
3A

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Request for Approval to Field Test the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers PK-3

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents a request from California State University, Fresno to field test a version of the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers developed specifically for candidates pursuing the PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction Credential.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends the Commission 1) approve the FAST PK-3 field test as proposed for fall 2025, 2) approve waiver requests from Fresno State to waive the teaching performance assessment requirement for currently-enrolled PK-3 candidates who successfully complete the FAST PK-3, and 3) require field test participants to pass with a minimum of 2 points on each rubric of both the Site Visitation Project and the Teaching Sample Project.

Presenters: Juliet Wahleithner, Director, Division of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment; Lindsay Meeker, Assistant Professor, Early Childhood Education, Heather Horsley, Associate Professor, Early Childhood Education, & Residency Coordinator, and Suzie Brandl, Lecturer & FAST Coordinator, Kremen School of Education and Human Development, California State University, Fresno

Strategic Plan Goal

Educator Preparation and Advancement

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

Request for Approval to Field Test the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers PK-3

Introduction

This agenda item presents a request from California State University, Fresno to field test a revised version of their Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) for use with its PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction (PK-3) candidates. This new assessment builds on the recently-approved FAST 3.0 for Multiple Subject structure, which includes a literacy performance assessment.

The faculty of Fresno State plans to field test the FAST PK-3 during the 2025-26 academic year with its initial cohort of 24 PK-3 candidates, who began the three-semester program in summer 2025. This item recommends that the Commission approve a field test for the FAST PK-3; approve the requested waiver for selected candidates who will take part in the field test; and adopt an expected performance level for successful completion of the FAST PK-3, administered and scored during the 2025-26 field test. Results of the field test will be brought to the Commission in June 2026 for consideration of approval for operational administration.

Background on the TPA Requirement

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

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

The FAST has been approved for use in California since 2008. In 2024, the Site Visitation Project (SVP) component of the FAST Multiple Subject and Education Specialist assessments was revised to meet the requirements of SB 488. New literacy assessment tasks and scoring rubrics were developed to assess both the current TPEs (Domains 1 through 6) and the newly adopted TPE Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for all Students. The Commission approved the revised versions of FAST, FAST 3.0 for Multiple Subject, FAST 2.0 Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs, and FAST 2.0 Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs for operational use at its June 2025 meeting ([Agenda Item 3D](#)).

Development of the FAST PK-3

In response to the creation and approval of the PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction Credential in 2024, Fresno State undertook a revision of FAST 3.0 to create a PK-3-specific version of FAST. Through the revision process, faculty worked to ensure that the revised Site Visitation Project and the Teaching Sample Project are developmentally appropriate for PK-3 candidates working in TK–3rd grade settings, while still ensuring that the assessment system aligns with the Commission’s adopted Performance Assessment Design Standards. Changes to meet this need included revising the rubrics to utilize the PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist TPEs, with a keen focus on TPE 7: Addressing Early Literacy and TPE 8: Addressing Early Mathematics and ensuring alignment with the Preschool/TK Learning Foundations (PTKLF) recently revised by the State of California, as well as the California Dyslexia Guidelines.

Process

In spring 2025, Fresno State faculty with expertise in early childhood education, literacy instruction and assessment, and experience working with the FAST came together to examine the current version of the FAST and plan revisions. (See [Appendix A](#) for a list of faculty involved and their CVs.) Following a summer opportunity to gain feedback from TK stakeholders and mentor teachers from local school districts, the faculty group reconvened to review other preschool-based observational assessments and compare them to the TK teacher feedback and TPE 7 and TPE 8 key components. The faculty then revised the Fresno State PK-3 Early Childhood Education Credential FAST, including the Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project, based on the feedback received.

Structure

As in previous versions of the FAST, the FAST PK-3 consists of both a Site Visitation Project and a Teaching Sample Project. The Site Visitation Project has been revised to address the literacy elements specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code section 44259 in developmentally appropriate ways as designed by the Preschool/TK Learning Foundations.

Site Visitation Project: The FAST PK-3 Site Visitation Project focuses on assessing candidates’ knowledge of developmentally informed literacy instruction in a manner that aligns with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code section 44259. Assessment modifications were made to ensure developmentally appropriate/ informed and culturally and linguistically responsive assessment practices. For the SVP, TK stakeholder/teacher input was gathered on appropriate assessments to utilize for the SVP, which resulted in the incorporation of the [Desired Results Developmental Profile: An Early Childhood Developmental Continuum](#) (DRDP) (2025) as the key assessment in the areas of: Reciprocal Communication (DRDP LLD #4), Interest in Literacy (DRDP LLD #5), Comprehension of Age Appropriate Text (DRDP LLD # 6), Concepts of Print (Checklist based off of DRDP LLD #7, Phonological Awareness (DRDP LLD #8), Letter and Word Knowledge (DRDP LLD #9), and Emergent Writing (DRDP LLD #10). The DRDP was chosen primarily for its expansive alignment to TPE 7 and the PTKLF, but it was also specifically chosen because it is a focus assessment for Fresno County and California, as well as a required assessment for children identified with

disabilities in Early Intervention, PreK, and TK. It was also the most closely aligned commonly available options compared to existing observational assessments in school districts where there will be partnerships with mentor teachers. All PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist credential candidates will receive introductory training, as provided by DRDP and the California Department of Social Services, so that they are prepared to use the DRDP assessment tool appropriately. The DRDP is also available in Spanish, which will be helpful for children served in Dual Language TK settings.

- **Part 1 - Planning:** In the Site Visitation Project, PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Credential candidates will plan a 3-day lesson sequence prior to the observation, formally gather data on students in the class, and use this information, along with their knowledge of the identified learning needs, to explain their instructional choices in the lesson sequence. Candidates will assess their class to determine children’s initial level of foundational literacy proficiency. Based on their observational assessment results, candidates will (a) identify a focal small group with common specific learning needs in literacy and (b) complete additional assessment(s) for a more detailed understanding of their literacy needs. Based on assessment data, candidates will then plan and teach a 3-day lesson sequence focused on literacy that incorporates both foundational skills and meaning making abilities from TPE 7. To effectively align with the TPEs of the PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist credential, the teacher candidates will assess children using the DRDP 2025 that includes observable skills in language and literacy aligned to TPE 7 and the PTKLF. Candidates will also compare their planned lessons to the California Dyslexia Guidelines to ensure their instruction, approaches, and strategies are in alignment.
- **Part 2 - Implementation and Observation of the Lesson:** In addition to teaching the lesson sequence that is observed by an educational expert, the lesson sequence will also be videotaped. After each instructional day, candidates will document children’s progress in developing their foundational skills (including writing) and meaning making abilities and make adjustments to the following lessons.
- **Part 3 - Self-Evaluation of the Lesson Sequence:** Teacher Candidates will use the three videos as a tool for self-evaluation of the lesson sequence and select and submit two 3- to 5-minute unedited video clips to clearly demonstrate examples of targeted and developmentally appropriate reading foundation skill instruction in one or more of the following areas: phonemic awareness, phonics, decoding/encoding, and/or fluency; and candidates ability to provide targeted meaning making instruction in one or more of the following areas: identity reading, oral language/discussion, and/or writing.

Teaching Sample Project: The Teaching Sample Project (TSP) task assesses a candidate’s ability to: (a) identify the context of their classroom, (b) plan and teach a series of at least 5 cohesive lessons (a unit of study) with a focus on mathematics and literacy, (c) to assess a class of students’ learning before, during, and after the unit, (d) document their teaching and their students’ learning, and (e) reflect on the effectiveness of their teaching. The revised version requires candidates to design lessons that focus on teaching mathematics using current subject specific pedagogies. The PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist

credential rubrics are aligned to the PK-3 TPES, including TPE 8, and teacher candidates will be expected to utilize the Preschool/TK Learning Foundations. Within the rubrics, the descriptor “developmentally appropriate” has been included to ensure alignment with PK-3 expectations.

- **Students in Context:** *The teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context, including student individual differences, to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment.* The prompt requires candidates to describe the specific learning needs of their English language learners, children with identified special needs, and children from another group needing specialized instruction and how these children’s needs will influence their instructional planning and assessment. The expectations and management strategies identified by the candidates in their classroom management plan have a specific focus related to the new TPEs.
- **Learning Outcomes:** *The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied, and developmentally appropriate learning goals.* Candidates must plan and implement an integrated unit that addresses CA ELA/Literacy standards and the mathematics framework as defined in the PTKLF guidance.
- **Assessment Plan:** *The teacher uses culturally and linguistically responsive assessments aligned with learning goals and children’s developmental stages to assess children’s learning before, during, and after instruction. As noted above, they will use the DRDP (2025), a Concepts of Print checklist, and other informal assessments throughout their lessons that will help them adjust to the needs of the children in their focal group.*
- **Design for Instruction:** *The teacher designs developmentally appropriate instruction for specific learning goals, children’s characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.* The revised prompt focuses on incorporating universal lesson design elements and technology, as well as developmentally appropriate practices. The candidate must respond to questions about how they designed their lessons to provide access to the content and to support the acquisition of English language, the development of developmentally appropriate literacy skills, and the use of technology.
- **Instructional Decision-Making:** *The teacher uses regular and systematic evaluations of children’s learning to make instructional decisions, and they will collect evidence as part of the assessment processes to support their decisions, linking samples of evidence within their planning tables allowing them to analyze and adjust based on student work samples, which is a common assessment and planning process in early childhood settings.*
- **Analysis of Student Learning:** *The teacher uses assessment data to profile children’s learning and communicate information about children’s progress and achievement.*
- **Reflection and Self-Evaluation:** *The teacher reflects on children’s learning and the effectiveness of their instruction in order to improve teaching practice.*

Assessment

As in the approved versions of FAST, each task continues to have detailed instructions, along with task-specific, four-point scoring rubrics that are used to evaluate the project. The rubric levels are unchanged in the FAST PK-3:

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

The rubrics have been modified as necessary to align with the TPE elements being assessed, including TPE 7 and TPE 8. (See [Appendix D](#) for the revised Site Visitation Project rubrics and [Appendix E](#) for the revised Teaching Sample Project.)

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

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

Alignment with Key Elements of the Performance Assessment Design Standards ([Appendix B](#) provides a response to all relevant PADS elements)

When developing a TPA, all model sponsors must respond to and demonstrate the proposed TPA's alignment with the Commission's adopted Performance Assessment Design Standards (PADS). The section below provides a general discussion of how the FAST PK-3 aligns with each standard. [Appendix B](#) provides specific details about how the FAST PK-3 aligns with each element of each PADS standard and [Appendix C](#) demonstrates which TPEs are addressed by the FAST PK-3.

Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness

- The sponsor* of a teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in California (model sponsor) designs a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs).
 - The FAST PK-3 consists of two tasks, designed to measure candidates' competence on the PK-3 TPEs and their understanding and ability to apply developmentally appropriate practice as defined by NAEYC and the PTKLF. Developmentally appropriate practices have been added to instructional design and reflection components of the SVP rubrics ([Appendix D](#)) to ensure a keen focus on this component, noting that the tasks required must align with developmentally appropriate pedagogy as defined in the 1(b) 4 (See [Appendix C](#),

which includes a table indicating which PK-3 TPEs are addressed by the revised Site Visitation Project and the revised Teaching Sample Project.)

The first task, the Site Visitation Project (SVP), has been revised to assess candidates' abilities to develop their students' literacy and language skills as well as their ability to plan small group instruction in developmentally appropriate and targeted ways to respond in meaningful ways to child assessment data, demonstrating their knowledge of areas outlined in TPE 7. The SVP is assessed using three task-specific rubrics aligned with the designated TPEs ([Appendix D](#)). The FAST PK-3 SVP specifically changed the key assessment from Words Their Way used for Multiple Subject to DRDP (2025) to be intentional about the developmental appropriateness of the assessment used and to encourage anecdotal note-taking as a key assessment practice aligned with evidence-based assessment practices in early childhood.

The second task, the Teaching Sample Project (TSP), assesses candidates' ability to develop a five-lesson integrated unit that focuses on math and literacy, implement the unit, and reflect on their instruction. The TSP is assessed using seven task-specific rubrics, aligned with the designated TPEs. (See [Appendix F](#) for the FAST PK-3 complete manual, which includes specific details about each task as well as the rubrics used to assess each task.)

- The model sponsor clearly embeds developmentally appropriate pedagogy within the design and scoring rubrics of the Site Visitation Project (SVP) and Teaching Sample Project (TSP) to assess candidates' ability to teach literacy in alignment with Education Code 44259(b)(4)(A) and (B), the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), and the adopted ELA/ELD Framework.
 - The SVP and TSP are grounded in developmentally appropriate pedagogy for early childhood education. In the SVP, candidates use DRDP measures to observe foundational literacy skills, group children based on developmental needs, and design three targeted lessons that address oracy, phonemic awareness, writing, and comprehension. In the TSP, although the primary focus is on mathematics instruction, candidates must also demonstrate their ability to foster oral language, listening comprehension, and vocabulary development through developmentally responsive strategies. Across both tasks, candidates select culturally and linguistically responsive materials and justify their use based on child-level contextual data (e.g., ethnicity, language, disability status), aligning with EC §44259(b)(4)(A) and reinforcing equitable literacy engagement.
 - Both tasks emphasize active, motivating, and age-appropriate instruction, requiring candidates to plan and analyze multisensory, responsive lessons using California's Preschool and TK Learning Foundations, the ELA/ELD Framework, and the California Dyslexia Guidelines. These expectations align with the

developmentally appropriate foundational and meaning-making skills described in EC §44259(b)(4)(B), even within the math focus of the TSP.

- The scoring rubrics for both SVP and TSP (Appendices D and E) explicitly assess the candidate's use of structured, systematic, and explicit instruction, their integration of UDL and culturally sustaining pedagogy, and their ability to make data-informed instructional decisions. This approach supports alignment with the Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) and the Commission's program quality and effectiveness standards.
- The model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated (i.e., to serve as a determination of a candidate's status with respect to the TPEs and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness), anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment's validation process.
 - The sole purpose of this assessment is to determine candidates' status with respect to the assessed TPEs. Internal validity studies have demonstrated that the tasks required on previous versions of the FAST do align with expectations of beginning teachers. Data from the FAST are used to evaluate program quality and effectiveness. The FAST PK-3 aligns in all areas possible with the PK-3 specific TPEs. Additionally, in an effort to ensure the validity of the assessment, tasks have been created to ensure alignment to the PTKLF and with assessments specific to TK used across the state and within local partnering districts in PK-3 settings.
- The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program.
 - The assessment was designed to focus on candidates' abilities to meet the Teaching Performance Expectations. Task-specific rubrics and assessor training procedures focus on teaching performance and minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence. As is evident in a review of all tasks, directions, and rubrics, the focus is on evaluation of TPE-related performance only. An additional safeguard includes anti-bias training to reduce the effect of non-pedagogical performance related factors as an integral part of scoring training.
- A passing standard is recommended by the model sponsor based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning teachers to meet prior to licensure.
 - For the purposes of the field test, the passing standard has been set at a minimum rubric score of two for all associated rubrics (three for SVP, seven for TSP). After the initial cohort of candidates has completed the revised FAST PK-3 SVP & TSP, covering both content-specific instruction (e.g. early mathematics) and integrated literacy practices, a group of content experts that includes

literacy faculty, early childhood educators (PreK-3rd grade), and district partners, will evaluate a subset of the submitted projects using the rubrics. The goal will be to come to a consensus on the projects' scores for each task. These projects will then be used to calibrate the assessors for the remaining projects.

Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness

- The sponsor of the performance assessment requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical performance to serve as a valid basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary Teaching Credential.
 - The FAST PK-3 includes both the Site Visitation Project (SVP) and the Teaching Sample Project (TSP), which together provide comprehensive evidence of candidates' pedagogical performance across the full range of the TPE domains. As detailed in [Appendix C](#), both assessments are aligned with the revised TPEs and designed to elicit developmentally appropriate instructional practices consistent with the expectations for PK–3 educators.
 - The SVP assesses candidates' ability to deliver structured, explicit literacy instruction tailored to young children's developmental levels. It focuses on planning, instruction, assessment, and reflection based on observational data (DRDP 2025), and targets foundational reading and meaning-making aligned with EC 44259(b)(4)(A) and (B), the California Dyslexia Guidelines, and the ELA/ELD Framework.
 - The TSP includes a strong early literacy and mathematics component. Candidates plan, implement, assess, and reflect on a two-week integrated unit that must incorporate literacy strategies appropriate for early learners. They must use formative and summative assessments to adjust instruction and address diverse learning needs, including emergent bilinguals and students with exceptionalities. The design of the TSP explicitly aligns with developmentally appropriate pedagogy and supports analysis of instructional impact using evidence from student learning artifacts.
- The model sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with this stated purpose of the assessment.
 - In revising FAST PK-3, the faculty development team maintained a focus on ensuring the tasks created specifically evaluate the TPEs, particularly TPE 7 and TPE 8, and ask candidates to engage in pedagogical activities typical of a PK-3 teacher that demonstrates developmentally appropriate/informed practices.
- The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate and maintain assessor calibration over time.

- Fresno State has a comprehensive training system for university coaches and faculty to ensure inter-rater reliability. Each calendar year, university coaches and faculty are re-calibrated to maintain reliability. In preparation for scoring the revised SVP, all faculty and university supervisors will be provided professional development in the elements of TPE 7 prior to participating in a calibration session. All individuals who score will be required to be calibrated on the revised assessment.
- The model sponsor periodically evaluates the assessment system to ensure equitable treatment of candidates.
 - Each semester, scores from the SVP and TSP administration are analyzed by faculty to ensure all candidates score equitably and that no sub-groups of candidates have lower pass rates than others. With the revised FAST PK-3, scores will also be looked at by cohort to ensure no one cohort has lower pass rates than another, to ensure all candidates have access to instruction that aligns with TPE 7 and TPE 8.
- The assessment system and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.
 - FAST PK-3 data will be reported to the CTCC on an annual basis, as is already program practice.

Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities

- The sponsor of the performance assessment provides technical support to teacher preparation programs using that model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed.
 - (Not applicable)
- The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a national scorer approach and/or the local scoring option.
 - Fresno State will continue to recruit scorers from its faculty and university coaches and will ensure all scorers are calibrated on an annual basis. Scorers for the SVP will be provided with literacy-specific professional development led by literacy program faculty to ensure they have the necessary content knowledge to accurately assess candidate's literacy teaching practices. Annual recalibration ensures continued inter-rater reliability across both the SVP and TSP.
- The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the Commission, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the Commission, and to maintain the currency of the model overtime.
 - Fresno State will continue to provide any/all candidate and program outcomes data to the Commission as requested.

Alignment with SB 488 Legislation

When revising the FAST PK-3 to align with revised PADS, faculty worked to ensure the assessment measured the specific areas of TPE 7 that aligned with California Education Code section 44259 (b) subparagraphs 4(A) and 4(B), the Dyslexia Guidelines, and the ELA/ELD Framework.

Education Code section 44259 (b)(4)(A) and (B):

(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following:

- (i) The study of organized, systematic, explicit skills including concepts of print, phonemic awareness, direct, systematic, explicit phonics, and decoding skills.
- (ii) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.
- (iii) Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.
- (iv) Early intervention techniques.
- (v) Guided practice in a clinical setting.

(B) For purposes of this section, “direct, systematic, explicit phonics” means phonemic awareness, spelling patterns, the direct instruction of sound/symbol codes and practice in connected text, and the relationship of direct, systematic, explicit phonics to the components set forth in clauses (i) to (v), inclusive, of subparagraph (A).

- The FAST PK-3 SVP asks each candidate to, first, assess 10-12 students minimum, using an observational based and developmentally appropriate assessment (DRDP 2025) to determine students’ areas of strength and areas for growth. Based on the assessment results, the candidate will then group students based on their skill level. Next, the candidate will select a focal group for which to plan targeted instruction. The focal group must include at least one student who is an emergent bilingual (English learner).
- The candidate will plan three targeted and developmentally appropriate lessons for this small group, ensuring the content meets children’s unique needs in ways that align with the [ELA/ELD Framework](#), noting specific ELA and ELD standards met in the lesson. Teacher candidates will ensure their lessons are aligned with the PTKLF and the California Dyslexia Guidelines, as appropriate for the children they are teaching.
- The three lessons must:
 - demonstrate the candidate's ability to teach developmentally appropriate foundational reading skills in print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition.
 - demonstrate the candidate's ability to teach meaning making in text, oral discussion, and writing.
- The candidate will record each of the lessons and then select two 3-5-minute video clips that, respectively:

- demonstrate the candidate’s ability to provide targeted reading foundational skills instruction in one or more of the following areas: phonemic awareness, phonics, decoding/encoding, fluency.
 - demonstrate the candidate’s ability to provide targeted meaning making instruction in one or more of the following areas: identity reading, oral language/discussion, writing.
- The candidate will then provide a reflection on the implementation and overall effectiveness of the lessons based on the video clips.

Dyslexia Guidelines

- Based on the results of their initial assessment of their students, candidates are asked to apply their knowledge of the Dyslexia Guidelines, when appropriate and warranted, to support their students’ literacy development.

ELA/ELD Framework

- One of the students in the candidate’s focal group must be an emergent bilingual. Candidates are expected to apply their knowledge of the ELA/ELD Framework to design instructional activities aligned with the ELD standards to support the student’s literacy development.

Part 2: Commission Authority to Issue a Waiver

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

The commission shall do all of the following:

(m) Review requests from school districts, county offices of **education**, private schools, and postsecondary institutions for the waiver of one or more of the provisions of this chapter or other provisions governing the preparation or licensing of educators. The commission may grant a waiver upon its finding that professional preparation equivalent to that prescribed under the provision or provisions to be waived will be, or has been, completed by the credential candidate or candidates affected. (emphasis added)

The underlined section of statute sets criteria for the issuance of a waiver that requires equivalence or comparability of requirement to be established. The process of the development of the FAST PK-3 involves multiple steps, including faculty meetings to revise FAST 3.0 tasks and rubrics to measure the designated PK-3 TPEs, including TPE Domain 7 and TPE Domain 8; a field test of the revised assessment; a standard setting study; and finally, review and approval by the Commission for use in California. The FAST PK-3 has not completed the Commission’s review process yet, as it is still under development. The FAST PK-3 is expected to be presented to the Commission for review and final approval at its June 2026 Commission meeting, following a field test during the 2025-26 academic year.

A panel of psychometricians reviewed the original version of the FAST in 2008 and found that it met the Commission’s adopted [Performance Assessment Design Standards](#) (PADS). In addition, the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) completed a [comparability study](#) in 2019 and found that the FAST was sufficiently comparable to the other TPA models approved by the Commission (CalTPA and edTPA) in its representation of the PADS and its assessment and weighting of the Commission-adopted Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). In 2024, Commission staff, with the support of literacy experts, conducted a review of how well the proposed FAST 3.0 met the 2023 updates to the PADS and the requirements of SB 488. The review indicated that the FAST 3.0 did satisfy the standards as adopted by the Commission. On that basis, the FAST 3.0 was considered appropriate to measure the literacy elements required by SB 488. The FAST PK-3 builds on the FAST 3.0 for Multiple Subject structure.

Under these conditions, the Commission has the authority to provide waivers to candidates that meet the expected performance level on the FAST PK-3. The Commission has previously allowed a waiver for the TPA under similar circumstances for the initial pilot of the edTPA during 2012-13, the [redeveloped CalTPA in 2017](#), and the [pilot test](#) of the Commission’s Literacy Performance Assessment, and the [field test of the FAST 3.0](#) in August 2024.

As discussed above, detailed information about the current structure of the FAST PK-3, including specific information about the TPEs assessed and how the assessment addresses key provisions of the Commission’s adopted PADS, are presented in [Appendix B](#) (PADS alignment Table) and [Appendix C](#) (TPE Table) to illustrate how the completion of the FAST PK-3 is appropriate for meeting the PK-3 credential TPA requirement, including the literacy performance assessment component. [Appendix F](#) includes a list of all candidates currently enrolled in Fresno State’s PK-3 Early Childhood Instruction Specialist credential program who are seeking a waiver to use the FAST PK-3 to meet the TPA credential requirement.

Part 3: Proposed Performance Level to Pass the FAST 3.0

Developers of TPA models typically conduct a standard setting study in order to establish the requirements for successful completion of the assessment. Fresno State will conduct a standard setting study following each of the task field tests: SVP in fall 2025 and TSP in spring 2026. The purpose of the current field test is to engage participants to collect additional validity evidence about the design of the performance assessment components, specifically the tasks and rubrics, and use these data to refine the FAST PK-3.

Fresno State faculty have recommended that the passing standard for the field test of the FAST PK-3 be the same as the currently approved passing standards for each of the other versions of FAST: a minimum score of 2 on all rubrics of both the Site Visitation Project and the Teaching Sample Project. Commission staff recommend that the Commission approve this passing standard. Candidates who do not meet the Commission’s expected minimum performance level will be supported in retaking rubrics on which they score a 1.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission:

1. Approve the FAST PK-3 field test as proposed for fall 2025.

2. Approve waiver requests from Fresno State to waive the teaching performance assessment requirement for currently-enrolled PK-3 candidates who successfully complete the FAST PK-3.
3. Require field test participants to pass with a minimum of 2 points on each rubric of both the Site Visitation Project and the Teaching Sample Project.

Next Steps

If the Commission approves the FAST PK-3 for field test and the waiver requests from Fresno State and adopts the proposed passing standard, staff will work with Fresno State to conduct the initial field test and to provide any necessary support. Fresno State will be accepted to report results of the field tests and any planned revisions of the FAST PK-3 to the Commission in June 2026.

Appendix A

Faculty Involved in Revision of Site Visitation Project

- Dr. Lindsay Meeker, Assistant Professor, Early Childhood Literacy Education, Fresno State ([CV](#))
- Suzie Brandl, Lecturer & FAST Coordinator, Fresno State ([CV](#))
- Dr. Pei-Ying Wu, Associate Professor, Early Childhood Education, Fresno State ([CV](#))
- Dr. Heather Horsley, Associate Professor, Early Childhood Education, Fresno State ([CV](#))
- Marcia Haas, Coach & PK-3 Candidate Advocate, Fresno State ([CV](#))

Appendix B

FAST PK-3 Alignment with Performance Assessment Design Standards (adopted June 2023)

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness	
<p>The sponsor* of a teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in California (model sponsor) designs a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess California’s Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated (i.e., to serve as a determination of a candidate’s status with respect to the TPEs and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness), anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment’s validation process. The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program. A passing standard is recommended by the model sponsor based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning teachers to meet prior to licensure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple, task-specific, 4-level rubrics supporting the assessment of the PK-3 TPEs including TPE Domain 7 (see Appendix D). • Candidates must score a minimum of a 2 on each task-specific rubric in order to pass the FAST PK-3 SVP and TSP. • Field Test and Pilot Timeline <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fall 2025: Field test FAST PK-3 SVP with initial cohort of PK-3 candidates ○ Spring 2026: Field test FAST PK-3 TSP with initial cohort of PK-3 candidates ○ Summer 2026: Review data from field tests of SVP and TSP and make any necessary revisions ○ Fall 2026: Pilot FAST PK-3 SVP with second cohort of PK-3 candidates ○ Spring 2027: Pilot FAST PK-3 TSP with second cohort of PK-3 candidates • A standard setting will be held with literacy faculty, university supervisors, and practicing teachers using a subset of submitted assessments to establish scoring guidelines.
<p>1(a) The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring rubrics that are clearly related to the TPEs that the task</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A literacy-focused lesson sequence based on the pedagogical sequence of assess, plan, teach, reflect, and apply that directly addresses the TPEs including TPE Domain 7. • FAST PK-3 includes: TPEs 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7,2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 , 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 , 4.4, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 6.1,6.2, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, (see Appendix C).

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
<p>measures. Each task and its associated rubrics measure two or more TPEs. Collectively, the tasks and rubrics in the assessment address key aspects of all major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the performance assessment documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks, and rubrics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each section of the FAST PK-3 SVP and TSP rubrics indicate the TPEs addressed.
<p>1(b) 1. (<i>Multiple Subject</i>)</p>	<p>(not applicable)</p>
<p>1 (b) 2. (<i>Single Subject</i>)</p>	<p>(not applicable)</p>
<p>1 (b) 3. (<i>Education Specialist</i>)</p>	<p>(not applicable)</p>
<p>1 (b) 4. The PK-3 TPA model sponsor must include a focus on developmentally appropriate pedagogy within the design of the TPA tasks and scoring scales to assess the candidate’s ability to effectively teach literacy in a manner aligned to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code section 44259; the Commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs); and the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the State Board, as well as the content areas authorized by the credential.</p>	<p>FAST PK-3 SVP tasks and rubrics assess candidate’s ability to effectively plan and teach literacy; TSP focuses on Mathematics that directly address the PK-3 TPEs, including TPE Domain 8 (FAST PK-3 Manual).</p> <p>Within the SVP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focus on Developmentally Appropriate Pedagogy: SVP explicitly centers on planning, implementing, and reflecting on early literacy instruction in PK–3 classrooms, using developmentally-appropriate strategies such as small-group, phonics-based instruction informed by DRDP data. Assessment of Foundational Literacy Skills: Candidates design and deliver three sequenced lessons that target early foundational literacy areas (phonemic awareness, decoding, CAP, fluency, etc.), directly aligning with EC 44259(b)(4)(A) which outlines these as core components. Integration with the ELA/ELD Framework: The SVP requires candidates to align lesson plans with CA Common Core ELA Standards, CA ELD Standards, and Preschool Transitional Kindergarten

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
	<p>Learning Foundations, ensuring instructional coherence with state-adopted frameworks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of TPE-Aligned Teaching Competencies: Scoring rubrics assess competencies aligned with TPE 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7, especially TPE 7.3–7.6, which cover inclusive, responsive, and culturally affirming literacy instruction. • Emphasis on Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: Candidates must justify their identity text selection based on the cultural/linguistic profiles of children and reflect on how these texts support engagement and meaning-making. <p>Within the TSP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Unit Integrating Literacy and Mathematics: Candidates plan and teach a 5-lesson unit with integrated literacy and mathematics instruction, addressing CA CCSS-ELA, ELA/ELD Framework, and PTK Learning Foundations. • Evidence-Based Literacy Instruction: The TSP requires documentation of pre-, formative, and summative assessments for literacy learning outcomes, and lesson plans that reflect direct, explicit instruction aligned with developmentally appropriate practice. • Assessment of Key Literacy TPEs: Rubrics measure candidate performance on TPE 7.1, 7.3, 7.7, 7.9, 7.10, 7.11, ensuring candidates demonstrate the ability to teach literacy using age-appropriate and culturally responsive strategies. • Contextualized and Differentiated Instruction: Candidates must analyze classroom demographic data (ELs, children with disabilities, etc.) and tailor instruction using UDL, assistive tech, and scaffolded

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
	<p>supports—addressing EC 44259(b)(4)(B) on adapting instruction for diverse learning needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection and Continuous Improvement: Final components require reflection on teaching effectiveness, literacy skill development, and planning next steps, reinforcing the continuous improvement cycle outlined in the Commission’s expectations for effective literacy teaching.
<p>1(c) Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the model sponsor defines scoring rubrics so candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different literacy and content-specific pedagogical practices that support implementation of the state-adopted content standards, curriculum frameworks, and Preschool Learning Foundations. The model sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use a wide range of pedagogical practices that are educationally effective and builds scoring protocols to take these variations into account.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAST PK-3 SVP structure allows for a variety of response options based on candidate’s assessment of students. • Candidates will choose specific video clips that highlight key moments of instruction and reflect on their teaching practices to identify areas for improvement. • Evaluators of the FAST PK-3 SVP task will be literacy-trained university supervisors and literacy faculty. • Task assessor training (literacy as per SB 488), calibration, and scoring designed to address a variety of response options including training on implicit bias.
<p>1(d) 1. For Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and PK-3 candidates, the model sponsor must include within the design of the TPA candidate tasks a focus on addressing the teaching of English learners, all underserved education groups or groups that need to be served differently, and students with disabilities in the general education classroom to adequately assess the candidate’s ability to effectively teach all students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both FAST tasks require classroom context and student characteristics; including numbers of English learners and students with IEPs, 504 Plans; description of English language proficiency levels; description of social-emotional and academic learning strengths and needs; and description of funds of knowledge, ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, language, religion, as well as students whose first language is English, English learners, and reclassified English learners.

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
<p>1(e) 1. For Multiple Subject, PK-3, and Education Specialist candidates, the model sponsor must include assessments of the candidate’s ability to demonstrate pedagogical competence related to teaching current, state-adopted core content areas of at least Literacy and Mathematics. Programs use local program performance assessments for History/Social Science and Science if not already included as part of the TPA.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The FAST PK-3 TSP has been revised to align with PK-3 TPE 7 & 8 and requires candidates to construct a five-lesson integrated unit that addresses mathematics and literacy in developmentally appropriate ways.
<p>1(f) The model sponsor must include a teaching performance within the TPA during the required clinical experience, including a video of the candidate’s teaching performance with candidate commentary describing the lesson plan and rationale for teaching decisions shown and evidence of the effect of that teaching on student learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAST PK-3 SVP requires candidates’ include 3 videos of their literacy lesson sequence. • FAST PK-3 SVP requires candidates’ include 2 video clips that demonstrate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Targeted foundational literacy skill instruction ○ Targeted meaning making instruction
<p>1(g) The TPA model sponsor must provide materials appropriate for use by programs in helping faculty become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks, and the scoring rubrics so that faculty can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment. The TPA model sponsor must also provide candidate materials to assist candidates in understanding the nature of the assessment, the specific assessment tasks, the scoring rubrics, submission processes and scoring processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face-to-face and online zoom orientations and training sessions will be provided for program coordinators, credential faculty, and university coaches to ensure familiarity with tasks and processes. • Face-to-face and online zoom orientations, along with multiple mid-semester training sessions, will be provided for candidates. • FAST PK-3 manual, templates, and rubrics provided to for university coaches, program faculty, and candidates.
<p>1(h) The model sponsor develops scoring rubrics and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include any actual or perceived characteristic protected by AB 537, which</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bias prevention addressed in training, calibration, and ongoing scoring during pilot, field test, and operation administration. • Candidate personal information is protected. • Performance scoring data monitored on an ongoing basis for issues of potential bias.

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
<p>includes sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, ethnic group identification, race, ancestry, national origin, religion, color, or mental or physical disability or any other bias that is not likely to affect job effectiveness and/or student learning, such as appearance, hairstyles and/or hair texture, demeanor, speech patterns and accents, or personal attire.</p>	
<p>1(i) 1. The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor’s clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for Multiple Subject, PK-3, and Education Specialist candidates, preparation programs, public schools, and public school students within the authorization of the credential. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the literacy and content-specific pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A statement of intended use is included within the FAST PK-3 manual. • Each task also includes specific language that details the purpose of the assessment.
<p>1(i) 2. The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor’s clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for single subject candidates, preparation programs, public schools, and public school students within the authorization of the credential. The statement includes appropriate cautions</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (not applicable)

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
<p>about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the content-specific pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.</p>	
<p>1(j) The model sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that literacy and content-specific pedagogical assessment tasks and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically responsive, sustaining, fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to pilot study, field test data will be reviewed for cultural sensitivity and for the use of academic language that might interfere with fairness for candidates with diverse backgrounds. • All PK-3 candidates will be expected to participate in similar trainings for DRDP 2025 offered online and in-person to ensure equitable and accessible training related to the successful completion of the SVP.
<p>1(k) The model sponsor completes initial and periodic basic psychometric analyses to identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring rubrics that results in differential effects in relation to candidates' race, ethnicity, language, gender or disability. When group pass rate differences are found, the model sponsor investigates the potential sources of differential performance and seeks to eliminate construct-irrelevant sources of variance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychometric analyses are planned following each phase of the field test (SVP Fall 2025; TSP Spring 2026) and each phase of the pilot (SVP Fall 2026; TSP Spring 2027).
<p>1(l) In designing assessment administration procedures, the model sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities or learning needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (PL 101-336), appropriate accommodations are provided to any requesting candidate on a case-by-case basis to address the individual need(s)

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
	<p>while maintaining the validity of the assessment results.</p>
<p>1(m) In the course of determining a passing standard, the model sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, supervisors of teachers, support providers of new teachers, and other preparers of teachers regarding necessary and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level teachers. The model sponsor periodically reviews the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard, when and as directed by the Commission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A standard setting will be held with literacy faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers who have expertise in literacy using a subset of submitted projects. • The standard setting group will also be responsible for selecting exemplars to be used in calibration sessions with all assessors.
<p>1(n) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the model sponsor may need to develop and field test new literacy and content-specific pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring rubrics to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the model sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring rubrics to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs and serve as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and student population of California’s public schools. The model sponsor documents the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and rubrics as needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate results, along with survey data and focus group discussions with both candidates and assessors, will be used to help inform revisions to the field version of the SVP. • Revisions will be piloted in Fall 2026.
<p>1(o) The model sponsor must make all TPA materials available to the Commission upon request for review and approval, including materials that are proprietary to the model sponsor. The Commission will maintain the confidentiality of all materials designated as proprietary by the model sponsor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fresno State will continue to ensure all FAST materials are available to the Commission for review and approval.

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
<p>1(p) For concurrent bilingual candidates, no candidate can be required to translate student work or provide English transcriptions for the video component(s) of the TPA if in a language other than English. Model sponsors must ensure candidates may demonstrate their knowledge and skills teaching literacy in the language of instruction, including in a language other than English.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For candidates completing their clinical practice in a bilingual setting, bilingual assessors will be utilized to score their submissions.
<p>1(q) All candidates must demonstrate as part of the TPA effective strategies teaching an English learner, in English with the use of the language of instruction as appropriate, within the content area of the intended credential. Each candidate must submit his or her analyses and reflections primarily in English.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates must include an emergent bilingual within their selected focal group of students and must demonstrate how they plan instruction to support the student’s literacy development in ways that align with the ELA/ELD Roadmap.
<p>Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness</p>	
<p>The sponsor of the performance assessment requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate’s pedagogical performance to serve as a valid basis to judge the candidate’s general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The model sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with this stated purpose of the assessment. The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate and maintain assessor calibration over time. The model sponsor periodically evaluates the assessment system to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment system and its implementation contribute to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The revised FAST PK-3 SVP and TSP evaluate candidates’ mastery of key elements of all TPEs, including TPE Domains 7 & 8 (see Appendix C). The complex tasks allow for diverse modes of expression and enable candidates to provide evidence of their ability to use subject specific pedagogy to teach all students.

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.	
2(a) In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks, rubrics, and the associated directions to candidates are designed to meet qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential as one part of the requirements for the credential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple forms of evidence are required across each step of each FAST task. • SVP and TSP assess elements of each TPE and are measured multiple times, with different dimensions. • Revised FAST PK-3 SVP: assessment of children’s literacy level, development of 3-day literacy sequence, video recorded instruction, observation of 1 literacy lesson, ongoing reflection of literacy development, self-reflection of candidate’s teaching and students’ growth in literacy skill.
2(b) Pedagogical assessment tasks and scoring rubrics are extensively field tested in practice before being used operationally in the Teaching Performance Assessment. The model sponsor evaluates the field test results thoroughly and documents the field test design, participation, methods, results and interpretation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field test of FAST PK-3 SVP scheduled for Fall 2025 with the first PK-3 cohort; data will be analyzed after administration of field test to determine what, if any, revisions need to be made; FAST PK-3 TSP will then be piloted with second PK-3 cohort in Fall 2026. • Field test of FAST PK-3 TSP scheduled for Spring 2026 with the first PK-3 cohort; data will be analyzed after administration of field test to determine what, if any, revisions need to be made; FAST PK-3 TSP will then be piloted with second PK-3 cohort in Spring 2027. • Data from both field tests and pilot studies will be evaluated to ensure validity and reliability of the assessment.
2(c) The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive process to select and train California educators as assessors who score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online and in-person professional development and training for literacy instruction per SB 488 for university coaches by literacy faculty during pilot and field test. • In-person training for university coaches supervising and scoring the FAST PK-3 SVP and TSP, calibration sessions for confirming

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
<p>implicit bias as it relates to scoring, the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the multi-level scoring rubrics. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor’s scoring accuracy and calibration in relation to the scoring rubrics associated with the task. The model sponsor for multiple subject, PK-3, and education specialist TPAs establish selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to appropriate literacy and pedagogical expertise in the content areas and TPE domains assessed within the TPA. The model sponsor for the single subject TPA establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to appropriate pedagogical expertise in the content areas and TPE domains assessed within the TPA. The model sponsor selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who successfully calibrate during the required TPA model assessor training sequence. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring rubrics are incorporated into the assessment, the model sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.</p>	<p>knowledge and understanding of the TPEs, including TPE Domain 7 and 8, utilizing rubrics for scoring.</p>
<p>2(d) In conjunction with the provisions of the applicable Teacher Preparation Program Standards relating to the Teaching Performance Assessment, the model sponsor plans and implements periodic evaluations of the assessor training program, which include systematic feedback from assessors and assessment trainers, and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing, timely monitoring of assigned scores, with prompt feedback to assessors based on scoring performance statistics based on 15% double scoring of tasks. • Full complement of online reliability and validity at the assessment and individual assessor level.

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
<p>which lead to substantive improvements in the training as needed.</p>	
<p>2(e) The model sponsor provides a consistent scoring process for all programs using that model, including programs using a local scoring option provided by the model sponsor. The scoring process conducted by the model sponsor to assure the reliability and validity of candidate outcomes on the assessment may include, for example, regular auditing, selective back reading, and double scoring of candidate responses near the cut score by the qualified, calibrated scorers trained by the model sponsor. All approved models must include a local scoring option in which the assessors of candidate responses are California program faculty and/or other individuals identified by the program who meet the model sponsor’s assessor selection criteria. These local California assessors are trained and calibrated by the model sponsor, and whose scoring work is facilitated, and their scoring results are facilitated and reviewed by the model sponsor. The model sponsor provides a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining scorer accuracy and inter-rater reliability during field testing and operational administration of the assessment. The model sponsor demonstrates that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate determination of each candidate’s overall pass-fail status on the assessment. The model sponsor must provide an annual audit process that documents that local scoring outcomes are consistent and reliable within the model for candidates across the range of programs using local scoring and informs the Commission where</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAST is designed for use by Fresno State only. • Scorer and trainer assessment before scoring and embedded calibration scoring • Monitoring of inter-rater reliability and scoring processes during pilot, field test, and future assessment administration. • Double scoring will be conducted on 15% of candidate’s responses to tasks.

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
<p>inconsistencies in local scoring outcomes are identified. If inconsistencies are identified, the sponsor must provide a plan to the CTC for how it will address and resolve the scoring inconsistencies both for the current scoring results and for future scoring of the TPA.</p>	
<p>2(f) The model sponsor’s assessment design includes a clear and easy to implement appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program, if the program is using centralized scoring provided by the model sponsor. If the program is implementing a local scoring option, the program must provide an appeal process as described above for candidates who do not pass the assessment. Model sponsors must document that all candidate appeals granted a second scoring are scored by a new assessor unfamiliar with the candidate or the candidate’s response.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates who fail to earn a passing score of at least 2 on any section in their initial attempt will be given an opportunity to revise and resubmit the non-passing sections for re-scoring. • For the SVP: If a non-passing score is earned in the Planning or Implementation tasks, candidate will have an opportunity to develop a new literacy sequence of activities for implementation and reflection. • FAST PK-3 also provides the opportunity for candidates to appeal a non-passing score if their resubmission does not earn a passing score.
<p>2(g) The model sponsor conducting scoring for the program provides results on the TPA to the individual candidate based on performance relative to TPE domains and/or to the specific scoring rubrics within a maximum of three weeks following candidate submission of completed TPA responses. The model sponsor provides results to programs based on both individual and aggregated data relating to candidate performance relative to the rubrics and/or domains of the TPEs. The model sponsor also follows the timelines established with programs using a local scoring option for providing scoring results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAST PK-3 tasks are submitted electronically, scores will be made available to candidates electronically within three weeks of submission. • Programs will be provided with results relative to the rubric regarding candidate performance.

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
<p>2(h) The model sponsor provides program level aggregate results to the Commission, in a manner, format and time frame specified by the Commission, as one means of assessing program quality. It is expected that these results will be used within the Commission’s ongoing accreditation system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> California State University, Fresno will continue to provide aggregate results to the Commission as specified by the Commission and understands these results will be used as part of the ongoing accreditation system.
<p>Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities</p>	
<p>The sponsor of the performance assessment provides technical support to teacher preparation programs using that model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a national scorer approach and/or the local scoring option. The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the Commission, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the Commission, and to maintain the currency of the model overtime.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The FAST PK-3 SVP is designed to be implemented only with PK-3 teacher candidates at Fresno State. Technical support to the PK-3 program is coordinated by the FAST coordinator, as well as by Tk20 support, which is the data management system.
<p>3(a) The model sponsor provides technical assistance to programs implementing the model to support fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. Clear implementation procedures and materials such as a candidate and a program handbook are provided by the model sponsor to programs using the model.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAST coordinator monitors technical assistance provided to the programs to ensure the model is implemented as designed. The FAST PK-3 manual, rubrics, and directions will be available for all candidates, coaches, and faculty.
<p>3(b) A model sponsor conducting scoring for programs is responsible for providing TPA outcomes data at the candidate and program level to the program within three weeks and to the Commission, as specified by the Commission. The model sponsor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results will be provided to the programs at Fresno State within the three-week submission. FAST coordinator will oversee data collection, review with programs, and reporting to the Commission.

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

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by FAST PK-3
	<p>but both the failing score and passing score will be recorded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="812 357 1421 504">• If candidate fails to earn a passing score a second time, the candidate may petition for Special Consideration for a 3rd attempt within 7 days.<li data-bbox="812 514 1421 777">• FAST also provides the opportunity for candidates to appeal a non-passing score if their resubmission does not earn a passing score. When a candidate appeals, the submission is re-scored by another qualified assessor and reviewed by the FAST coordinator.

Appendix C

FAST PK-3 Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project TPE Alignment Map

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Young Children in Learning		
1. Demonstrate knowledge of the range and characteristics of typical and atypical child development from birth to age eight, including competencies related to developmental progressions (e.g., cognitive, social, emotional, linguistic, and physical) and use that knowledge to engage and support all children in learning.	Yes	Yes
2. Demonstrate and use knowledge about children’s assets, including their prior experiences and interests, funds of knowledge, language, and sociocultural backgrounds, to engage and support them in learning.	Yes	Yes
3. Demonstrate and apply knowledge of the integral role and effects of children’s interpersonal relationships (e.g., peers, school staff, parents/guardians, community) and cultural factors (e.g., traditions, beliefs) to engage and support them in learning.	No	No
4. Connect learning to meaningful and relevant contexts in the lives of children and facilitate both child and teacher-initiated active learning experiences which engage children’s interests to deepen and extend their learning.	Yes	No
5. Engage and collaborate in partnership with families/guardians to support children’s development and learning in a culturally responsive, respectful, and interactive manner.	Yes	No
6. Monitor children’s active engagement in learning and adjust activities and tasks as needed to provide access to the full range of the curriculum for all children.	Yes	Yes
7. Promote children’s thinking (e.g., creative, concrete, abstract, critical) through developmentally appropriate activities, including play-based learning activities, that provide opportunities for children to engage in effective expression, inquiry, problem solving, and reflection on their learning.	Yes	Yes
TPE 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Children’s Development and Learning		

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
1. Create effective, developmentally appropriate, and culturally responsive learning environments (e.g., routines, classroom norms/expectations, physical space, access to materials and equipment) that promote all children’s development and learning.	Yes	Yes
2. Create a positive classroom climate by building rapport and a caring relationship with children and showing respect for children's perspectives, identities, and home languages, providing assistance when needed, recognizing their work and accomplishments.	Yes	No
3. Communicate and collaborate effectively with peers, colleagues, specialists, families/guardians, and community service providers to support children’s development and learning.	No	Yes
4.Promote positive relationships and effective learning for all children by creating culturally and linguistically responsive, flexible learning environments, and establishing classroom routines, procedures, expectations, and norms with children, in partnerships with families/guardians.	Yes	Yes
5. Nurture children’s positive and developmentally appropriate social behavior, self-regulations, and social emotional development, including emotional literacy, by modeling and using respectful language to communicate and encourage positive student-to-student and student -to-teacher interactions	Yes	No
6. Establish, maintain, and monitor inclusive learning environments that are safe (e.g., physically and emotionally) and foster a caring community where each child is treated fairly and respectfully by adults and peers by using positive interventions and supports (e.g., restorative justice, peer collaboration, developmentally appropriate conflict resolution practices).	Yes	Yes
7. Identify and access resources that provide inclusive support for all children, including those who have experienced trauma inside or outside of school (e.g., homelessness, foster care, serious medical needs, exposure to violence, abuse).	Yes	No
TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Core Curriculum for Children’s Learning		
1. Demonstrate knowledge of current state adopted standards (e.g., Preschool Learning Foundations and Curriculum Frameworks, as well as the K-3 Student Content Standards and Frameworks) and use that	Yes	Yes

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
knowledge to organize curriculum and create developmentally appropriate play-based activities, cross disciplinary activities/lessons, both child-led and teacher guided activities to promote all children’s learning.		
2. Use subject specific pedagogy in accordance with the Preschool Learning Foundations and applicable K-3 Student Content Standards within and across the core curriculum, including a focus on language, literacy, and mathematics.	Yes	Yes
3. Consult, collaborate, and/or co-teach with other educators to provide and support opportunities for children to learn and demonstrate their knowledge of the core curriculum.	Yes	No
4. Set individualized goals and objectives for content learning and make appropriate instructional adaptations to promote access to the core curriculum for all children.	No	Yes
5. Promote core curriculum knowledge in all children, including monolingual and multi-lingual children, children with disabilities and children with other learning needs, by adapting the curriculum, implementing differentiated instruction, and providing explicit support for vocabulary and academic language development.	Yes	No
6. Remove barriers to development and learning and provide access through instructional strategies which include, but are not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • using developmentally appropriate instructional technology, • applying principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL): multiple means of engagement, representation, and action and expression, • using Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS), including assistive technology. 	Yes	Yes
7. Model and promote critical digital literacy and digital citizenship where developmentally appropriate by applying the principles of the internationally recognized International Society of Technology in Education (ISTE) standards to engage children and support multiple ways to demonstrate their learning.	No	No
TPE 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Developmentally Appropriate Learning Experiences for All Children		

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
1. Plan activities and lessons that build on what children know, accommodate children’s developmental needs and learning preferences and provide opportunities for large group, small group, and individual hands-on learning experiences.	Yes	Yes
2. Ensure opportunities for both teacher- and child-initiated experiences that are engaging for young children and that contribute to children’s content knowledge, language development, and social, emotional growth.	Yes	Yes
3. Provide learning experiences, including those that may be informed by parents/guardians, that incorporate and help validate children’s backgrounds (e.g., cultural, linguistic, ethnic, economic, gender), as well as their diverse learning preferences, skills, and levels of social development to meet children’s individual needs.	Yes	Yes
4. Provide opportunities for children to express their needs and to successfully participate in activities/lessons based on education plans (e.g., IEP and 504 plans) within the general education classroom setting to promote learning and social, emotional development.	Yes	No
5. Integrate movement, kinesthetic activities, and other types of multisensory experiences within activities/lessons to support the development of different dimensions of children’s development.	Yes	No
6. Use digital tools and learning technologies across learning environments as appropriate to create new content and provide personalized and integrated technology-rich activities/lessons to engage children in learning, promote digital literacy, and offer multiple means for children to demonstrate their learning.	No	Yes
7. Plan and adapt developmentally, linguistically, and culturally responsive learning activities / lessons, instructional materials, and resources for all children including mono- and multi-lingual learners to provide access to the core curriculum.	Yes	Yes
8. Apply information based on observation as well as information that may be provided by parents/guardians about children’s current levels of development, language proficiency, cultural background, content-specific learning goals and needs, and assessment data to plan and implement daily learning activities.	Yes	No
TPE 5: Assessing and Documenting Children’s Development and Learning		

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
1. Demonstrate and apply knowledge of the purposes, characteristics, and appropriate uses of different types of assessments (e.g., diagnostic, informal, formal, progress-monitoring, formative, summative, and performance) to design and administer culturally responsive, developmentally and linguistically appropriate classroom assessments, including use of scoring rubrics, and use the results to help plan and modify instruction and to document children’s learning over time.	Yes	Yes
2. Assess each child’s learning and development as part of an ongoing cycle of observation, analysis, documentation, planning, implementation, and reflection.	Yes	Yes
3. Analyze and interpret formative and summative assessment data to determine children’s progress toward meeting learning goals.	No	Yes
4. Apply assessment data and information from children’s IEP, and/or 504 plans to establish learning goals and to differentiate and adapt instruction.	No	No
5. Collaborate with specialists to interpret assessment results from formative and summative assessments to appropriately identify monolingual-and multilingual children, as well as children with language or other disabilities.	Yes	No
6. Guide and monitor children in developmentally appropriate self-assessment to help them reflect on their learning goals and progress and to provide children with opportunities to revise or reframe their work based on assessment feedback.	No	No
7. Communicate assessment information in an appropriate and timely manner to assist families/guardians in understanding children’s progress in meeting social, emotional, content-specific, and language development goals.	No	Yes
TPE 6: Developing as a Professional Early Childhood Educator		
1. Reflect on one’s own practice and use this information to improve teaching and learning in the ECE context.	Yes	Yes
2. Exhibit and support acceptance and fairness toward all children, families/guardians, and colleagues to mitigate implicit and explicit biases and the ways they could negatively affect teaching and learning.	Yes	No

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
3. Demonstrate professional responsibility for learning environments, including responsibility for the learning outcomes of all children along with appropriate concerns and policies regarding the privacy, health, and safety of children.	No	Yes
4. Act with integrity in an honest and ethical manner with children’s and families/guardians’ well-being as a central concern. Comply with all laws concerning professional responsibilities, professional conduct, and moral fitness (i.e., mandated reporting, use of social media, and digital platforms).	No	Yes
5. Co-plan, co-teach, and communicate effectively with colleagues, mentors, and/or specialists in the early childhood setting to reflect on practices and gain feedback about one’s own effectiveness in meeting children’s learning needs.	No	Yes
TPE 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for PK-3 Settings		
1. Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction appropriate to children’s age, grade, and development (including children’s linguistic, cognitive, and social strengths) that is grounded in an understanding of California’s English Language Arts and Literacy Standards, English Language Development Standards, and Preschool Learning Foundations; the themes of the English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework (Foundational Skills, Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, and Content Knowledge) and their integration; and the Preschool Curriculum Framework.	Yes	Yes
2. Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction appropriate to children’s age, grade, and development (including children’s linguistic, cognitive, and social strengths) that is grounded in an understanding of Universal Design for Learning; California’s Multi-Tiered System of Support (Tier 1–Best first instruction, Tier 2–Targeted, supplemental instruction, and Tier 3–Referrals for intensive intervention); and the California Dyslexia Guidelines, including the definition and characteristics of dyslexia and structured literacy (i.e., instruction for children at risk for and with dyslexia that is comprehensive, systematic, explicit, cumulative, and multimodal and that includes phonology, orthography, phonics, morphology, syntax, and semantics).	Yes	Yes
3. Incorporate asset-based pedagogies ¹⁵ and inclusive approaches and culturally and linguistically affirming and sustaining practices in literacy	Yes	Yes

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
instruction, recognizing and incorporating the diversity of children’s cultures, languages, dialects, and home communities. Promote children’s literacy development in languages other than English in multilingual (dual language and bilingual education) programs.		
4. Provide literacy instruction for all children that is active, motivating, and engaging; responsive to children’s age, language and literacy development, and literacy goals; reflective of family engagement, social and emotional learning, and trauma-informed practices; and based on children’s assessed learning strengths and needs, analysis of instructional materials and tasks, and identified academic standards. Create literacy environments for young children that encourage active, playful exploration; interaction with others; child-initiated, self-directed activities; and imaginative and dramatic play.	Yes	No
5. Foundational Skills. Develop children’s foundational skills according to standards and expectations specified for children’s age and grade, understanding that children often approach TK and Kindergarten with varying levels of oracy and literacy skillsets. Develop children’s skills in print concepts, including letters of the alphabet; phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition, including letter-sound, spelling-sound, and sound-symbol correspondences; decoding and encoding; morphological awareness; and text reading fluency, including accuracy, prosody (expression), and rate (as an indicator of automaticity) as developmentally appropriate for each child’s developmental stage in early literacies, including emergent writing. Instruction will be structured and organized as well as direct, systematic, developmentally appropriate and explicit, and it will include practice connected to developmentally appropriate and culturally/linguistically responsive texts, including decodable texts when the children are ready for that stage of transition from phonological awareness to phonics. Create literacy environments that are print rich and that foster interest in print; engage young children actively and deliberately with games, books, poetry, oral storytelling, and songs that draw their attention to print, the manipulation of sounds, and alphabet letters. Provide instruction in text reading fluency that emphasizes spelling and syllable patterns, semantics, morphology, and syntax. Advance children’s progress in the elements of foundational skills, language, and cognitive skills that support them as they read and write increasingly complex disciplinary texts with comprehension and effective expression.	Partial based on Candidate Choice based on children’s assessment data	No

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
<p>6. Meaning Making. Engage children in meaning making by building on prior knowledge and using age-appropriate literary and informational texts (print, digital, and oral) that are appropriately complex and that mirror children’s backgrounds, including their cultures, languages, genders, and abilities. Engage children in questioning and discussion to develop their literal and inferential comprehension, including the higher-order cognitive skills of reasoning, perspective taking, and critical listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Engage children in reading, listening, speaking, writing, and viewing closely to draw information from texts, ask and answer questions, and support analysis, reflection, and research. Ensure that literacy experiences for young children include reading aloud, modeling, and assisting children in making predictions, retelling and reenacting, and responding to and generating questions about stories, picture books, and other texts.</p>	<p>Partial based on Candidate Choice</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>7. Language Development. Promote children’s oral and written language development by providing rich exposure to and experience with varied forms of language and responding attentively to children’s language use. Develop children’s language by attending to vocabulary knowledge and use, grammatical structures (e.g., syntax), and discourse-level understandings as children listen, speak, read, and write with comprehension and effective expression. Create environments that foster oral and written language development, including discipline-specific academic language. Enhance language development by engaging children in the creation of diverse print, oral, digital, and multimedia texts. Conduct instruction that leverages children’s existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging.</p>	<p>Partial based on Candidate Choice</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>8. Effective Expression. Develop children’s effective expression as they discuss, present, write, and use language conventions. Engage children in a range of formal and informal collaborative discussions, including extended conversations in which multiple conversational turns are taken, and writing for varied purposes, audiences, and contexts. Develop young children’s early writing skills by prompting them to share ideas, information, and stories using their developing knowledge of how print works. Teach children in ways appropriate for their age and development to plan, develop, provide feedback to peers, revise using peer and teacher feedback, edit, and produce their own writing and oral presentations in various genres, drawing on the modes of opinion, information, and narration. In transitional kindergarten and beyond, teach children letter</p>	<p>Partial based on Candidate Choice</p>	<p>No</p>

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
<p>formation/printing and related language conventions, such as capitalization and punctuation, in conjunction with applicable decoding skills. Develop children’s use of keyboarding, technology, and multimedia, as appropriate, and fluency in spelling, handwriting, and other language conventions to support writing and presentations.</p>		
<p>9. Content Knowledge. Promote children’s content knowledge by engaging children in developmentally appropriate and playful literacy instruction as outlined in the PTKLF and TPE 7, in all pertinent content areas, that integrates reading, writing, listening, and speaking in discipline-specific ways, including through printed and digital texts and multimedia; discussions; experimentation; hands-on explorations; and wide and independent reading and read alouds and by providing choices that reflect and expand their interests. Teach children to navigate increasingly complex literary and informational texts relevant to the discipline, research questions of interest, and convey knowledge in a variety of ways. Promote digital literacy and the use of technology, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate digital resources safely and responsibly, and foster digital citizenship.</p>	<p>Partial based on Candidate Choice</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>10. Monitor children’s progress in literacy development using developmentally appropriate formative assessment practices, ongoing progress monitoring, and diagnostic techniques that inform instructional decision making.¹⁹ Understand how to use screening to determine children’s literacy profiles and identify potential reading and writing difficulties, including children’s risk for dyslexia and other literacy-related disabilities. Understand how to appropriately assess and interpret results for English learner students.²⁰ If indicated, collaborate with families and guardians as well as with teachers, specialists, other professionals, and administrators from the school or district to facilitate comprehensive assessment for disabilities in English and as appropriate in the home language; plan and provide supplemental instruction in inclusive settings; and initiate referrals for children who need more intensive support.</p>	<p>Partial based on Classroom Context</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>11. Provide instruction in English language development (ELD) for children identified as English learner students based on an understanding of comprehensive ELD, which includes both integrated and designated ELD and is part of Tier 1 instruction. Understand how integrated and designated ELD are related and how designated ELD is taught in connection with (rather than isolated from) content areas and topics. Use</p>	<p>Partial based on Classroom Context</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
<p>ELA/literacy standards, Preschool Learning Foundations, or other content standards and ELD standards in tandem to plan instruction that attends to children’s literacy profiles, levels of English language proficiency, and prior educational experiences. Provide ELD Instruction that builds on children’s cultural and linguistic assets and develops children’s abilities to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works across disciplines.</p>		
<p>TPE 8 Effective Mathematics Instruction in a PK-3 Setting</p>		
<p>1. Plan and implement mathematics instruction appropriate to children’s age, grade, and developmental levels (including children’s linguistic, cognitive, social and emotional strengths and learning needs) that is grounded in an understanding of California’s Mathematics Standards and Framework and the Preschool Learning Foundations and Curriculum Framework.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>2. Provide learning opportunities, consistent with Universal Design for Learning principles, for children to develop knowledge related to:1) number and operations, including counting and cardinality, 2) mathematical thinking and understanding relationships, 3) algebra and functions, 4) measurement and data analysis, and 5) geometry, as described in the California’s Mathematics Standards and the Preschool Learning Foundations.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>3. Provide a secure environment for children to take intellectual risks, foster positive attitudes toward mathematics and encourage student curiosity, academic discourse, and persistence in solving mathematical problems.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>4. Consistent with California’s Standards for Mathematical Practice, develop children’s abilities according to their individual developmental levels, linguistic, cognitive, social and emotional strengths and learning needs, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) make sense of problems and persevere in solving them 2) reason abstractly and quantitatively 3) construct viable arguments and critique the reasoning of others 4) model with mathematics 5) use appropriate tools strategically 6) attend to precision 7) look for and make use of structure 	<p>No</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Teaching Performance Expectation	Addressed in SVP	Addressed in TSP
8) look for and express regularity in repeated reasoning 9) Make and test conjectures to solve problems; and 10) recognize relationships within and among concepts.		
5. Differentiate and provide developmentally appropriate instruction and tasks to meet individual children’s learning needs and engage children in self-initiated as well as teacher-led learning activities, including play-based activities, that use manipulatives and other tools to solve problems.	No	Yes
6. Observe and interpret children’s strategies in solving problems and ask thought-provoking questions that lead to deeper understanding (e.g., analysis, synthesis, evaluation). provide follow-up activities and ensure access to manipulatives and other tools, including education technology to further develop and build on children’s mathematical thinking.	No	Yes
7. Support respectful child-to-child interactions as students engage with their classmates to figure out ways to solve problems and explain or show how they arrived at their solution and provide ways for children to demonstrate their ability to construct mathematical arguments based on sound reasoning and relevant evidence.	No	No
8. Support all children to develop the academic language of mathematics, ensuring access for all children to the content of mathematics appropriate to grade level expectations and encourage parents/guardians to use the home language to talk about mathematics (especially numbers, arithmetic, spatial relations, and patterns) and share with children where mathematics is used in the home and the community.	No	No

Appendix D

FAST PK-3 SVP Rubrics

Foundational Skills

Rubric scoring based on the following evidence:

- Foundational Skills Planning Table based on DRDP 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
<p>Planning Reading Pedagogy: Foundational Skills</p> <p>TPE 1.4, 3.1, 3.3, 3.5, 7.1, 7.2. 7.5, 7.10</p>	<p>Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects minimal or incorrect application of foundational skills pedagogy, and/or is not developmentally appropriate. There are less than three focal areas are consistent with current pedagogy in literacy.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Provides inadequate justification for why instructional activity was chosen to develop each foundational skill.</p> <p>Instructional activities may not support each area of focus; If</p>	<p>Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a general application of developmentally appropriate foundational skills pedagogy, a minimum of three focal areas are aligned and consistent with current pedagogy in literacy.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Provides appropriate justification for why instructional activity was chosen to develop each foundational skill.</p>	<p>Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a specific application of developmentally appropriate foundational skills pedagogy, more than three focal areas are aligned and consistent with current pedagogy in literacy.</p> <p>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 complexity over three days for at least one focal area.</p> <p>Provides specific justification for why instructional activity was chosen to develop foundational skill.</p> <p>Includes at least one instructional activity that supports each focal area AND more than one instructional</p>	<p>Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a deep and comprehensive application of developmentally appropriate foundational skills pedagogy in all six focal areas.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Provides specific justification for why instructional activity was chosen to develop foundational skill.</p>

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
	addressing all skill areas is not appropriate, does not provide an explanation.	Includes at least one instructional activity that supports each focal area; If addressing all skill areas is not appropriate, provides an explanation.	activity in at least one of the focal areas; If addressing all skill areas is not appropriate, provides an explanation.	Includes more than one instructional activity to support each focal area; If addressing all skill areas is not appropriate, provides a detailed explanation.
Implementation: Daily Progress Notes Foundational Skills TPE 1.6, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 3.5, 4.5, 7.5, 7.10	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. Delivery is ineffective and/or developmentally inappropriate. Daily Progress Notes are incomplete and/or not individualized for each child; copied and pasted and/or not based on child learning. Reading Lesson Planning Table is not adjusted using strike-through function.	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. Delivery may be minimally effective (unrehearsed), is developmentally appropriate , but does not include multi-sensory/ kinesthetic components. Daily Progress Notes are complete , are generally individualized for each child; based on child learning. Reading Lesson Planning Table is generally adjusted using strike-through function.	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. Delivery is effective , developmentally appropriate, and includes multi-sensory/ kinesthetic components. Daily Progress Notes are complete, are specifically individualized for each child; based on child learning. Reading Lesson Planning Table is specifically adjusted using strike-through function.	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. Delivery is highly effective, developmentally appropriate, and includes multi-sensory/ kinesthetic components and responsive to the specific child. Daily Progress Notes are complete, are specifically individualized for each child; based on child learning. Reading Lesson Planning Table is comprehensively adjusted using strike-through function.

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Reflecting on Reading Pedagogy: Foundational Skills TPE 1.4, 1.6, 6.1, 7.5	Provides inadequate justification for the alignment of activity and the focal area. Provides inadequate justification for the effectiveness and developmentally appropriate practices of the instructional activity in Video clip 1 based on the intended outcome.	Provides general justification for the <u>alignment</u> of activity in video 1 and the focal area. Provides general justification for how the <u>effectiveness</u> and <u>developmentally appropriate practices</u> of instructional activity in Video clip 1 based on the intended outcome.	Provides specific justification for the <u>alignment</u> of activity in video 1 and the focal area. Provides specific justification for how the <u>effectiveness</u> and <u>developmentally appropriate practices</u> of instructional activity in Video clip 1 based on the intended outcome and includes child data as evidence.	Provides specific justification for the alignment of the activity and the focal area. Provides specific justification of the effectiveness and developmentally appropriate practices of instructional activity in Video clip 1 based on the intended outcome, includes child data as evidence, and differentiates between the children in the group.

Meaning Making

Rubric scoring based on the following evidence:

- Meaning Making Skills Planning Table
- Daily Progress Notes: Meaning Making Skills
- Video Clip 2 and Reflection on Meaning Making Skills Instruction

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Planning Reading Pedagogy: Meaning Making TPE 1.1, 1.3, 3.5, 4.7, 7.1, 7.4, 7.6, 7.8	Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects minimal or incorrect application of meaning making pedagogy and/or is not developmentally appropriate; less than two focal areas are aligned and consistent with current pedagogy in literacy. Includes less than three consecutive lessons, and/or less than two focal areas;	Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a general application of developmentally appropriate meaning making pedagogy; a minimum of two focal areas are aligned and consistent with current pedagogy in literacy. Includes at least three consecutive lessons for at	Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a specific application of developmentally appropriate meaning making pedagogy; all three focal areas are aligned and consistent with current pedagogy in literacy. Includes at least three consecutive lessons for at least two focal areas of Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing;	Reading Lesson Planning Table reflects a deep and comprehensive application of developmentally appropriate meaning making pedagogy. Includes at least three consecutive lessons for more than two focal areas; Integrates advanced knowledge of Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
	<p>including Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing.</p> <p>Provides inadequate justification for why instructional activity was chosen to develop each meaning making skill.</p> <p>Instructional activities may not support each area of focus; If addressing all skill areas is not appropriate, does not provide an explanation.</p>	<p>least two focal areas; including Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing.</p> <p>Provides appropriate justification for why instructional activity was chosen to develop each meaning making skill.</p> <p>Includes at least one instructional activity that supports each focal area; If addressing all skill areas is not appropriate, provides an explanation.</p>	<p>instructional activities increase in complexity over three days for at least one focal area.</p> <p>Provides specific justification for why instructional activity was chosen to develop each meaning making skill.</p> <p>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>Writing; instructional opportunities increase in complexity over three days for all focal areas.</p> <p>Provides specific justification for why instructional activity was chosen to develop each meaning making skill.</p> <p>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 Meaning Making</p> <p>TPE 2.2, 2.3, 3.5, 7.4, 7.6, 7.8</p>	<p>Meaning making instruction and progress notes reflect minimal or incorrect application of instructional activities to support Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing; activities do not align with focal area.</p> <p>Delivery is ineffective and/or developmentally inappropriate.</p> <p>Daily Progress Notes are incomplete and/or not individualized for each child; copied and pasted and/or not based on learning.</p>	<p>Meaning making instruction and progress notes reflect a general application of instructional activities to support Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing; a minimum of two activities align with focal areas.</p> <p>Delivery may be minimally effective, (unrehearsed), and minimally developmentally appropriate.</p> <p>Daily Progress Notes are complete, are generally individualized for each child; based on learning.</p>	<p>Meaning making instruction and progress notes reflect a specific application of instructional activities to support Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing; all three activities align with focal areas.</p> <p>Delivery is effective, and developmentally appropriate.</p> <p>Daily Progress Notes are complete, are specifically individualized for each child; based on learning.</p> <p>Reading Lesson Planning Table is specifically adjusted using strike-through function.</p>	<p>Meaning making instruction and progress notes reflect a deep, comprehensive application of multiple instructional activities to support Identity Reading, Oral Language/ Discussion, and Writing.</p> <p>Delivery is highly effective, developmentally appropriate, and responsive to the specific child.</p> <p>Daily Progress Notes are complete and are specifically individualized for each child; based on learning.</p>

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
	Reading Lesson Planning Table is not adjusted using strike-through function.	Reading Lesson Planning Table is generally adjusted using strike-through function.		Reading Lesson Planning Table is comprehensively adjusted using strike-through function.
Reflecting on Reading Pedagogy: Meaning Making TPE 1.4, 6.1, 7.6, 7.8	Provides inadequate justification for the alignment of activity and the focal area. Provides inadequate justification for the effectiveness and developmentally appropriate practices of the instructional activity in Video clip 2 based on the intended outcome.	Provides general justification for the <u>alignment</u> of activity in video 2 and the focal area. Provides general justification for how the <u>effectiveness</u> and <u>developmentally appropriate practices</u> of instructional activity in Video clip 2 based on the intended outcome.	Provides specific justification for the <u>alignment</u> of activity in video 2 and the focal area. Provides specific justification for how the <u>effectiveness</u> and <u>developmentally appropriate practices</u> of instructional activity in Video clip 2 based on the intended outcome and includes child data as evidence.	Provides specific justification for the alignment of the activity and the focal area, as well as how the effectiveness and <u>developmentally appropriate informed practices</u> of instructional activity in Video clip 2 based on the intended outcome, includes child data as evidence, and differentiates between the children in the group.

Instructional Decision Making & Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy

Rubric scoring based on the following evidence:

- Cultural and Interest Data Collection on both Foundational and Meaning Making Planning Tables
- Self-Evaluation of Lessons; Instructional Decision Making & Culturally Sustaining Pedagogies

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Instructional Decision Making TPE 1.4 1.6,, 2.2, 3.2, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 7.2, 7.4, 7.10, 7.11	Description of instructional decision is not detailed and/or missing vital information. Reason for change is not indicated. Description of how change supported child progress	Description of instructional decision is described generally. Reason for change is generally described. Description of how change supported child progress	Description of instructional decision is described specifically Reason for change is specifically described. Description of how change supported child progress towards intended outcome is specific.	Description of instructional decision is described specifically. Reason for change is specifically described and includes child data. Description of how change supported child progress towards intended outcome

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
	towards intended outcome is not clear.	towards intended outcome is general .		is specific with child data as evidence .
Instructional Decision Making: Next Steps TPE 1.2, 1.5, 2.2, 3.2, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.5, 5.8, 7.4, 7.10, 7.11	Next steps are not clearly defined. Next Steps are not supported by data and developmentally appropriate practices.	Next steps are clearly defined and generally individualized . Next steps are generally supported by data and developmentally appropriate practices .	Next steps are clearly defined with individualized supports for children in focal group . Next steps are specifically supported by data and developmentally appropriate practices .	Next steps are clearly defined with individualized supports for children in focal group, includes research to back up decision . Next steps are specifically supported by child data and developmentally appropriate practices; and are differentiated for each child .
Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy TPE 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 3.5, 4.1, 4.3, 4.7, 7.3, 7.4, 7.7	Focal Group Profile Table includes surface level cultural background and/or child interest, or the information provided is incomplete. Explanation of chosen identity text does not reflect child cultural backgrounds and/or child interest data. Reflection includes little to no awareness of the relationship between materials that reflect cultural backgrounds and/or interests and child engagement. Reflection shows misunderstanding of culturally sustaining pedagogy: includes	Focal Group Profile Table includes relevant information about children' s cultural backgrounds and interests. Explanation of chosen identity text reflects some child cultural backgrounds and child interest data. Reflection includes some awareness of the <u>relationship</u> between materials that reflect children' s cultural backgrounds and/or interests and child engagement. Reflection shows surface level understanding of culturally sustaining	Focal Group Profile Table includes thoughtful information about children' s cultural backgrounds and interests. Explanation of chosen identity text meaningfully reflects cultural backgrounds and child interest data. Reflection includes thoughtful awareness of the <u>relationship</u> between materials that reflect children' s cultural backgrounds and/or interests and child engagement. Reflection shows thoughtful understanding of culturally sustaining pedagogy: includes asset-based perspectives .	Focal Group Profile Table includes comprehensive information about children' s cultural backgrounds and interests; multiple aspects of child background and interest data are included. Explanation of chosen identity text reflects cultural background and child interest data and incorporates child choice . Reflection includes highly developed awareness of the relationship between materials that reflect children' s cultural

Criteria	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
	deficit perspectives or marginalizes children.	pedagogy: does not marginalize children.		backgrounds and interests and child engagement. Reflection shows highly developed understanding of developmentally appropriate and culturally sustaining pedagogy: includes asset-based perspectives, demonstrates understanding of connection between culturally sustaining pedagogy, developmentally appropriate instruction, and child engagement and success.

Appendix E

FAST PK-3 Teaching Sample Project

Children in Context

Teaching Process Standard: *The teacher uses information about the children, their individual characteristics and differences as well as information about the learning-teaching context to set learning outcomes and to plan instruction and assessment.*

TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Young Children in Learning

TPE 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Children’s Development and Learning

TPE 4 Planning Instruction and Designing Developmentally Appropriate Learning Experiences for All Children

TPE 5: Assessing and Documenting Children’s Development and Learning

TPE 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for PK-3 Settings

TPE 8: Effective Mathematics Instruction in a PK-3 Setting

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Implications for Instruction TPE 1.1, 1.2 4.1, 4.3, 5.1, 7.3, 7.7, 7.11, 8.1, 8.5	Descriptions of instructional approaches are <u>limited or inappropriate</u> for at least two of the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency, (b) children with identified special needs, (c) children with different instructional needs, (d) children from underserved education groups.	Descriptions of instructional approaches are <u>generally appropriate</u> for at least <u>three</u> of the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency, (b) children with identified special needs, (c) children with different instructional needs, (d) children from underserved education groups.	Descriptions of instructional approaches are <u>specifically aligned with the needs of at least three</u> of the following groups: (a) different levels of English proficiency, (b) children with identified special needs, (c) children with different instructional needs, (d) children from underserved education groups.	Descriptions of instructional approaches are <u>detailed and specifically aligned</u> with the needs of <u>all</u> of the following groups: (a) a <u>full range</u> of English proficiency levels, (b) children with identified special needs, (c) children with different instructional needs, (d) children from underserved education groups.
Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments TPE 2.1, 2.3, 2.6	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior are <u>limited or inappropriate</u> related to at least <u>two</u> of the following: (a) individual responsibility, (b) intolerance, (c) an inclusive climate.	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include <u>general</u> examples related to at least <u>two</u> of the following: (a) individual responsibility,	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include <u>specific</u> examples related to <u>all</u> of the following: (a) individual responsibility, (b) intolerance, (c) an inclusive climate,	Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include <u>specific examples and justification</u> related to (a) individual responsibility, (b) intolerance, and (c) an inclusive environment, which reflect fair and respectful treatment

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
	Routines are ineffective, with no or limited description of how they were communicated to children.	(b) intolerance, (c) an inclusive climate. Routines focus on management, with a <u>general</u> description of how they were communicated to children.	<u>and</u> focus on <u>positive, fair and respectful</u> treatment of children. Routines are <u>specifically designed to facilitate learning</u> , with a detailed description of how they were communicated to children.	<u>specifically designed for the full range of children in the class.</u> Routines, designed to facilitate learning, are described <u>and justified</u> , including a description of how they were communicated to children <u>and families, and maintained throughout the year.</u>

Circle overall rating for Children in Context

1

2

3

4

Learning Outcomes

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

TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Core Curriculum for Children’s Learning

TPE 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for PK-3 Settings

TPE 8: Effective Mathematics Instruction in a PK-3 Setting

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Learning Outcomes and Standards TPE 3.1, 3.2, 7.1, 8.1	Outcomes <u>are not clearly related</u> to math or literacy standards. Outcomes <u>poorly represent</u> the math and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards or address a <u>limited range</u> in the level of learning.	Outcomes <u>primarily</u> address <u>either</u> math <u>or</u> literacy standards. Most outcomes represent the math <u>and level of learning</u> (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the math standards, though they primarily focus on <u>lower levels</u> of learning.	Outcomes clearly address <u>both</u> math <u>and</u> literacy standards. Most outcomes represent the math and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards and address a <u>range</u> in the type or level of learning, <u>including a focus on higher level learning</u> .	Outcomes clearly <u>integrate</u> math and literacy standards. <u>All</u> outcomes represent the math and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the math standards, address a range in the type or level of learning, including a focus on higher level learning, <u>and real world connections</u> .
Appropriate-ness for children’s	Description of unit and rationale provide <u>limited</u>	Description of unit and rationale provide <u>general</u> justification for:	Description of unit and rationale provide <u>specific</u> justification for:	Description of unit and rationale provide specific justification for:

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
knowledge/ background TPE 1.1, 3.2	justification for the appropriateness of the unit for: (a) development of math knowledge <u>or</u> literacy skills, (b) past learning, prerequisite knowledge, <u>or</u> future learning, (c) children’s cultural backgrounds, interests, and lives.	(a) development of either math knowledge <u>or</u> literacy skills, (b) past experiences, prerequisite knowledge, <u>or</u> future learning, (c) children’s cultural backgrounds, interests, and lives.	(a) development of math knowledge <u>and</u> literacy skills, (b) past experiences, prerequisite knowledge, or future learning, (c) children’s cultural backgrounds, interests, and lives.	(a) <u>integration</u> of math knowledge <u>and</u> literacy skills, (b) past experiences, prerequisite knowledge, <u>and</u> future learning, (c) children’s cultural backgrounds, interests, and lives, <u>specifically referencing information from Children in Context section.</u>

Circle overall rating for Learning Outcomes:

1 2 3 4

Assessment Plan

Teaching Process Standard: *The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning outcomes to assess child learning before, during and after instruction.*

TPE 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Developmentally Appropriate Learning Experiences for All Children

TPE 5: Assessing and Documenting Children’s Development and Learning

TPE 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for PK-3 Settings

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Congruence with Learning Outcomes and Content TPE 4.1, 4.3, 5.1	Most methods of assessment <u>lack congruence</u> with learning outcomes and level of learning (e.g. DOK level). Little or no attention to the assessment of math knowledge or literacy skills.	Most assessment methods <u>are congruent</u> with learning outcomes in <u>either content or level</u> of learning (e.g. DOK level). Attention to assessment of math knowledge <u>or</u> literacy skills.	Most assessment methods are congruent with learning outcomes in content <u>and</u> level of learning (e.g. DOK level). Attention to assessment of <u>both</u> math knowledge <u>and</u> literacy skills.	<u>All</u> assessments are clearly congruent with the learning outcomes in both content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level). <u>Specific</u> attention to the assessment of <u>integrated</u> math knowledge and literacy skills.

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Variety in Methods of Assessment TPE 5.2, 7.10	The assessment plan is <u>limited</u> or does not assess children before, during, and after instruction, or uses <u>only one method</u> of assessment.	The assessment plan assesses child knowledge or performance before, during, and after instruction, with <u>some variety</u> in the assessment methods.	The assessment plan assesses child knowledge or performance before, during and after instruction, includes <u>a variety</u> of assessment methods, <u>including assessment of higher level thinking</u> (e.g. complex task).	The assessment plan assesses child knowledge and performance before, during and after instruction, includes a variety of assessment methods, <u>including those requiring an integration of knowledge, skills, and reasoning.</u>
Clarity of Assessment Methods TPE 5.1	Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are <u>not clearly</u> described. Candidate demonstrates <u>little understanding</u> of the relationship between the format and purpose of assessments.	Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are <u>are given</u> for most assessment methods. Candidate <u>describes</u> how the format of the assessments match the learning outcomes and the purpose of assessing.	Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are <u>clearly described</u> for most assessment methods. Candidate <u>evaluates</u> how the format of the assessments match the learning outcomes and the purpose of assessing.	Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are clearly described for <u>all</u> assessment methods, <u>and explicitly linked to learning outcomes.</u> Candidate <u>evaluates and justifies</u> how the format of the assessments match the learning outcomes and the purpose of assessing.

Circle overall rating for Assessment Plan:

1

2

3

4

Design for Instruction

Teaching Process Standard: *The teacher designs instruction for specific learning outcomes, child characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.*

TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Young Children in Learning

TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Core Curriculum for Children’s Learning;

TPE 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Developmentally Appropriate Learning Experiences for All Children

TPE 5: Assessing and Documenting Children’s Development and Learning

TPE 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for PK-3 Settings

TPE 8: Effective Mathematics Instruction in PK-3 Settings

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
<p>Use of Contextual Information and Data to Inform Instruction</p> <p>TPE 1.1, 1.2 1.6, 3.1, 3.2,3.4, 3.6, 5.1, 7.1,7.2, 7.3, 7.7, 7.11,8.1, 8.4</p>	<p>Lessons are <u>in conflict</u> with the results of the pre-assessment Lessons do not connect to real world, including child’s background and interests.</p> <p>Lessons include <u>limited or inappropriate ways</u> to provide access to the math content or to develop literacy skills.</p>	<p>Lessons show <u>some attention</u> to pre-assessment results Lessons <u>attempt</u> real world connection though superficial; including children’s background and interests.</p> <p>Lessons provide access to math content <u>or</u> develop literacy skills for at <u>least two</u> of the following: (a) identified special needs, (b) different levels of English language proficiency, (c) different instructional needs, (d) underserved educational groups.</p>	<p>Lessons are <u>in alignment with pre-assessment results.</u></p> <p>Lessons include real world connections; including children’s background and interests.</p> <p>Lessons provide access to math content <u>and</u> develop literacy skills for at <u>least two</u> of the following: (a) identified special needs, (b) different levels of English language proficiency, (c) different instructional needs, (d) underserved educational groups.</p>	<p>Lessons have been designed with <u>specific reference to pre-assessment data and includes integrated real world connections to children’s background and interests.</u></p> <p>Lessons provide access to math content and develop literacy skills for <u>all</u> of the following: (a) identified special needs, (b) different levels of English language proficiency, (c) different instructional needs, (d) underserved educational groups.</p>

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Alignment with Learning Outcomes & Standards TPE 3.1, 3.2, 4.3, 4.7, 7.9, 8.1	Lessons are <u>minimally aligned</u> with the unit learning outcomes or are <u>inconsistent</u> with current math pedagogy.	Lessons are <u>aligned with</u> unit learning outcomes and are <u>consistent</u> with current math pedagogy <u>or</u> literacy skills.	Lessons are <u>aligned with</u> unit learning outcomes and are <u>consistent</u> with current math pedagogy <u>and</u> the development of literacy skills.	Lessons are <u>aligned</u> with learning outcomes, <u>consistent</u> with current math pedagogy and the development of literacy skills, <u>and demonstrate seamless integration</u> of math and literacy.
Variety in Instruction TPE 1.7, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7	<u>Limited variety</u> in instructional methods and engagement strategies. <u>Limited or inappropriate</u> use of technology.	A <u>variety</u> of instructional methods and engagement strategies. <u>Appropriate</u> use of technology to engage children or promote access to content, though <u>primarily used by teacher</u> .	A <u>variety</u> of instructional methods and engagement strategies, <u>including</u> activities that provide children <u>opportunities for critical and creative thinking</u> . Appropriate use of technology to engage children <u>or</u> promote <u>equitable access</u> to math and/or literacy.	A <u>variety</u> of instructional methods and engagement strategies, including activities that provide opportunities for critical and creative thinking <u>and utilize a range of communication or activity modes</u> . <u>Clear justification</u> for the use of technology to engage children <u>and</u> promote equitable access to math and/or literacy.

Circle overall rating for Design for Instruction:

1

2

3

4

Instructional Decision-Making

Teaching Process Standard: *The teacher uses on-going analysis of child learning to make instructional decisions.*

4TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Young Children in Learning

TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Core Curriculum for Children’s Learning

TPE 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for PK-3 Settings

TPE 8: Effective Mathematics Instruction in a PK-3 Setting

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Monitoring child Learning TPE 1.6	<p><u>No or limited</u> evidence of monitoring children during instruction.</p> <p>Focus is on <u>external factors</u> (e.g. time, schedule) rather than child behavior or learning.</p>	<p>Evidence of monitoring children during instruction is <u>implied or general</u>.</p> <p>Focus is primarily on <u>behavior or lesson structure</u> rather than child learning.</p>	<p>Evidence of monitoring children during instruction is <u>specifically</u> described.</p> <p>Focus is on child <u>learning and engagement</u>.</p>	<p>Evidence of monitoring children during instruction is connected to <u>specific individuals and groups of children in the class</u>.</p> <p>Focus is on productive child learning and <u>active engagement</u> by all children.</p>
Adjustments Based on Knowledge of child Learning and Providing Access to Curriculum TPE 3.4, 7.10, 8.6	<p>Teacher treats class as “<u>one plan fits all</u>” with no adjustments OR information about child learning is not used, or used inappropriately, to adjust instruction.</p>	<p><u>Some adjustments</u> of the instructional plan are made to address <u>general child needs</u>, with some connections to knowledge of child learning <u>or</u> providing access to curriculum.</p>	<p><u>Appropriate</u> adjustments of the instructional plan are made to <u>specifically</u> address needs of <u>children in this class</u>. These adjustments are <u>informed by the knowledge of child learning related to the unit topic</u> and providing access to curriculum.</p>	<p>Appropriate adjustments of the instructional plan are made to specifically address needs of <u>both whole group and specific children</u>. These adjustments are <u>explicitly informed</u> by the knowledge of child learning, <u>with specific reference to learning outcomes</u>, and providing access to curriculum.</p>
Alignment Between Adjustments and Learning Outcomes TPE 3.4, 7.10	<p>Adjustments to instruction are <u>minimally or not</u> aligned with learning outcomes.</p> <p>Limited or no reasons given for how adjustments would improve child progress.</p>	<p>Adjustments to instruction are <u>generally</u> aligned with learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Adjustments to instruction are <u>specifically aligned</u> with learning outcomes.</p> <p>Reasons for the adjustments <u>specifically address how</u> they would improve child progress.</p>	<p>Adjustments to instruction are <u>explicitly aligned to</u> learning outcomes.</p> <p>Reasons for adjustments include how they would improve cold</p>

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
		Reasons for adjustments address efforts to improve child progress.		progress <u>for the whole class and specific children.</u>

Circle overall rating for Instructional Decision-Making: 1 2 3 4

Analysis of Children’s Learning

Teaching Process Standard: *The teacher uses assessment data to profile child learning and communicate information about child progress and achievement.*

TPE 5: Assessing and Documenting Children’s Development and Learning

TPE 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for PK-3 Settings

TPE 8: Effective Mathematics Instruction in a Pk-3 Setting

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Analysis and Interpretation of Data TPE 5.2, 5.3, 7.10, 8.6	Analysis and interpretation of data: (a) provides <u>limited or no</u> evidence of the number of children meeting the learning outcomes; (b) is <u>missing, inaccurate, or unsupported</u> by evidence; (c) provides a <u>limited description</u> of how the data/scores reflect the learning outcomes; (d) conclusion <u>does not</u> include patterns found from data.	Analysis and interpretation of data: (a) provides <u>some evidence</u> of the number of children meeting <u>at least one</u> of the learning outcomes; (b) is generally <u>accurate</u> , with <u>some supporting evidence</u> ; (c) describes <u>how the data/scores</u> reflect learning related to at least <u>one</u> of the learning outcomes;	Analysis and interpretation of data: (a) provides <u>clear evidence</u> of the number of children meeting <u>each of the two</u> learning outcomes; (b) is generally <u>accurate</u> and <u>clearly supported</u> by <u>evidence from data</u> ; (c) describes how the data/scores reflect learning related to <u>each of the two</u> learning outcomes; (d) conclusion <u>specifically</u> describes patterns found from data.	Analysis and interpretation of data: (a) provides clear evidence of the number of children meeting each of the two learning outcomes <u>and making some or no progress toward the learning outcomes</u> ; (b) is <u>completely</u> accurate, clearly supported by evidence from data with <u>specific examples to support statements</u> ; (c) uses specific examples to describe how the data/ scores reflect <u>each of the two</u> learning outcomes;

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
		(d) conclusion <u>generally</u> describes patterns found from data.		(d) conclusion describes patterns found from data <u>delineated</u> by groups.
Progress Report TPE 5.7	Progress report for child who struggled: (a) uses limited or inappropriate data or examples to describe strengths <u>or</u> areas for growth related to <u>one</u> of the unit outcomes; (b) provides no, limited, or unrealistic suggestions for improving child learning.	Progress report for child who struggled: (a) uses <u>some</u> data <u>or</u> examples to describe strengths <u>or</u> areas for growth related to <u>one</u> of the unit outcomes; (b) provides <u>general</u> suggestions for improving child learning.	Progress report for child who struggled: (a) uses appropriate data <u>and</u> examples to describe strengths <u>and</u> areas for growth related to <u>at least one</u> of the unit outcomes; (b) provides <u>realistic</u> suggestions for improving child learning <u>related to these learning outcomes</u> .	Progress report for child who struggled: (a) uses appropriate data and examples to describe strengths and areas for growth related to <u>both</u> of the unit outcomes; (b) provides realistic and <u>specific</u> suggestions for improving child learning related to these learning outcomes for <u>the needs of this child</u> .

Circle overall rating Analysis of Children’s Learning: 1

2

3

4

Reflection and Self-Evaluation

Teaching Process Standard: *The teacher analyzes the relationship between his or her instruction and child learning in order to improve teaching practice.*

TPE 6: Developing as a Professional Early Childhood Educator

TPE 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for PK-3 Settings

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment	<u>Does not</u> describe effective instructional activities for at least <u>two</u> of these categories: (a) a range of English proficiency, (b) children with identified special learning needs,	Describes <u>effective</u> instructional activities for at least <u>three</u> of these categories: (a) a range of English proficiency,	Describes effective instructional activities and provides <u>plausible</u> justification for at least <u>three</u> of these categories: (a) a range of English proficiency, (b) children with identified special learning needs,	Describes effective instructional activities <u>and</u> provides plausible justification <u>with supporting evidence</u> for <u>all</u> of these categories: (a) a range of English proficiency,

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Does Not Meet Expectations	2 Meets Expectations	3 Meets Expectations at a High Level	4 Exceeds Expectations
TPE 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 7.3	(c) children with different learning needs, (d) children from underserved education groups. Provides limited or no statements about the alignment between assessments and learning outcomes. Does not describe mathematical knowledge OR description of mathematical knowledge does not relate to this unit.	(b) children with identified special learning needs, (c) children with different learning needs, (d) children from underserved education groups. Identifies the alignment between assessments and learning outcomes. Describes mathematical knowledge related to this unit.	(c) children with different learning needs, (d) children from underserved education groups. Identifies <u>and justifies</u> the alignment between assessments and learning outcomes. Describes how mathematical knowledge <u>influenced the success of the unit</u> .	(b) children with identified special learning needs, (c) children with different learning needs, (d) children from underserved education groups. Identifies and justifies the alignment between assessments and learning outcomes, <u>including supporting evidence</u> . Describes how mathematical knowledge influenced the success of the unit, <u>and provides supporting evidence from the unit</u> .
Implications for Future Teaching TPE 6.1	Provides <u>limited or inappropriate</u> suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, or assessment.	Provides two <u>appropriate</u> suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, or assessment.	Provides appropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, or assessment <u>and</u> explains why these adjustments would improve child learning.	Provides appropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, <u>and</u> assessment, <u>connects</u> these suggestions to assessment data, <u>and</u> explains why these adjustments would improve child learning.
Implications for Professional Development TPE 6.3, 6.5	Professional learning goal is not related to practice. Steps are impractical or inappropriate.	Presents a reasonable professional learning goal <u>connected to teaching in general</u> . Appropriate steps described in <u>general</u> terms.	Presents a reasonable professional learning goal <u>connected to the unit</u> . Appropriate steps described in <u>specific</u> terms.	Presents a reasonable professional learning goal <u>based on child learning documented</u> in the unit. Appropriate steps described in specific terms.

Circle overall rating Reflection and Self Evaluation:

1

2

3

4

Appendix F

Fresno State PK-3 Candidate Waiver Request

Last Name	First Name
Boonthavongkham	Bonnie
Cha	Blia
Chavez Geronimo	Esperanza
Cortes	Yenifer
Delgadillo Vega	Yasslyn
Dorantes	Anel
Duarte	Marisol
Flores	Maria Isabel
Garcia	Ileana
Hernandez	Angela
Ibarra Campos	Yesica
Lizarraga Duran	Maricela
Lo	Leena
Mannion	Charlene
Mares	Claudia Jasmine
Mcsweeney	Candice Charity
Millan Aguiar	Azucena
Ortiz	Yesenia
Pacheco	Odalys
Perez	Andrea
Rodriguez	Victoria
Thao	Sue
Vincent	Samantha
Yang	Yer