an “and” do both and once you check off the things in a Level 3 to aim for Level 4.”
- “We worked through the rubrics ... its hard for candidates to digest the rubrics and templates all at once. What’s frustrating about the rubrics is how they’re scored ... they’re used as a check list ... all or nothing.”
- “We lead them through rubric level revisions on each step so they sit with peers and go through each construct. We had 3 peer review sessions. We also had writing fellows available.”
- “We had them look at rubrics in the beginning and then again at the end as a self-assessment. I told them that they should be able to physically highlight each construct in Level 3 in their portfolio, and that they should be speaking to each construct when possible, using it as a sentence starter in in their narrative.”

Rubrics: Did you use the rubrics to self-assess before you submitted the LPA? If yes, how helpful was this process?

Candidates:

- “Yes, that’s what we did in our final workshop, we were told to self-assess using the rubrics.”
- “Yes, and our director walked them through what you needed to do for a 3 and what to add for a 4.”
- “With a peer we [self-assessed] together with the rubrics.”
- “No. Not enough time.”

Program Coordinators

- “Use the level 3 as the checklist. In a normal class I make the checklist but not for this one. Used the rubric itself to self-evaluate.”
- “Yes, and peer assessment as well.”

- “Yes, we had them go through the rubrics and check off everything in the constructs for Level 3 and then go to Level 4.”

Rubrics: Was the language in the rubrics clear enough to make score judgements about the evidence the candidate provided?

Assessors

- “Some of the areas could be subjective, making evaluation difficult at times-especially between a 3 and a 4.”
- “It was great.”
- “It was sometimes difficult to determine if students were actively engaged or not.”

Additional Feedback

Candidates

- “Response time for questions from CTC was quick and appreciated. We'd ask questions on our Zoom meetings with our program director and she was always able to get quick responses from CTC and get back to us with answers and clarification.”
- “Maybe require candidates to submit materials earlier in steps rather than on one official due date.”
- “I prefer this to a standardized test.”
- “Finding a different way to assess us teachers. The LPA doesn't really assess me as a teacher. I feel like if you were coming to my classroom and see me interact with my students and teach them in the way I normally teach them that would be a way better way to assess me.”
- “I would have loved examples. I need to see it so it would be nice to have that visual aspect of it too.”
- “Overall, the LPA field test helped me make stronger connections between assessment, instructional planning, and student outcomes. It reinforced the importance of using observation-based data to inform instruction and being intentional with how I support growth. This experience will influence how I plan lessons, assess student progress, and collaborate with other educators moving forward.”
- “Future candidates need to use time well and plan to spend 6-8 weeks developing, recording, revising, and finalizing documents.”
- “The LPA field test was overwhelming. I felt a lot of the questions were repetitive. I don't think the timeline that was given was enough.”
- “The CTC Pearson website was not working when I attempted to turn in my assessment. Maybe have maintenance on the website before the due date.”

Program Coordinators

- “Add foundational and additional themes check boxes to templates.”
- “Exemplars are always so helpful”
- “Everybody waits til the last minute. I'm wondering if there is a way for them to sign up for a submission time to cut down on system slow down.”
- “Some of my candidates were placed with mentors who don't teach foundational reading skills.”
- “I think maybe more targeted training and prep for the higher grades because a lot of those faculty and supervisors might not be so well versed with some of the foundational skills and how to apply them and make them age and developmentally appropriate.”

- “LPA is better than the current Cycle 2 - more flexibility, concise, and clearer. Would like to see more ‘Digging Deeper’ webinars that provide more examples of what is expected in CalTPAs.”
- “I think it is great that there is no requirement for a student self-assessment, because teachers struggle with this aspect of Cycle 2. Perhaps Template H can be more clear since we had questions about this part of the LPA.”

Assessors

- Candidates who do not pass should receive support and remediation from their programs.
- **DHH:** Consider adding ASL development goals alongside ELD goals to ensure candidates focus on both English and ASL literacy development.

Cooperating Teachers

- “I believe this is a good opportunity for candidates who are already interning with a district and have classroom experience. Being able to complete the LPA tasks within her own classroom with familiar students was beneficial.”

Appendix H

edTPA Task Expectations by Credential Area

edTPA Multiple Subject, Literacy with Mathematics	
Planning Task 1: Planning for Instruction and Assessment	
What to Do	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select one class as a focus for this assessment. • Consider the 3 students you will choose as your focus students (see Task 1 and 3 instructions for more information). • Provide relevant context information. • Identify a learning segment to plan, teach, and analyze student learning. Your learning segment should include 3–5 consecutive literacy lessons. • Identify the central focus for your learning segment. The learning segment should be based on high-quality, evidence-based literacy instruction that supports the development of foundational skills to all students, including a multi-tiered system of support for those with reading difficulties, English learners, and those with exceptional needs, in meaningful contexts. • Select Academic Language (language function; vocabulary/symbols; active listening; grammatical structures; written, visual, or verbal communication) associated with literacy learning; identify where you plan for students to use Academic Language. • Identify planned instructional supports for selected Academic Language. • Write and submit a lesson plan for each lesson in the learning segment. • Select and submit key instructional materials needed to understand what you and the students will be doing. • Respond to commentary prompts prior to teaching the learning segment. • Submit copies of all written assessments and/or clear directions for any oral or performance assessments from the learning segment. 	
What to Submit	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part A: Context for Learning Information • Part B: Lesson Plans for Learning Segment • Part C: Instructional Materials • Part D: Literacy Assessments • Part E: Literacy Planning Commentary 	
Evaluation Rubrics	
Rubric 1: Planning for Literacy Learning Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Use Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	
Instruction Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Literacy Learning	
What to Do	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain required permissions for videorecording from parents/guardians of your students and other adults appearing in the video. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify lessons from the learning segment you planned in Literacy Planning Task 1 to be videorecorded. Choose lessons that demonstrate how you interact with students in a positive literacy environment to engage with high-quality, evidence-based literacy learning that supports the development of foundational skills. Videorecord teaching and select 1-2 video clips (together no more than 20 minutes total, but not less than 3 minutes). Video evidence should demonstrate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> how you actively engage students in high-quality, evidence-based literacy learning that supports the development of foundational skills to develop effective expression and meaning making how you elicit student responses to promote thinking while supporting the development of foundational literacy in a meaningful context Analyze teaching and students' learning in the video clips by responding to commentary prompts
What to Submit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part A: Video Clip(s) Part B: Literacy Instruction Commentary
Evaluation Rubrics
<p>Rubric 6: Learning Environment</p> <p>Rubric 7: Engaging Students in Learning</p> <p>Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning</p> <p>Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy: Elementary Literacy</p> <p>Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness</p>
Assessment Task 3: Assessing Learning
What to Do
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select one assessment from the learning segment to use to evaluate your students' developing knowledge and literacy skills. Attach the assessment used to evaluate student performance to the end of the Assessment Commentary. Define and submit the evaluation criteria you will use to analyze students' literacy learning. Collect and analyze student work from the selected assessment to identify quantitative and qualitative patterns of literacy learning within and across learners in the class. Provide 3 student work samples to illustrate analysis of patterns of literacy learning within and across learners in the class. At least 1 of the samples must be from a student with specific learning needs. These 3 students will be your focus students. Summarize the learning of the whole class, referring to work samples from the 3 focus students to illustrate patterns in student understanding across the class.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submit feedback for the work samples for the 3 focus students in written, audio, or video form. Analyze evidence of students' literacy learning and language development and use from (1) the video clips from Literacy Instruction Task 2, (2) an additional video clip of one or more students using language within the learning segment, AND/OR (3) the student work samples from Literacy Assessment Task 3.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze evidence of student learning and plan for next steps by responding to commentary prompts
What to Submit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part A: Student Literacy Work Samples Part B: Evidence of Feedback Part C: Literacy Assessment Commentary Part D: Evaluation Criteria Part C: Evidence of Feedback Part D: Assessment Commentary
Evaluation Rubrics
<p>Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning</p> <p>Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning</p> <p>Rubric 13: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback</p> <p>Rubric 14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Literacy Learning</p> <p>Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction</p>
edTPA Education Specialist, Literacy: MMSN/ESN
Planning Task 1: Planning for Instruction and Assessment
What to Do
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select one learner as a focus for this assessment. The focus learner must be a student with 1) with an identified disability; (2) who is an English learner; and (3) who is from an underrepresented group or a group that needs to be served differently. If there are no English learners in the placement, candidates must choose a focus learner who is challenged by academic English, including early literacy. Obtain required permissions for videorecording from a parent/guardian of your focus learner (or, if appropriate, the focus learner) before planning the learning segment. Provide relevant context information. Select a foundational literacy learning goal for the focus learner, which will be the focus of instruction for this assessment. Obtain or collect baseline data for the focus learner's knowledge and skills related to the foundational literacy learning goal prior to planning the learning segment. NOTE: Candidates should include relevant information obtained from parents, teachers, and other community and school personnel. Given the foundational literacy learning goal and the baseline data, develop lesson objectives for a 3–5 lesson learning segment for the learning goal. Design a learning segment of 3–5 lessons that provides access to curriculum and instruction and supports the focus learner in meeting the literacy lesson objectives.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Choose one communication skill that the focus learner will need to use to participate in learning tasks and/or demonstrate learning related to the foundational learning goal; this should be language used in the appropriate discipline (literacy, mathematics, social studies, science), as appropriate for the learner. Explain how you will support the learner's use of the communication skill.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write and submit a lesson plan for each lesson in the learning segment, including the daily collection of assessment data to monitor the focus learner's progress toward lesson objectives associated with the foundational learning goal. • Select and submit key instructional and support materials needed to understand what you and the focus learner are doing. • Submit copies of all written assessments and/or data sheets, including any data collection procedures for any oral or performance assessments from the learning segment. • Respond to commentary prompts prior to teaching the learning segment.
What to Submit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part A: Context for Learning Information • Part B: Lesson Plans for Learning Segment • Part C: Instructional Materials • Part D: Assessments and/or Data Collection Procedures • Part E: Planning Commentary
Evaluation Rubrics
<p>Rubric 1: Planning for Alignment and Development of Knowledge and Skills</p> <p>Rubric 2: Planning Support for the Focus Learner</p> <p>Rubric 3: Justification of Instruction and Support</p> <p>Rubric 4: Supporting the Focus Learner's Use of Expressive/Receptive Communication</p> <p>Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Learning</p>
Instruction Task 2: Instructing and Engaging the Focus Learner
What to Do
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtain required permissions for videorecording from other adults and from parents/guardians of ALL learners who might appear in the videorecording. • Videorecord your instruction during the learning segment. Check the video and sound quality, analyze your teaching, and select the most appropriate video clip(s) to submit. • Provide 1–2 video clips (together no more than 20 minutes total, but not less than 3 minutes). The interactions in the clip(s) should demonstrate how you (Video evidence should demonstrate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o how you actively engage the focus learner in high-quality, evidence-based literacy learning that supports the development of foundational skills to develop effective expression and meaning making o how you elicit focus learner responses to promote thinking while supporting the development of foundational literacy in a meaningful context • Analyze your teaching and the learning of the focus learner in the video clip(s) by responding to commentary prompts.
What to Submit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part A: Video Clip(s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part B: Instruction Commentary
Evaluation Rubrics

Rubric 6: Learning Environment
 Rubric 7: Engaging the Focus Learner
 Rubric 8: Deepening Learning
 Rubric 9: Supporting Teaching and Learning
 Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness

Assessment Task 3: Assessing Learning

What to Do

- 1) Use the baseline data, daily assessment records, and work sample(s) from the learning segment to analyze the focus learner's progress on lesson objectives related to the foundational literacy learning goal.
- 2) Submit **one** copy of the baseline data and the completed daily assessment record for each lesson.
- 3) Submit **one** work sample analyzed to help illustrate the conclusions you reach in your analysis. The work sample may take the form of a test, an assignment, or a video clip of performance.
- 4) Submit feedback you gave to the focus learner for the assessment from which the work sample comes. The feedback can be provided on a written work sample, in a video work sample, as an audio clip, or as an additional video clip.
- 5) Analyze evidence of the focus learner's use of communication from (1) the video clip(s) from Instruction Task 2, (2) an additional video clip of the focus learner's use of communication within the learning segment, or (3) the work sample from Assessment Task 3 or a different work sample.
- 6) Analyze the data on the focus learner's progress toward the foundational literacy learning goal, and plan for next steps by responding to commentary prompts.

What to Submit

- Part A: Work Sample
- Part B: Completed Daily Assessment Records and Baseline Data
- Part C: Evidence of Feedback
- Part D: Assessment Commentary

Evaluation Rubrics

Rubric 11: Analyzing the Focus Learner's Performance
 Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning
 Rubric 13: Learner Understanding and Use of Feedback
 Rubric 14: Explaining the Focus Learner's Use of Communication
 Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

Appendix I

edTPA Multiple Subject, Literacy with Mathematics Sample Rubric

edTPA Multiple Subject, Literacy with Mathematics Assessment Handbook

Literacy Planning Rubrics

Rubric 1: Planning for Literacy Learning

How do the candidate's plans build students' understanding of high-quality, evidence-based literacy instruction that supports the development of foundational skills?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate's plans for instruction show minimal attention to literacy instruction that supports the development of foundational skills.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There are significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Standards, objectives, and learning tasks and materials are not aligned with each other.</p>	<p>Candidate's plans for literacy instruction vaguely support student learning of foundational skills.</p> <p>Plans are not high quality and evidence based.</p>	<p>Candidate's plans for literacy instruction are high quality and evidence based AND build on each other to support development of foundational skills.</p>	<p>Candidate's plans for literacy instruction are consistently high quality and evidence based AND consistently build on each other to support development of foundational skills.</p>	<p>Level 4 plus:</p> <p>Candidate explicitly shows how lessons build on each other to support the development of foundational skills.</p>

Appendix J

edTPA Score Distributions by Rubric

edTPA Multiple Subject Score Distribution and Mean Score by Rubric (Levels 1-5)

Rubric	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Mean
Rubric 1: Planning for Literacy Learning	0	19	83	2	0	2.84
Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs	0	16	62	26	0	3.10
Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	0	11	80	13	0	3.02
Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Use	0	17	80	7	0	2.90
Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	5	23	75	1	0	2.69
Rubric 6: Learning Environment	0	0	104	0	0	3.00
Rubric 7: Engaging Students in Learning	1	17	85	1	0	2.83
Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning	0	13	88	3	0	2.90
Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy: Elementary Literacy	0	26	68	10	0	2.85
Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	1	26	58	19	0	2.91
Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning	1	13	86	4	0	2.89
Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning	8	4	26	65	1	3.45
Rubric 13: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback	7	21	66	10	0	2.76
Rubric 14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Literacy Learning	1	22	63	18	0	2.94
Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	0	10	66	27	0	3.17

edTPA Education Specialist Score Distribution and Mean Score by Rubric (Levels 1-5)

Rubric	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Mean
Rubric 1: Planning for Development of Knowledge and Skills	4	23	71	6	0	2.76
Rubric 2: Planning to Support for the Focus Learner	3	21	69	11	0	2.85
Rubric 3: Justification of Instruction and Support	1	28	70	5	0	2.76
Rubric 4: Supporting the Focus Learners' Use of Communication Skills	1	19	73	11	0	2.90
Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Learning	2	37	65	0	0	2.61
Rubric 6: Learning Environment	0	13	91	0	0	2.88
Rubric 7: Engaging the Focus Learner	0	19	82	3	0	2.85
Rubric 8: Deepening Learning	3	25	76	0	0	2.70
Rubric 9: Supporting Teaching and Learning	3	14	86	1	0	2.82
Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	1	27	72	2	0	2.74
Rubric 11: Analyzing the Focus Learner's Performance	25	23	51	5	0	2.35
Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning	2	25	65	12	0	2.84
Rubric 13: Learner Understanding and Use of Feedback	2	53	48	1	0	2.46
Rubric 14: Explaining the Focus Learner's Use of Communication	2	31	67	4	0	2.70
Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	4	32	63	5	0	2.66

Appendix K

edTPA Survey Feedback on Literacy Field Test

Results from Survey of edTPA Literacy Field Test Candidates by Credential Area (Multiple Subject candidates, n=24; Education Specialist candidates, n=14)

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Part I:					
The edTPA allowed me to demonstrate my literacy instructional practice in an authentic way					
	Multiple Subject	4	16	2	2
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	4	8	3	0
The edTPA was a fair measure of my ability to teach literacy					
	Multiple Subject	1	14	5	3
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	3	10	1	0
The tasks associated with completing the edTPA align with what I have been learning in my educator preparation coursework					
	Multiple Subject	8	12	2	2
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	10	0	0
The edTPA allowed me to demonstrate my ability to teach foundational reading skills					
	Multiple Subject	6	13	4	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	9	1	0
The edTPA allowed me to demonstrate my ability to teach the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework (meaning-making, language development, effective expression, and content knowledge)					
	Multiple Subject	6	13	3	2
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	9	1	0
Part II:					
Overall, the directions provided in the edTPA handbook were clear					
	Multiple Subject	5	10	6	3
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	7	3	
The directions for how to identify my focus learner was clear					
	Multiple Subject	4	16	4	
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	6	8	1	

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The directions for how to use the ELA/ELD Framework to plan my lessons and assessments were clear					
	Multiple Subject	5	12	6	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	4	6	3	1
The directions for how to frame a high-quality, evidence-based literacy learning goal were clear					
	Multiple Subject	4	10	7	3
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	6	6	2	
The directions for how to use the California Preschool/Transitional Kindergarten Learning Foundations (PTKLF) or California Common Core State Standards for ELA/Literacy (CCSSM) for instructional decision-making were clear					
	Multiple Subject	6	9	5	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	4	9	1	
The directions for how to select video clips of my literacy instruction were clear					
	Multiple Subject	7	9	6	2
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	6	8	1	
The directions for analyzing the focus learner's performance were clear					
	Multiple Subject	(item not included)			
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	8	1	1
The directions for analyzing an assessment were clear					
	Multiple Subject	6	10	6	2
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	(item not included)			
The directions for how to provide the focus learner with feedback from the analyzed assessment were clear					
	Multiple Subject	4	11	8	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	7	2	
Part III					
The way the edTPA handbook was organized made it easy to find the information I needed (e.g., rubrics embedded with step instructions, glossary, links to resources)					
	Multiple Subject	6	14	3	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	4	9	2	0
The Purpose and Overview section of the handbook helped me understand what would be expected of me to be successful					
	Multiple Subject	2	17	4	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	8	0	0

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The explanation of High-Quality, Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction and Language Development in edTPA was clear					
	Multiple Subject	2	16	5	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	7	2	0
I understood how to leverage students' cultural and/or linguistic assets and/or interests to plan my literacy activities/lessons.					
	Multiple Subject	7	11	6	0
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	9	0	1
I understood how to implement a multiple tier systems of support (MTSS) within edTPA					
	Multiple Subject	4	13	7	0
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	7	3	0
The commentary prompts helped me fully describe what I was doing and why					
	Multiple Subject	7	12	5	0
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	7	2	1
The five levels of performance for each rubric were clear					
	Multiple Subject	4	13	6	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	4	9	0	0
The Understanding Rubric Level Progression sections in the handbook helped me to better understand how my edTPA will be scored					
	Multiple Subject	4	17	2	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	6	8	0	0
Part IV:					
My program faculty/instructors provided me with sufficient support during the edTPA field test					
	Multiple Subject	12	10	1	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	6	4	0
My cooperating teacher provided me with sufficient support during the edTPA field test					
	Multiple Subject	10	8	2	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	5	3	0
The edTPA materials provided sufficient information to assist me throughout the field test process					
	Multiple Subject	11	11	1	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	8	2	0
My program provided sufficient guidance on how to manage the completion of the edTPA within the field test window					

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
	Multiple Subject	12	10	1	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	6	7	2	0
My program prepared me to be able to plan ELA/literacy learning goals					
	Multiple Subject	9	13	2	0
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	9	1	0
My program prepared me to be able to plan ELD learning goals					
	Multiple Subject	10	10	4	0
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	6	6	3	0
My program provided sufficient guidance to help me understand the edTPA rubrics					
	Multiple Subject	10	11	3	0
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	6	4	0
My program encouraged me to self-assess using the rubrics					
	Multiple Subject	10	11	2	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	8	2	0
My program provided sufficient guidance to help me understand the evidence I needed to submit for the edTPA					
	Multiple Subject	10	12	1	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	5	9	1	0
My program provided guidance on how to register and upload my submission (e.g., video, templates).					
	Multiple Subject	10	13	0	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	6	8	1	0
My program prepared me to be able to teach foundational reading skills for the edTPA field test					
	Multiple Subject	10	12	1	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	6	6	2	0
My program prepared me to assist students in applying foundational reading skills to the themes (meaning making, language development, effective expression, content knowledge) from the ELA/ELD framework					
	Multiple Subject	10	13	0	1
	Education Specialist (MMSN/ESN)	6	6	1	1

Results from Survey of edTPA Literacy Field Test Coordinators and Faculty (n=7)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Part I				
The edTPA allowed candidates to demonstrate their literacy knowledge, skills, and abilities in an authentic way	3	3	1	0
The edTPA was a fair measure of candidates' abilities to teach literacy	3	4	0	0
The tasks associated with completing the edTPA aligned with what candidates have been learning in their educator preparation coursework	4	3	0	0
The edTPA allowed candidates to demonstrate their ability to teach foundational reading skills	3	3	0	0
The edTPA allowed candidates to demonstrate their ability to teach the additional themes from the ELA/ELD Framework (meaning making, language development, effective expression, content knowledge)	4	3	0	0
Part II				
Overall, the directions provided in the edTPA handbook were clear	1	5	1	0
The directions for how to identify focus student(s) were clear	2	5	0	0
The directions for how to use the ELA/ELD Framework to plan lessons and assessments were clear	1	6	0	0
The explanation of High-Quality, Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction and Language Development were clear	2	4	1	0
The directions for how to use the California Preschool/Transitional Kindergarten Learning Foundations (PTKLF) or California Common Core State Standards for ELA/Literacy (CCSSM) to plan the activities	2	3	0	0
The directions for how to select video clips of candidates' literacy instruction were clear	3	2	2	0
The directions for analyzing an assessment were clear	1	5	1	0
The directions for how to provide students with feedback from the analyzed assessment were clear	2	5	0	0
Part III				
The way the edTPA handbook was organized made it easy to find the information needed (e.g., rubrics embedded with step instructions, glossary, links to resources)	5	2	0	0
The Purpose and Overview section of the handbook was helpful to understand what would be expected of candidates to be successful	3	4	0	0

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Candidates understood how to leverage students' cultural and/or linguistic assets and/or interests to plan the literacy activities/lessons.	2	4	1	0
Candidates had enough information about the focus student's assets, interest and/or learning needs to plan adaptations for the literacy activity/lesson	2	4	1	0
Candidates understood how to implement a multiple tier systems of support (MTSS) within edTPA	2	4	1	0
The commentary prompts helped candidates fully describe what they were doing and why	2	3	2	0
The five levels of performance for each rubric were clear	2	5	0	0
The Understanding Rubric Level Progression sections in the handbook helped candidates to better understand how edTPA will be scored	2	5	0	0
Part IV				
The Pearson-hosted meetings for coordinators helped communicate expectations for programs participating in edTPA field test	5	1	0	0
Handbooks and assessment materials were thoroughly reviewed with me prior to the field test	4	1	1	0
The edTPA materials provided sufficient information to assist candidates throughout the field test process	4	2	0	0
The field test website provided valuable information about the field test	3	2	1	0
The coordinator office hours hosted by the Pearson were a helpful resource for me during the edTPA field test	4	1	1	0
Cooperating teachers provided candidates with sufficient support during the edTPA field test	1	3	2	0

Results from Survey of edTPA Literacy Field Test Mentor Teachers (n=22)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Part I				
The edTPA allowed my candidate (student teacher, intern) to demonstrate their literacy knowledge, skills, and abilities in an authentic way	5	16	1	0
The edTPA was a fair measure of candidates' abilities to teach literacy	4	15	0	0
The tasks associated with completing the edTPA aligned with what typically occurs when planning and implementing literacy instruction in my classroom	5	14	3	0
The edTPA allowed candidates to demonstrate their ability to plan for and teach ELA/literacy and ELD learning goals	7	14	1	0
Part II				
I read the edTPA Assessment Handbook	2	15	3	1
I read the edTPA Templates	2	15	3	1
I reviewed the edTPA rubrics	2	16	3	1
I discussed the edTPA materials (Assessment Handbook, Templates, and/or Rubrics) with my candidate	5	12	2	0
I provided support to my candidate to select the ELA/Literacy Standards for their lessons and assessments	7	12	1	0
I provided support to my candidate to select the ELD Standards for their lessons and assessments	5	12	1	0
I provided support to my candidate to select the foundational reading skills for their lessons and assessments	7	13	1	0
I provided support to my candidate to select the themes (meaning making, language development, effective expression, content knowledge) from the ELA/ELD Framework for their lessons and assessments	6	12	3	0
Part III				
The way the edTPA handbook was organized made it easy to find the information I needed to support my candidate (e.g., rubrics embedded with step instructions, glossary, links to resources)	3	14	3	0
I was able to support my candidate with reviewing available, recent, literacy assessments that were used in my classroom or school	8	11	0	0

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The options provided for my candidate to select focus student(s) were representative of the students in my classroom	6	13	0	0
The explanation of High-Quality, Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction and Language Development was clear	4	14	0	0
Candidates understood how to leverage student's cultural and/or linguistic assets and/or interests to plan the literacy activity/lesson	5	13	2	0
Candidates had enough information about their focus student's assets, interest and/or learning needs to plan adaptations for their literacy activity/lesson	7	12	0	0
The commentary prompts helped candidates describe what they were doing and why	4	12	1	0
There was enough evidence from my candidate's assessment results to determine next steps	6	13	0	0
Candidates understood how to implement a multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS)	6	12	1	0
The commentary prompts helped candidates fully describe what they were doing and why	6	12	0	0
The five levels of performance for each rubric were clear	7	13	0	0
The Understanding Rubric Level Progression sections in the handbook helped candidates to better understand how edTPA will be scored	6	13	0	0
Part IV				
The edTPA materials provided sufficient information to assist my candidate throughout the field test process	5	12	1	0
Program faculty provided my candidate with sufficient support during the edTPA field test	5	13	0	0
Program faculty provided me with sufficient information as I supported my candidate during the edTPA field test	5	10	3	1
The field test website provided valuable information about the field test	3	2	1	0
The coordinator office hours hosted by the Pearson were a helpful resource for me during the edTPA field test	4	1	1	0
Cooperating teachers provided candidates with sufficient support during the edTPA field test	1	3	2	0

Appendix L

edTPA Qualitative Feedback from Surveys

Candidate Responses:

- “The edTPA provided a structured opportunity for me to demonstrate key elements of literacy instruction, particularly in planning and differentiating for diverse learners, delivering intentional instruction aligned to standards, and using assessment to guide instruction. However, while it offered opportunities to highlight specific practices, I found that certain limitations impacted the authenticity of how my full literacy instructional approach was represented.”
- “In my case I felt that It was hard to complete the edTPA at the same time as student teaching because although I knew that the edTPA was important I prioritized my student teaching work over the edTPA but it make it hard to catch up at the end.”
- “The edTPA gave me a real chance to show how I plan and teach literacy, especially when it came to differentiating for diverse learners and using strategies I learned in my credential program. Task 1 really let me highlight how I plan with clear goals and supports in mind. While I felt it mostly reflected my teaching, it didn’t fully capture my ability to teach foundational reading or go deep into ELA/ELD themes like language development and meaning-making. I believe adding more flexibility around student choice or allowing a wider range of learner profiles could make it more authentic.”

Program Coordinator & Faculty Responses:

- "I believe the edTPA allowed candidates to teach literacy with flexibility and creativity in their mentor's classroom or their own if they are an intern in their classroom. Before candidates would be confused to only teach comprehension or composition strategies. Using foundational skills, meaning making, language development, and intentionally planning oral discourse for effective expression helped candidates teach all literacy development. It was easier for the candidates to teach more of the English Language Arts curriculum that their mentor wanted them to teach.”
- “I felt that my students benefited tremendously from the literacy focus! They stated this and it reflected in their assignments.”
- “I think overall much better than original edTPA, but the massive nature of the task and the stakes involved, causes stress thereby limiting full ability to express authentic selves.”
- “The edTPA requirement formalizes what the students are doing in their classrooms and encourages them to think critically about the process and the outcomes.”

Mentor Teacher Responses:

- "The edTPA allowed my candidate to authentically demonstrate their literacy instructional practice. The candidate was able to demonstrate her lesson planning skills, teaching, and adjusting instruction to support all learners in the classroom, and assessment of foundational literacy skills. The candidate was able to demonstrate her knowledge about the literacy domains: listening, speaking, reading, writing, with

emphasis on vocabulary, sentence structure, decoding, and encoding of simple and complex words to support all learners in the classroom.”

- “In my experience with teachers completing the edTPA, it is too labor intensive and requires more than what a teacher would do when working in a classroom.”
- “My candidate had to think more strategically about how to support her specific learner to have access to a grade level text.”

Assessor Responses:

- "Candidate Preparation Programs need to be advised that for Rubric 11, candidates must have objective measurable criteria for their objectives. This is still a problem, and it becomes more apparent as candidates attempt to prove their instructional sequence was successful without communicating to scorers what constitutes proficiency."
- "Rubrics 12/13: Candidates provide feedback that is unrelated to the learning goals/objectives. This is another opportunity for training programs to build capacity in candidates for connectivity between explicit, timely feedback pertinent to the learning sequence and the growth of the focus learner. All feedback is not the same."

Appendix M

FAST 3.0 SVP Overview

SVP Outline

See the Parts of the Project section of this handbook for more detailed instructions and information about the required forms to submit.

These general directions present an outline of the Site Visitation Project requirements.

Prior to completing the SVP tables, the candidate should complete the following:

1. Assess their entire class using the Words Their Way (WTW) assessment
2. Use the WTW assessment results to group all students in the class based on spelling stage.
3. Identify one specific group for focused work that includes at least one Emergent Bilingual (EB)
4. Gather contextual information; including ethnicity, languages spoken (including ELPAC results), and identified special needs.

After candidate identifies focal group:

5. Conduct Narrative Comprehension Task with the identified focal students to learn more about their specific instructional needs.
6. Gather data and contextual information on each student in focal group
 - o Plan three targeted lessons for this small group, ensuring the content meets the students' unique needs in ways that align with the [ELA/ELD Framework](#); specific ELA and ELD standards must be noted. If appropriate based on the needs of the group, instruction should also align with CA Dyslexia Guidelines.
 - o Complete the Foundational Skills Planning Table and Meaning Making Planning table at least 3 days prior to start of implementation.
7. Engage the focal group in these three lessons, and video record the three sessions to capture their progress and interactions. Candidates are responsible for recording ALL THREE LESSONS using Panopto, Kremen's approved secure online video platform.
 - o One of the three lessons will be observed by University Coach; choose a time that is mutually convenient.
 - o One of the complete videos will be uploaded to Tk20
8. After each day's lessons, reflect on the growth and engagement of focal group. Complete Daily Reflection In Action for both Foundational Skills and Meaning Making Skills for each individual student in the focal group.
9. After teaching all three days, reflect on the overall effectiveness of your lessons. Choose specific video clips that highlight key moments of instruction, describe decision making, and reflect on culturally sustaining pedagogies.
 - o Submit the Planning & Reflection Tables (including the two 3-5 minute video clips), and the instructional decision making & culturally sustaining pedagogies reflection **within 7 days** of the completion of teaching the 3-day lesson sequence.

The project will be evaluated using the Scoring Rubrics at the end of the directions.

* The Site Visitation Project is one of two tasks in the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) that together measure the pedagogical competence of teacher candidates and interns for the Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California. Together, the tasks also provide information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.

A candidate's responses to project prompts MUST reflect their own unaided work. In addition, candidates may not submit AI-generated responses as part of a task submission.

SVP Preparation

To prepare for the SVP you should be familiar with the following:

- the *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* (ELA/ELD Framework)
- the *California Common Core State Standards for English Language and Literacy* (CA CCSS ELA/Literacy);
- the *California English Language Development Standards* (CA ELD Standards), and
- the *California Dyslexia Guidelines*.

See the Parts of the SVP section of this handbook for more detailed instructions for specific requirements.

1. Review the [Teaching Performance Expectations \(TPEs\)](#) that are evaluated in this project.
2. Review the Scoring Rubrics (SVP) section of this handbook.
3. Discuss expectations for the SVP with your Mentor Teacher.
4. Make arrangements for the observation with your University Coach for a mutually convenient time.

Parts of the SVP

The SVP has 3 parts: planning, implementation, and reflection. All required forms are available in your Tk20 SVP Portfolio. Copies of the forms are also included in the Appendix of this handbook.

Parts of the SVP	Planning Task(s)	Implementing Tasks	Reflection Tasks
Foundations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Foundational Skills Planning & Reflection Table Complete 3 days prior to first day of teaching Submit one day as a lesson plan 3 days prior for observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Video record all 3 lessons University Coach observes one lesson in person After each lesson, reflect and record your thoughts on the daily progress notes portion of the Foundational Skills Planning & Reflection Table Upload one of three video links for scoring purposes (in Tk20 only) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select a 3-5 minute unedited Video Clip demonstrating Foundational Skills Self-Evaluation of alignment and effectiveness of Foundational Skills
Meaning Making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meaning Making Skills Planning & Reflection Table Complete 3 days prior to first day of teaching Submit one day as a lesson plan 3 days prior for observation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Video record all 3 lessons University Coach observes one lesson in person After each lesson, reflect and record your thoughts on the daily progress notes portion of the Meaning making Planning & Reflection table Upload one of three video links for scoring purposes (in Tk20 only) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select a 3-5 minute unedited Video Clip demonstrating Meaning Making Skills Self-Evaluation of alignment and effectiveness of Meaning Making Skills

Appendix N

FAST 3.0 SVP Foundational Skills Rubric

Foundational Skills

Rubric scoring based on the following evidence:

- Foundational Skills Planning Table based on Words Their Way Spelling Inventory
- Daily Progress Notes: Foundational Skills
- Video Clip 1 and Reflection on Foundational Skills Instruction

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Planning Reading Pedagogy: Foundational Skills TPE 1.4, 3.1, 3.3, 3.5, 7.1, 7.2. 7.5, 7.10	a. Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects minimal or incorrect application of foundational skills pedagogy, less than three focal areas are consistent with current pedagogy in literacy. 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, irregular words, and /or Concepts About Print. c. Provides inadequate justification for why	a. Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a general application of foundational skills pedagogy, a minimum of three focal areas are aligned and consistent with current pedagogy in literacy. 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, irregular words, and /or Concepts About Print.	a. Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a specific application of foundational skills pedagogy, more than three focal areas are aligned and consistent with current pedagogy in literacy. 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, irregular words, and /or Concepts About Print; instructional opportunities increase in	a. Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a deep and comprehensive application of foundational skills pedagogy in all six focal areas . 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, irregular words, and /or Concepts About Print; instructional opportunities increase in complexity over three days in all focal areas . c. Provides specific justification for why

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
	<p>instructional activity was chosen to develop each foundational skill.</p> <p>d. Instructional activities may not support each area of focus; If addressing all skill areas is not appropriate, does not provide an explanation.</p>	<p>c. Provides appropriate justification for why instructional activity was chosen to develop each foundational skill.</p> <p>d. Includes at least one instructional activity that supports each focal area; If addressing all skill areas is not appropriate, provides an explanation.</p>	<p>complexity over three days for at least one focal area</p> <p>c. Provides specific justification for why instructional activity was chosen to develop foundational skill.</p> <p>d. 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; If addressing all skill areas is not appropriate, provides an explanation.</p>	<p>instructional activity was chosen to develop foundational skill.</p> <p>d. Includes more than one instructional activity to support each focal area; If addressing all skill areas is not appropriate, provides a detailed explanation.</p>
<p>Implementation: Daily Progress Notes Foundational Skills</p> <p>TPE 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 7.5, 7.10</p>	<p>a. Foundational skill instruction and progress notes reflect minimal or incorrect application of instructional activities to support phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondence, decoding/ encoding, fluency, irregular words, and /or Concepts About Print; activities do not align with focal area.</p>	<p>a. Foundational skill instruction and progress notes reflect a general application of instructional activities to support phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondence, decoding/ encoding, fluency, irregular words, and /or Concepts About Print; a minimum of three activities align with focal areas.</p>	<p>a. Foundational skill instruction and progress notes reflect a specific application instructional activities that support phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondence, decoding/ encoding, fluency, irregular words, and /or Concepts About Print; more than three activities align with focal areas.</p> <p>b. Delivery is effective.</p>	<p>a. Foundational skill instruction and progress notes reflect a deep, comprehensive application of multiple instructional activities that support phonemic awareness, phoneme grapheme correspondences, decoding/ encoding, fluency, irregular words, and /or Concepts About Print; in all six areas.</p>

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
	b. Delivery is ineffective and/or inappropriate c. Daily Progress Notes are incomplete and/or not individualized for each student; copied and pasted and/or not based on student learning. d. Reading Lesson Planning Table is not adjusted using strike-through function.	b. Delivery may be minimally effective, (unrehearsed). c. Daily Progress Notes are complete , are generally individualized for each student; based on student learning d. Reading Lesson Planning Table is generally adjusted using strike-through function.	c. Daily Progress Notes are complete, are specifically individualized for each student; based on student learning. d. Reading Lesson Planning Table is specifically adjusted using strike-through function.	b. Delivery is highly effective and responsive to the specific students. c. Daily Progress Notes are complete, are specifically individualized for each student; based on student learning. d. Reading Lesson Planning Table is comprehensively adjusted using strike-through function.
Reflecting on Reading Pedagogy: Foundational Skills TPE 1.4, 6.1, 7.5	a. Provides inadequate justification for the alignment of activity and the focal area. b. Provides inadequate justification for the effectiveness of the instructional activity in Video clip 1 based on the intended outcome.	a. Provides general justification for the <u>alignment</u> of activity in video 1 and the focal area. b. Provides general justification for how the <u>effectiveness</u> of instructional activity in Video clip 1 based on the intended outcome.	a. Provides specific justification for the <u>alignment</u> of activity in video 1 and the focal area. b. Provides specific justification for how the <u>effectiveness</u> of instructional activity in Video clip 1 based on the intended outcome and includes student data as evidence.	a. Provides specific justification for the alignment of the activity and the focal area. b. Provides specific justification of the effectiveness of instructional activity in Video clip 1 based on the intended outcome, includes student data as evidence, and differentiates between the students in the group.

Appendix O

FAST Candidate Survey Responses

Candidate Overall Level of Preparation

	Yes	Somewhat	No
Did you feel prepared to complete the SVP 3.0?	6 (40%)	7 (46.7%)	2 (13.3%)
Do you believe you have the literacy knowledge needed to instruct in each of the foundational and meaning making skills?	11 (73.3%)	4 (26.7%)	0 (0%)

Candidate Level of Preparation for Specific Tasks

	1	2	3	4	5
How prepared did you feel to complete the Lesson Planning Table in foundational skills?	1 (6.7%)	2 (13.3%)	4 (26.7%)	6 (40%)	2 (13.3%)
How prepared did you feel to complete the Lesson Planning Table in meaning making skills?	1 (6.7%)	2 (13.3%)	3 (20%)	5 (33.3%)	4 (26.7%)
How prepared did you feel in completing the Implementation & Daily Reflection in Action portion of the SVP?	1 (6.7%)	3 (20%)	3 (20%)	7 (46.7%)	1 (6.7%)
How prepared did you feel in completing the Self-Reflection & Instructional Decision Making/Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies portion of the SVP?	1 (6.7%)	1 (6.7%)	2 (13.3%)	7 (46.7%)	4 (26.7%)

Support Sessions

14/15 responders attended two support sessions; 1 responder attended one

	1	2	3	4	5
On a scale of 1-5, how effective were the support sessions in preparing you to complete the components of the SVP?	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)	2 (13.3%)	6 (40%)	6 (40%)

Selected FAST Candidate Responses

Did you feel prepared to complete the SVP 3.0?

- I was not able to attend the second meeting and did not feel prepared at all for the second part of the SVP. Also, I don't think that the requirements of the SVP lent themselves to a 6th classroom, so many of them were hard to implement.
- I felt like it was hard to plan just because we didn't have much to go off of. Being the first group to do this kind of SVP was a little nerve wracking, and if we had some examples beforehand it would have been better to help us fill out the information and tables needed.
- The support provided in the seminars, as well as the resources provided on the Canvas shell made it accessible to get information needed to answer questions regarding SVP preparation/completion.
- I felt very supported by my professors and my coach and mentor teacher. Even though they did not give me specific answers or examples, they guided me in the right direction.

Do you believe you have the literacy knowledge needed to instruct in each of the foundational and meaning making skills?

- Yes and no, as an educator, you're always learning more and more each day. I believe I had enough foundational literacy knowledge to instruct the students in my placement. I feared that with not enough instruction on my specific placement that I would not be successful.
- Based on my experience with the SVP, I believe I am capable to cater instruction in foundational and meaning making skills based on my students needs. With this project I was able to go in depth and learn how to create a plan of instruction catering towards my students learning goals.
- Being able to create and teach my own lessons over the course of 3 days helps me get into the idea that I can teach the foundational and meaning making skills. The fact that I passed also proves to me we could do it!

How prepared did you feel to complete the Lesson Planning Table in Foundational Skills?

- 1) The support session was NOT recorded. This meant that I couldn't go back to rewatch the sessions. If they were recorded then I didn't get the recording sent to me. 2) The session did not prepare us for the SVP as it felt like they just read the FAST document and retold us it. Finally, 3) There was NO examples. Although I understand the purpose of this was to assessed us to see whether or not we were competent enough to design a lesson independently, it didn't feel like this as it felt more like we were given a pop-quiz on something we've never learned about before.
- The information provided in the support sessions was beneficial to my understanding of what the SVP entailed. My questions were able to be answered and the information that was given was available for us to refer back to when needed. The google drive folder as well as the handbook also served as guides that led me to feel prepared in completing the lesson table in foundational skills.
- I think instructions and clarifications were right on, I personally liked that we had options on how to add the information such as paragraphs or bullet points or etc. I also

believe that the table can be set up differently to be easier to read and identify for each section.

How prepared did you feel to complete the Lesson Planning Table in meaning making skills?

- I felt like meaning making was more straightforward than foundational skills, so it was easier to understand what was being asked.
- For meaning making the most difficult task was choosing what text to use for my DI Kindergarteners since I wanted to tie it to the foundational skills. I overcomplicated it, and should've went strictly based on my focal group's commonalities. I felt like my final choice of the literature was based on what my students would be able to read rather than a topic more centered on them where I could've read it to them.
- The Planning Table lacked examples. What do you mean my interest? Is it what the students' interest on what they want to learn? What they like to do? Their favorite game? Favorite subject? Essentially, I needed more information about what information I needed to retrieve from the students. Additionally, asking about students' ethnicity was extremely uncomfortable because, due to prior experiences, there are sites that have policies that doesn't allow that information from being distributed.

How prepared did you feel in completing the Implementation & Daily Reflection in Action portion of the SVP?

- Being that I knew the outcome of the lesson would impact my scoring, I felt prepared yet reflecting back I know I could have made some adjustments like managing my time better.
- I went with my heart when I reflected. I didn't realize how much I needed to think about while teaching that when I began filling out the daily reflection I was greatly relieved that I had the videos to rely on for certain information. It is a lot to think and analyze while teaching. Get multiple angles of recordings!
- The format table was a little confusing on to take notes.

How prepared did you feel in completing the Self-Reflection & Instructional Decision Making/Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies portion of the SVP?

- I didn't know how to reflect on the cultural part since it was not the focus on the focal students rather than why I chose them and so having to do further research to connect to the cultural aspect or interests was a bit challenging and frustrating.
- I feel like by the time the reflection came I personally felt drained from all the planning and implementing.
- I reflected throughout the lessons and was excited to see what I can change and make better. What mistakes were made and why they didn't work out. Since I did this, writing the reflection was an easy flow.

Please add any other information for the program to know in regards to the SVP for improvement

- I found much of this tedious because it was repetitive. I often questioned if I was doing the correct thing because I had no guidance. Again, this may have been because I had a poor coach experience, but if there was more of a class setting rather than a "call me if

you need me" situation, I would have asked for more help. If this is meant to take the place of the RICA, candidates need more guidance than I received.

- Since we were the first cohort to have the SVP 3.0 it would have been nice to see an example project to look back on in case we needed to see how to approach a section and/or answer any question we had.
- I think that the rubrics on passing scores should be addressed in the workshops rather than focus on what the candidates need to do or add another workshop to focus on passing and helping students understand, I think the two workshops were not enough to help candidates.

Appendix P

FAST Coach/Assessor Survey Responses

Coach/Assessor Overall Level of Preparation (n=19)

	Yes	Somewhat	No
Did you feel prepared to support candidates with the SVP 3.0?	10 (52.6%)	7 (36.8%)	2 (10.5%)
Do you believe you have the literacy knowledge needed to support candidates in each of the foundational and meaning making skills?	12 (63.2%)	6 (31.6%)	1 (5.3%)

Coach/Assessor Level of Preparation for Scoring Specific Tasks (n=19) (scale: 1=very unprepared; 5=very prepared)

	1	2	3	4	5
How prepared did you feel to score the Lesson Planning Table in Foundational Skills?	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (15.8%)	11 (57.9%)	5 (26.3%)
How prepared did you feel to score the Lesson Planning Table in Meaning Making skills?	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (5.3%)	13 (68.4%)	5 (26.3%)
How prepared did you feel to score the Implementation & Daily Reflection in Action portion of the SVP?	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (21.1%)	9 (47.4%)	6 (31.6%)
How prepared did you feel to score the Self-Reflection & Instructional Decision Making/Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies portion of the SVP?	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (15.8%)	9 (47.4%)	7 (36.8%)

Support Sessions for Scoring

7/19 responders attended two support sessions in person

2/19 responders attended two virtual support sessions

5/19 responded attended one support session in person

5/19 responded attended one virtual support session

	1	2	3	4	5
On a scale of 1-5, how effective were the support sessions in preparing you to score the components of the SVP?	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (10.5%)	8 (42.1%)	9 (47.4%)

Selected FAST Coach/Assessor Responses

Did you feel prepared to support students with the SVP 3.0?

- The training provided built on my prior knowledge and experience in early literacy training.
- The training you provided and support from colleagues was extremely valuable. I appreciated the opportunity to practice with the scoring anchors. The availability of the materials we needed was great!
- I was still learning about the assignment directions when my student started working on the SVP.

Do you believe you have the literacy knowledge needed to candidates in each of the foundational and meaning making skills?

- I have taught both Special Day class and RSP students which allowed me to use my skills. I was familiar with the assessments used to identify students needing support. I did have to "refresh" my memory around phonemic awareness, which is a language of its own.
- Based on my experience with instructional leadership and involvement with district curriculum/instruction, I felt confident with Foundational & Meaning Making skills.
- I have experience supporting early literacy specifically foundational skills as well as similar work for older students through to middle school.

How prepared did you feel to score the Lesson Planning Table in Foundational Skills?

- I felt prepared to score the entire thing, but of course because it was new I needed to take some extra time.
- The training was sufficient but I do not feel that I am an expert in this area.
- The foundational skills had many components I hadn't seen in years. So I needed to write out the definitions of each component.

How prepared did you feel to score the Lesson Planning Table in meaning making skills?

- Once again I was confused by the format and submissions being turned in separately for each area.
- Meaning making is an integral part of my teaching and coaching experiences.
- It was repackaged information that I have been aware of and used for a long time.

How prepared did you feel to score the Implementation & Daily Reflection in Action portion of the SVP?

- This is kind of a subjective area, but I think it's pretty manageable, even if I wasn't completely immersed in early literacy as a research area.
- When I write up lessons, every lesson reflection should tell me about the student's knowledge of skills and what they need to improve or try or to add to their instruction.
- We met as a cohort and discussed implementation and reflected together. I believe the feedback the students received from each other improved their final product and provided me with insight into each student's thinking.

How prepared did you feel in completing the Self-Reflection & Instructional Decision Making/Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies portion of the SVP?

- I thought I was okay with scoring but the section titled Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy on the rubric was interesting because the students could receive a passing score with very limited reference to cultures and more focused on student interests. Isn't this missing the point?
- Again, calibration discussions helped
- This is an area where the students could actually identify the challenges when working with SPED students and the importance of making accommodations and modifications to meet the requirements of the assessment if taught in their SPED coursework.

Please add any other information for the program to know in regards to the SVP for improvement

- **Suggestions: Review Rubric & revise. Possibly more training with sharing of SVP exemplars representing each component. Share samples representing a 4,3,2,1. * sharing of all three 20 minute lessons with coaches *Access to the Identity Book (Modeling of books in coursework should not be used.) * formatting of daily progress notes (across instead of down) *Scoring Rubric -- formatting change * Directions more inclusive.
- I find it beneficial to examine a range of examples and discuss those with others.
- The SVP was challenging to score because of all of the documentation submitted by the students. What strategies are other coaches using when they read and score the SVPs?

Appendix Q

FAST Mentor Teacher Survey Responses

Mentor Teacher Overall Level of Preparation (n=21)

	Yes	Somewhat	No
Did you feel prepared to support candidates with the literacy Site Visitation Project?	14 (63.6%)	5 (22.7%)	3 (13.6%)
Do you believe you have the literacy knowledge needed to support candidates in each of the foundational and meaning making skills?	12 (63.2%)	6 (31.6%)	1 (5.3%)

Mentor Teacher Appropriate Literacy Knowledge to Support Candidates in Specific Foundational Skills (n=22)

	Yes	Somewhat	No
Do you believe you have the literacy knowledge needed to support candidates in each of the foundational skills?			
- Phonemic Awareness	18	4	0
- Phoneme/Grapheme Correspondence	16	6	0
- Fluency	19	3	0
- Decoding & Encoding	18	4	0
- Irregular Words	19	3	0
- Concepts about Print	17	5	0

Mentor Teacher Appropriate Literacy Knowledge to Support Candidates in Meaning Making Skills (n=22)

	Yes	Somewhat	No
Do you believe you have the literacy knowledge needed to support candidates in each of the following meaning making skills?			
- Appropriate book/literature selection	22	0	0
- Oral Language Discussions	22	0	0
- Writing	21	1	0

Selected FAST Mentor Teacher Responses

Did you feel prepared to support your students with the literacy SVP?

- In order to better support the student teacher the school should send over the guidelines and the assignment so the mentor teacher can make sure to help.
- The project was valuable to my teaching candidate because they initial whole class assessment allowed her to see where each individual student was on some of the foundational skills and form a small group with similar needs with feedback from me. She was able to work with the small group over the course of the project to fill some of the gaps the students had.
- All the information I recieved was from my student teacher. If I am expected to help my student teacher, all information should come from the university program instead from her. If my student teacher didn't understand how how to do something then how am I suppose to help her if I have no guide on how to help her.

What could Fresno State do to better support future mentor teachers around foundational skills in literacy?

- I am always interested in learning more regarding foundational skills in literacy. Additional trainings that student teachers and mentors could attend together would be valuable and useful.
- Provide the mentor teachers with a guidebook or other resource so we can better understand what the student teacher is working on.
- Adjust the SVP to grade level (upper and lower elementary school literacy skills

What could Fresno State do to better support future mentor teachers around meaning making skills in literacy?

- I'm not sure. The program and expectations have changed immensely since I have been through it and I am not in the meetings where you go over the guidelines and expectations. My student teacher seemed confused and unsure of all assignments given to her.
- As mentioned above, ongoing training or professional learning would be useful in supporting mentor teachers around meaning making skills in literacy.
- Communicate clear assignments, teach explicitly what is expected of students to teach, Classes at Fresno State should go over beginning reading skills

Please add any other information for the program to know in regards to the literacy based Site Visitation Project for improvement:

- Another suggestion is to send the mentor teacher the requirements for the SVP so we know what our student teacher is expected to do.
- I would have like a monthly communication from the university in order to provide the best support for the teacher candidate
- Like mentioned above, if we are expected to help student teachers we need to know what is expect from them so that I can better support them. I'm sure there were more assignments that didn't require the classroom setting but I believe more practice in the classroom with real students would be very beneficial to all student teachers