

REVISED

4E

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

**Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA):
Background and Discussion of Issues**

Executive Summary: This agenda item includes background on Education Code section 44283 and a summary of a public meeting held at the Commission to examine the use of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) as a measure to evaluate a candidate's preservice knowledge, skills, and abilities relative to effective reading and literacy instruction.

Recommended Action: For Information only

Presenters: Roxann Purdue and Jake Shuler,
Consultants, Professional Services Division

Strategic Plan Goal

I. Educator Quality

- b) Develop, maintain, and promote high quality authentic, consistent educator assessments and examinations that support development and certification of educators who have demonstrated the capacity to be effective practitioners.

February 2018

REVISED

Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA): Background and Discussion of Issues

Introduction

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) developed the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) in response to Education Code section 44283 (*Appendix A*). This section of statute requires the Commission to develop, adopt, and administer a reading instruction competence assessment for prospective teachers. As it has been over twenty years since this law took effect, this agenda item provides an opportunity for the Commission to discuss the preparation and assessment of new teachers relative to their readiness to teach reading and develop literacy skills.

A study session on the knowledge and skills teachers need to have to provide reading instruction and literacy development was held during the [October 2016](#) Commission meeting. Additionally, staff facilitated a stakeholder meeting to discuss the topic further on December 20, 2017. This agenda item provides background information on the RICA and examines issues raised during the study session and the public forum related to preparing and assessing new teachers in the area of reading instruction and literacy development.

Background

The California Reading Initiative (CRI), launched in the mid-1990's, was a research informed, multifaceted state effort to improve the reading achievement and literacy levels of California students. As part of this initiative, a bill was passed in 1996 that established Education Code section 44283 which required the Commission to develop, adopt, and administer a reading instruction competence assessment for prospective teachers. The RICA requirement was put in place by the Commission on October 1, 1998 for Multiple Subject candidates. Subsequently, Education Code section 44283.2 added this same requirement for Education Specialist candidates and was put in place by the Commission on January 1, 2000. Passage of the RICA is not required for Single Subject candidates. Additional background on the RICA examination is provided in *Appendix B* with passage rate data provided in *Appendix C*.

A public study session was held by the Commission at its February 2007 meeting to solicit public input regarding the implications and feasibility of incorporating the knowledge, skills, and abilities assessed by the RICA within the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). The public study session and required report to the Governor and the legislature by July 1, 2007 were initiated by SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006) specified in Education Code section 44252.6(c). The public study session resulted in a strong recommendation that the knowledge, skills and abilities assessed by the RICA not be incorporated with the TPA.

Participants from the public study session had multiple reasons for not incorporating the RICA content within the TPA as outlined in a [Commission report](#) on the meeting from April 2007. Two

REVISED

primary concerns from that report were that the depth and breadth of critical RICA content would be lost if incorporated within another assessment and that there are several different TPA versions that would put the valid and reliable assessment of the RICA content at risk. In summary, the public study session concluded without support for incorporating the RICA content with the TPA based on the belief that it would dilute the verification of the beginning teacher's ability to teach reading effectively.

Candidates for the Multiple Subject and Education Specialist teaching credentials are required to pass the RICA prior to being recommended for a preliminary teaching credential. The Commission offers both a RICA Written Examination and a RICA Video Performance Assessment. The RICA is a competency-based assessment that evaluates examinees based on their knowledge of content rather than how well they perform in relation to other examinees. The [RICA content specifications](#) adopted by the Commission in 2009 are consistent with the SBE Standards and Frameworks adopted in 2007, prior to the adoption of the Common Core State Standards. The specific domains currently addressed in the RICA as outlined in the RICA content specifications are:

- Planning, organizing, and managing reading instruction based on ongoing assessment;
- Word analysis;
- Fluency;
- Vocabulary, academic language, and background knowledge; and
- Comprehension.

The Commission adopted revised standards for preliminary general education teacher preparation in December 2015 and revised Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) in June 2016 that align with the current State Board of Education (SBE) adopted [English Language Arts/English Language Development \(ELA/ELD\) Framework](#) (2014). The ELA/ELD Framework provides guidance for implementation of both the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in English Language Arts/Literacy and the California English Language Development Standards. The SBE is responsible for adopting Content Standards and Frameworks for the content taught in California's K-12 public schools. The Commission is charged with ensuring that educators are prepared to teach the SBE adopted content standards. The RICA examination was reviewed with respect to possible changes based on the 2014 framework, but was not modified because the RICA examination focuses specifically on the teaching of reading, and not on the teaching of broader concepts related to literacy development across the curriculum, as called for in the CCSS. The CSET: Multiple Subjects and the CSET: English examinations have been modified to align with the current ELA/ELD Framework and the CCSS.

As part of its effort to overhaul accreditation of educator preparation, the Commission adopted significantly revised teacher preparation standards in 2015. The previous teacher preparation standards included standards 7A and 7B which specifically directed teacher preparation programs regarding the content of their reading methods courses (*Appendix D*). The revised standards moved away from lengthy, prescriptive standards governing the curriculum of teacher education and shifted the focus to development of candidate competence on the TPEs and RICA specifications. As a result, the content that was previously in Standards 7A and 7B is now only

REVISED

addressed within the RICA content specifications, and teacher preparation programs are expected to align their course content for reading instruction with the RICA content specifications in addition to the current program standards and TPEs.

RICA Public Forum at the Commission

On December 20, 2017, a public meeting was held at the Commission to review the RICA, examine what candidates are expected to know about the teaching of reading and development of literacy, and consider how this material is best assessed. The meeting was coordinated by the Commission along with the California Department of Education (CDE), the California State University Center for the Advancement of Reading, and the California Teachers Association (CTA). A public invitation was distributed in the Commission's Professional Services Division (PSD) e-news each Friday beginning on November 9. Overall, there were 87 participants in the meeting, with 49 individuals attending in-person and another 38 attending via online Zoom technology. Attendees came from a wide array of organizations including California State University (CSU), University of California (UC), private universities, CTA, California Federation of Teachers (CFT), California Association for Bilingual Education (CABE), Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), Consortium on Reaching Excellence in Education (CORE), the University of California San Francisco (UCSF) Dyslexia Research Center, Public Advocates, other advocacy organizations, and numerous local education agencies (LEAs).

In person attendees discussed four topics in small groups and were also given a chance to share their thoughts with the whole group and enter short comments into an online program (*Socrative.com*) for the entire group to view. This agenda item includes many of those responses in *Appendix F*. Those attending the meeting via Zoom were placed into online breakout groups and were given the opportunity to discuss the same topics and to enter responses into *Socrative*.

During the meeting, structured discussion time and activities centered around four topics. These topics included:

1. (A) What are the benefits/advantages with RICA?
(B) What are the challenges/difficulties with RICA?
2. What are some options for candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of teaching reading and developing literacy? What mechanism(s) might be most useful – e.g., updated RICA standalone assessment; updated RICA Video Performance Assessment; development of a 3rd cycle in the TPA; course completion; etc.?
3. How well do the former reading preparation Standards 7a & 7b align with the current ELA/ELD Framework?
4. (A) What should candidates know about the teaching of reading and development of literacy?
(B) How is this knowledge best assessed - in programs and/or via a larger-scale assessment?

REVISED

RICA Meeting Feedback

Many participants offered positive feedback about the format of the meeting, including the ability to talk in small groups, hear whole group statements, and to interact with each other through *Socratic* and during a gallery walk activity. Other participants expressed a need for more time to explore the topic in depth.

Participants also expressed an interest in knowing more about the reading instruction assessments of other states. A chart summarizing staff findings on this topic can be found in *Appendix E*. Out of the fifty states and the District of Columbia, forty-one assess elementary teaching candidates in the area of foundational reading skills. Nineteen of the forty-one also included a pedagogy component within their assessment. The depth, breadth, and format of these assessments vary greatly. Foundational reading instruction in general includes content knowledge of the five components of scientific reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Assessments with some level of pedagogy in general include knowledge of development of those areas as well as reading assessment and instruction. Candidates in these assessments generally are asked to apply their knowledge of those areas. Seventeen of the forty-one administered stand-alone reading instruction assessments while the remaining twenty-four assessed the content within the scope of another exam.

Feedback collected from participants during small group discussion in *Socratic* and during a gallery walk activity on poster paper is included in full in *Appendix F*. Some of the more prevalent responses included the following:

- When asked to identify the benefits and advantages of the RICA, participants included its function as a consistent external assessment of teacher knowledge, its use of a variety of assessment types (multiple choice, case studies, short essays) and its ability to help drive conversations for coaching and curriculum development in teacher preparation programs.
- Responses from participants on the challenges and difficulties of the RICA included the financial burden of the exam, that the exam is outdated and not aligned with the current standards/ framework. Others stated that the RICA does not properly address the needs of English learners (ELs) and special populations, and that they believed passage rates based on gender, ethnicity and other factors demonstrate bias. When participants compared former Commission program Standards 7A and 7B to the current ELA Framework, they made similar comments about a disconnect between the standards, the frameworks, and what the RICA is currently assessing.
- When responding to the question regarding what candidates should know about teaching reading and developing literacy, participants identified a broad range of competencies from teaching a love for reading to creating a culture for optimal learning and using a variety of literature across genres that represent students from all backgrounds. The final question asked participants to identify the best ways to assess these identified

REVISED

competencies. Some of the responses included using multiple measures, embedding the assessment completely within programs, adding an additional performance based assessment to the TPAs, and creating a portfolio assessment aligned to a standards based rubric.

Commission Discussion

Education Code section 44283 requires the Commission to administer a reading instruction competence assessment that is aligned to the Reading Program Advisory and Reading Curriculum Frameworks, both published by the State Board of Education (SBE) in 1996 and no longer in effect. While the Commission has an obligation to continue implementing this law, this section of statute should be amended to, at a minimum, ensure ongoing alignment with current research and with the SBE adopted curriculum standards and frameworks.

The public forum surfaced many different views on the RICA and the ways in which a new teacher might best be prepared and assessed on the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed for K-12 reading instruction and literacy development. While the public forum provided an opportunity for rich discussion of these topics, no consensus was reached. Some stakeholders advocated strongly for the elimination of RICA, which was characterized as an unnecessary burden on teacher candidates, while others advocated with equal strength for the need to retain RICA as an important lever to ensure adequate preparation of teachers to teach reading. Clearly, the questions under consideration require a deeper analysis of current research in this area, and an evaluation of the impact of RICA on teacher preparation, teaching practice and student learning.

Next Steps

It is timely for the Commission to evaluate the current scope, role and impact of RICA on teaching practice and student learning, which will be a complex undertaking. Commission staff presents this item for discussion by the Commission, and will develop a plan for next steps based on this discussion.

REVISED

Appendix A

Education Code §44283: Statutory Requirements for RICA

- (a) The Legislature hereby recognizes that teacher competence in reading instruction is essential to the progress and achievement of pupils learning to read in elementary and secondary schools. It is the intent of the Legislature that the commission develop a reading instruction competence assessment to measure the knowledge, skill, and ability of first-time credential applicants who are not credentialed in any state who will be responsible for reading instruction.
- (b) The commission shall develop, adopt, and administer a reading instruction competence assessment consisting of one or more instruments to measure an individual's knowledge, skill, and ability relative to effective reading instruction. The reading instruction competence assessment shall measure the knowledge, skill, and ability of first-time credential applicants who are not credentialed in any state that the commission determines to be essential to reading instruction and shall be consistent with the state's reading curriculum framework adopted after July 1, 1996, and the Reading Program Advisory published by the State Department of Education in 1996. The commission shall perform the following duties with respect to the reading instruction competence assessment:
 - (1) Develop, adopt, and administer the assessment.
 - (2) Initially and periodically analyze the validity and reliability of the content of the assessment.
 - (3) Establish and implement appropriate passing scores on the assessment.
 - (4) Analyze possible sources of bias on the assessment.
 - (5) Collect and analyze background information provided by first-time credential applicants who are not credentialed in any state who participate in the assessment.
 - (6) Report and interpret individual and aggregated assessment results.
 - (7) Convene a task force to advise the commission on the design, content, and administration of the assessment. Not less than one-third of the members of the task force shall be classroom teachers with recent experience in teaching reading in the early elementary grades.
 - (8) Prior to requiring successful passage of the assessment for the preliminary multiple subject teaching credential, certify that all of the teacher education programs approved by the commission pursuant to Section 44227 offer instruction in the knowledge, skills, and abilities required by the assessment.
- (c) Commencing on the earliest feasible date, as determined by the commission, the requirements for issuance of the preliminary multiple subject teaching credential, as set forth in subdivision (b) of Section 44259, shall include successful passage of one of the following components of the reading instruction competence assessment:
 - (1) A comprehensive examination of the knowledge and skill pertaining to effective reading instruction of the credential applicant.
 - (2) An authentic assessment of teaching skills and classroom abilities of the credential applicant pertaining to the provision of effective reading instruction.
- (d) The reading instruction competence assessment is subject to the provisions of Sections 44235.1 and 44298.

REVISED

Appendix B

Background Information: RICA Examination			
Exam Required for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Multiple Subject candidates All Education Specialist candidates 		
Format	Two options: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> RICA Written RICA Video Performance 		
Test Structure	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Written Examination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70 Multiple Choice items across all 5 domains 4 Focused Educational Problems and Instructional Tasks (short constructed response) 1 Extended Case Study (extended constructed response) </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <p>Video Performance Exam</p> <p>3 Video Packets, each including an instructional context form, a 10 minute video, and a reflection form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Video Packet A: Whole-Class instruction Video Packet B: Small-Group Instruction Video Packet C: Individual Instruction </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Written Examination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70 Multiple Choice items across all 5 domains 4 Focused Educational Problems and Instructional Tasks (short constructed response) 1 Extended Case Study (extended constructed response) 	<p>Video Performance Exam</p> <p>3 Video Packets, each including an instructional context form, a 10 minute video, and a reflection form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Video Packet A: Whole-Class instruction Video Packet B: Small-Group Instruction Video Packet C: Individual Instruction
<p>Written Examination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70 Multiple Choice items across all 5 domains 4 Focused Educational Problems and Instructional Tasks (short constructed response) 1 Extended Case Study (extended constructed response) 	<p>Video Performance Exam</p> <p>3 Video Packets, each including an instructional context form, a 10 minute video, and a reflection form</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Video Packet A: Whole-Class instruction Video Packet B: Small-Group Instruction Video Packet C: Individual Instruction 		
Content Assessed – Written and Video Performance	<p>5 Domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning, Organizing and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment Word Analysis Fluency Vocabulary, Academic Language, and Background Knowledge Comprehension 		
Test Administration Schedule	<p>Written Examination (Computer-Based): By appointment, year-round, Monday through Saturday (excluding some holidays).</p> <p>Video Performance Assessment: Three submission windows per year: November, March, and January.</p>		
Testing Time	<p>Written Examination: 4 hour testing window at testing site.</p> <p>Video Performance Assessment: varies per individual candidate, not done at a testing site.</p>		
Cost	\$171 (both Written and Video Performance)		
Exam Development and Validation Processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exam development guided by input from California content expert advisory panel appointed by the Commission in the field of the examination. Content eligible to be assessed on the exam presented in public session to the Commission for review and approval Exam questions reviewed by California content experts and by the Bias Review Committee Exam questions piloted with actual candidates as non-scorable items on test forms Statistical processes used to validate the item is performing appropriately to discriminate between candidates who do and who do not know the content being assessed Items that do not perform appropriately are revised, if possible, or discarded 		
Bias Prevention in Test Development	<p>Bias Review Committee reviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each test question; All candidate directions and scoring rubrics; and All other candidate informational materials for potential bias issues or concerns. 		

REVISED

Background Information: RICA Examination	
	Any issue or concern raised by the Bias Review Committee must be addressed by the Content Expert advisory panel
Bias Prevention in Scoring	Standardized scorer training processes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marker paper selection by California content experts; • content expert design team representation in all stages of development and in on-going operational scoring; • Initial scorer training and calibration; • Recalibration twice per day during scoring activities; • Use of adjudicated papers as an ongoing calibration check; • Back reading by the Chief Scorer; and • Ongoing review of scorer consistency.
Candidate Preparation Materials	Candidate preparation materials include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the RICA written examination – full length practice test; and • For RICA Video Performance examination – an extended preparation guide.
Testing Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RICA Written – 4 hour testing window. May take one or more subtests during the window. • RICA Video Performance – varies per individual candidate, not done at a testing site.

REVISED

Appendix C

RICA Data

Best Attempt Pass Rates for Written and Video by Language, Gender and Ethnicity 2012-17

RICA 2012-17	Examinees								
	Written			Video Performance			Total		
	N	N Pass	%Pass	N	N Pass	%Pass	N	N Pass	%Pass
ALL EXAMINEES	33,876	30,722	90.7	433	214	49.4	33,976	30,931	91.0
Best Language of Communication									
English	31,360	28,575	91.1	400	197	49.3	31,469	28,767	91.4
Spanish	303	241	79.5	6	*	*	303	244	80.5
Vietnamese	2	*	*	0	0	0.0	2	*	*
Cantonese	7	*	*	0	0	0.0	7	*	*
Hmong	4	*	*	0	0	0.0	4	*	*
Other	118	96	81.4	9	*	*	124	104	83.9
No response	2,082	1,802	86.6	18	6	33.3	2,067	1,808	87.5
First Language of Communication									
English only	23,657	21,854	92.4	296	150	50.7	23,744	22,001	92.7
English and one or more other languages	5,428	4,742	87.4	79	37	46.8	5,444	4,777	87.7
One or more languages other than English	2,591	2,221	85.7	40	22	55.0	2,605	2,243	86.1
No response	2,200	1,905	86.6	18	5	27.8	2,183	1,910	87.5
Gender									
Male	5,318	4,486	84.4	118	57	48.3	5,338	4,542	85.1
Female	28,090	25,791	91.8	315	157	49.8	28,170	25,944	92.1
No response	468	445	95.1	0	0	0.0	468	445	95.1
Racial/Ethnic Status									
African American/Black	1,004	841	83.8	26	14	53.8	1,010	853	84.5
Asian American/Asian	1,253	1,168	93.2	4	*	*	1,254	1,170	93.3
Filipino American/Filipino	604	550	91.1	3	*	*	606	552	91.1
Southeast Asia American	522	475	91.0	5	*	*	524	476	90.8
Other	1,634	1,445	88.4	27	11	40.7	1,643	1,456	88.6
Pacific Islander	102	86	84.3	5	*	*	102	87	85.3
Mexican American/Chicano	5,191	4,434	85.4	88	42	47.7	5,205	4,475	86.0
Latino/Latino Amer/Puerto Rican/Other Hispanic	1,984	1,720	86.7	30	15	50.0	1,989	1,735	87.2
Native Amer/Amer Indian/Alaskan Native	196	178	90.8	3	*	*	198	179	90.4
White (non-Hispanic)	16,911	15,720	93.0	210	115	54.8	16,965	15,834	93.3
No response	4,475	4,105	91.7	32	10	31.3	4,480	4,114	91.8

* Note: Pass rates are not reported for subgroups with fewer than ten examinees

REVISED

First Attempt Pass Rates for Written and Video by Language, Gender and Ethnicity 2012-17

RICA 2012-17	Examinees								
	Written 1st			Video Performance 1st			Total 1st		
	N	N Pass	%Pass	N	N Pass	%Pass	N	N Pass	%Pass
ALL EXAMINEES	33,876	22,852	67.5	433	172	39.7	33,976	22,892	67.4
Best Language of Communication									
English	31,889	21,684	68.0	404	159	39.4	31,983	21,719	67.9
Spanish	284	130	45.8	5	*	*	283	130	45.9
Vietnamese	3	*	*	0	0	0.0	3	*	*
Cantonese	8	*	*	0	0	0.0	8	*	*
Hmong	5	*	*	0	0	0.0	5	*	*
Other	121	70	57.9	9	*	*	126	75	59.5
No response	1,566	960	61.3	15	4	26.7	1,568	960	61.2
First Language of Communication									
English only	23,975	17,036	71.1	298	119	39.9	24,046	17,063	71.0
English and one or more other languages	5,599	3,313	59.2	79	30	38.0	5,617	3,318	59.1
One or more languages other than English	2,648	1,487	56.2	40	19	47.5	2,658	1,496	56.3
No response	1,654	1,016	61.4	16	4	25.0	1,655	1,015	61.3
Gender									
Male	5,318	2,917	54.9	118	40	33.9	5,338	2,923	54.8
Female	28,090	19,550	69.6	315	132	41.9	28,170	19,584	69.5
No response	468	385	82.3	0	0	0.0	468	385	82.3
Racial/Ethnic Status									
African American/Black	1,004	553	55.1	26	8	30.8	1,010	555	55.0
Asian American/Asian	1,253	946	75.5	4	*	*	1,254	945	75.4
Filipino American/Filipino	604	403	66.7	3	*	*	606	404	66.7
Southeast Asia American	522	349	66.9	5	*	*	524	349	66.6

* Note: Pass rates are not reported for subgroups with fewer than ten examinees

REVISED

Appendix D

Multiple Subject and Education Specialist Programs: Reading Standard (2001-16)

Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts

Standard 7-A: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction

The preparation program provides substantive, research-based instruction that effectively prepares each candidate to teach reading/language arts. Each candidate will be prepared to deliver a comprehensive program of systematic instruction in reading, writing, listening, and speaking aligned to the state-adopted English Language Arts Content Standards and the Reading/Language Arts Framework (2007). The program provides candidates with systematic, explicit instruction to meet the needs of the *full range of learners (including struggling readers, students with special needs, typologies of English learners, speakers of non-dominant varieties of English, and advanced learners)* who have varied reading levels and language backgrounds, as referenced in the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) Content Specifications and Chapter 7 of the Reading/Language Arts Framework (2007). Language Arts encompasses the domains of: Reading, Writing, Written and Oral English-Language Conventions, and Listening and Speaking.

The preparation program provides each candidate for a multiple subject teaching credential with experience in a classroom where beginning reading is taught. The program places all candidates in field experience sites and student teaching assignments with teachers whose instructional approaches and methods in reading are consistent with the Reading/Language Arts Framework (2007).

The Multiple Subject credential program prepares candidates to do the following:

	Reading	Writing	Listening and Speaking
Instructional Planning/ Objectives/ Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Strategically select and sequence the curricula to be taught as outlined in the Reading/ Language Arts Framework (2007) with opportunities for application using State Board of Education (SBE)-adopted core instructional materials for both instruction and intervention during fieldwork experience.Understand features of instructional design including what to teach and when to introduce skills and concepts, how to select examples, how to integrate standards, and how to teach for transference and generalization of skills.		
Instructional Delivery	Demonstrate knowledge of reading content as described in the RICA Content Specifications and grade level standards as outlined in the Reading/Language Arts Framework (2007). These strands include:	Demonstrate knowledge of components of effective instructional delivery in writing as described in the Reading/Language Arts Framework (2007). For example:	Demonstrate knowledge of components of effective instructional delivery in listening and speaking as described in the Reading/Language Arts Framework (2007). For example:

REVISED

	Reading	Writing	Listening and Speaking
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • word analysis • fluency • vocabulary, academic language, and background knowledge • reading comprehension • literary response and analysis <p>Demonstrate knowledge of components of effective instructional delivery in reading as described in the CA Reading/Language Arts Framework (2007). For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • orientation (e.g., engagement, teacher demonstration) • presentation (e.g., explicit instruction, modeling, pacing) • structured practice (e.g., reinforcement, questioning, feedback) • guided practice (e.g., questioning, feedback, corrections, peer-mediated instruction) independent practice and application • independent practice (e.g. opportunities for students to show level of mastery) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The systematic progression of instruction and application of foundational writing strategies, applications, conventions, and processes • Writing applications according to purposes, audiences, and grade-level appropriate genres (incorporating their corresponding language functions, forms, and vocabulary) • Writing conventions appropriate to grade level standards (i.e. sentence structure, grammar, punctuation, capitalization, and spelling) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The systematic progression of instruction and application to develop listening and speaking strategies and speaking applications that parallel and reinforce instruction in reading and writing • Listening and speaking strategies that include listening comprehension, organization and delivery of oral communication, analysis and evaluation of oral and media communication (grade-level appropriate)
Assessment	Understand that assessment and instruction are linked within any curriculum. Therefore, candidates must demonstrate knowledge and ability to use multiple monitoring measures within the three basic types of assessments (as listed below) to determine students' progress towards state adopted content standards, as referenced in Chapter Six of the Reading Language Arts Framework (2007). Candidates need to be able to analyze and interpret results to plan effective and differentiated instruction and interventions. Knowledge		Understand that assessment and instruction are linked within any curriculum. Therefore, candidates must demonstrate knowledge and ability to utilize ongoing assessments, both formal and informal to determine students' progress towards state adopted content

REVISED

	Reading	Writing	Listening and Speaking
	of the following assessments is crucial to achieving the English Language Arts Content Standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • entry level assessment for instructional planning • monitoring student progress • post-test or summative assessment 		standards. Candidates need to be able to analyze and interpret results to plan effective and differentiated instruction and interventions.
Universal Access/Differentiated Instruction	Demonstrate knowledge of how to organize and manage differentiated reading instruction and interventions to meet the needs of the <i>full range of learners</i> , including recognizing that students should be grouped for interventions according to their assessed instructional needs For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • using all components of California SBE-adopted core instructional materials to make grade-level content accessible to all students • using flexible grouping, individualized instruction, and whole-class instruction as needed • using selections listed in <i>Recommended Literature, Pre-Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve, including culturally and linguistically responsive literature providing additional explicit ELD for English learners at all proficiency levels as needed</i> 		

Intern Program Delivery Model:

The intern preservice component includes introductory preparation relative to Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts: Multiple Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction.

Standard 7-B: Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction

The single subject teaching credential teacher preparation program provides substantive, research-based content literacy instruction (defined below) that effectively prepares each candidate to teach content-based reading and writing skills to a full range of students including struggling readers, students with special needs, typologies of English learners, speakers of non-dominant varieties of English, and advanced learners. The single subject credential program prepares candidates to do the following:

- demonstrate knowledge of components for effective instructional delivery in reading as described in the CA Reading/Language Arts Framework. For example:
 - Orientation (e.g., engagement, teacher demonstration)
 - Presentation (e.g., explicit instruction, modeling, pacing)
 - Structured practice (e.g., reinforcement, questioning, feedback)
 - Guided practice (e.g., questioning, feedback, corrections, peer-mediated instruction)
- provide content-based literacy instruction (i.e., reading, writing, speaking, and listening) to facilitate learning of subject matter for the full range of learners in the classroom
- identify California Content Standards for their subject that require literacy strategies and approaches (e. g., using historical research to interpret events in history-social science, using professional journal articles for science research)

REVISED

- be aware of and understand research-based instructional approaches that build fluency, comprehension and background knowledge; develop academic language, develop study and research skills, and teach writing in the discipline
- use assessments (diagnostic, formative, and summative) for individualized content-based reading instruction in order to monitor student progress and demonstrate the linkage between assessment and instructional needs of all students, including students with special needs, English learners, speakers of non-dominant varieties of English, and advanced learners)

Research-based content literacy instruction includes:

- *Systematic vocabulary development* of words and terminology with general academic utility, as well as specialized vocabulary specific to the subject. Candidates will be prepared to teach the full range of students to do the following:
 - use derivations from Greek, Latin, and Anglo-Saxon roots and affixes in reading assignments (when applicable)
 - utilize cross-linguistic resource sharing (e.g., connections to cognates from students' home languages, use of home language for clarification)
 - learn new and important content vocabulary and review cumulatively and periodically during the school year
 - read independently (at skill level) in the content areas in order to promote vocabulary development
 - use of context clues, apposition, and word structure/analysis
- *Academic language* appropriate to the subject that allows students to read, discuss, interpret, and understand content area texts and other instructional materials. Candidates will be prepared to teach the full range of students to do the following:
 - recognize a variety of content-specific text structures (language functions and forms) to allow students to read and write a wide variety of texts
 - practice content-specific academic language with the support of oral and written scaffolding to facilitate initiating and participating in higher-level academic speaking and writing activities
 - engage in independent reading from a variety of sources to become familiar with a wide variety of academic vocabulary and discourse structure
- *Reading comprehension* strategies and skills that allow students to access grade-level content material in order to activate background knowledge, make connections within and across disciplines, synthesize information, build fluency, and evaluate content area documents. Candidates will be prepared to teach the full range of students to:
 - read a variety of informational texts and reference works, including but not limited to magazines; newspapers; online information; instructional manuals; consumer, workplace, and public documents; signs; and selections listed in *Recommended Literature, Pre-Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*
 - interact with the text based on teacher modeling (e.g., predicting, summarizing, clarifying, questioning)

REVISED

- respond to texts using appropriate critical thinking skills (e.g., synthesizing, paraphrasing, connecting to related topics, and extending ideas through original analysis, evaluation, and elaboration in all academic areas)
 - develop comprehension skills through writing (e.g., writing reports on historical investigations), speaking (e.g., delivering multimedia presentations), and listening (e.g., identifying logical fallacies in oral arguments)
 - read a variety of culturally responsive texts that support content instruction
- *Writing* that allows students to consolidate their subject matter understanding and demonstrate their knowledge using discipline-specific formats. Candidates will be prepared to teach students to:
 - use effective research methodologies (e.g., computer and library searches, notetaking, outlining, summarizing)
 - use the writing process as described in the English Language Arts Content Standards and the Reading Language Arts Framework (prewriting, writing, revising, editing, and presenting)
 - develop strategies for organizing and giving focus to their writing with increased emphasis given to supporting documentation (e.g., provide support for all statements and claims, provide support for major ideas (e.g., through the use of anecdotes, descriptions, facts, statistics, and specific examples))
 - establish a coherent controlling theme that conveys a clear and distinctive perspective on the subject and maintains a consistent tone and focus throughout the piece of writing
 - craft writing at the depth and complexity necessary for their subject matter and grade level
 - present research via multiple pathways in their writing, orally, and through technology, in accordance with state standards
 - effectively incorporate content-specific language, vocabulary, and structures
 - make linguistic choices in their writing that signal awareness of different audiences and purposes

Intern Program Delivery Model:

The intern preservice component includes introductory preparation relative to Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts: Single Subject Reading, Writing and Related Language Instruction.

REVISED

Appendix E

Reading Instruction Assessments: 50 States and DC, January 2018

State	Exam Required	F/P ¹	Format ²	Assessment Name
Alabama	Yes	F/P	S	Praxis Teaching Reading (5204)
Alaska	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
Arizona	No	-	-	-
Arkansas	Yes	F/P	S	Foundations of Reading Assessment
California	Yes	F/P	S	RICA: Reading Instruction Competency Assessment
Colorado	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
Connecticut	Yes	F/P	S	Foundations of Reading Assessment
Delaware	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
Florida	Yes	F	E	FTCE Elementary Education K-6 Subtest in Language Arts & Reading
Georgia	Yes	F	E	GACE Early Childhood Education Test I
Hawaii	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
Idaho	Yes	F/P	S	ICLA: Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Assessment
Illinois	Yes	F	E	Elementary Education (grades 1-6) Test: Subtest 1 Language and Literacy
Indiana	Yes	F	E	Elementary Education Generalist CORE Assessment
Iowa	No	-	-	-
Kansas	No	-	-	-
Kentucky	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
Louisiana	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
Maine	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
Maryland	No	-	-	-
Massachusetts	Yes	F/P	S	Foundations of Reading Assessment
Michigan	No	-	-	-
Minnesota	Yes	F	E	MTLE: Minnesota Teacher Licensure Examination Elementary Education Content
Mississippi	Yes	F/P	S	Foundations of Reading Assessment
Missouri	Yes	F	E	Missouri Educator Gateway Assessment: Elementary Education Multi-Content Test
Montana	No	-	-	-
Nebraska	No	-	-	-
Nevada	No	-	-	-
New Hampshire	Yes	F/P	S	Foundations of Reading Assessment
New Jersey	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
New Mexico	Yes	F/P	S	Essential Components of Elementary Reading Instruction
New York	Yes	F	E	NYSTCE: New York State Teacher Certification Exam Multi-Subject: Teachers of Childhood
North Carolina	Yes	F/P	S	Foundations of Reading Assessment
North Dakota	No	-	-	-
Ohio	Yes	F/P	S	Foundations of Reading Assessment
Oklahoma	Yes	F	S	Oklahoma Reading Test
Oregon	Yes	F/P	E	Early Childhood Education Assessment
Pennsylvania	Yes	F/P	E	Pennsylvania Educator Certification Test for PreK-4 Subarea 1 of Module 2
Rhode Island	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
South Carolina	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)

REVISED

State	Exam Required	F/P ¹	Format ²	Assessment Name
South Dakota	No	-	-	-
Tennessee	Yes	F/P	S	Praxis Teaching Reading: Elementary Education (5203)
Texas	Yes	F/P	E	TEXES Core Subjects EC-6 English Language Arts & Science of Teaching Reading
Utah	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
Vermont	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
Virginia	Yes	F/P	S	Praxis Reading for Virginia Educators: Elementary and Special Education (5306)
Washington	Yes	F/P	S	Essential Components of Elementary Reading Instruction
West Virginia	Yes	F/P	S	Praxis Teaching Reading: Elementary Education (5203)
Wisconsin	Yes	F/P	S	Foundations of Reading Assessment
Wyoming	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)
Washington DC	Yes	F	E	Praxis II Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects Subtest Reading & Language Arts (5002)

¹ Foundational reading instruction content knowledge (F) assessed and/or pedagogy for providing reading instruction (P) assessed. The depth, breadth, and format of these assessments varies greatly. Foundational reading instruction in general includes content knowledge of the five components of scientific reading instruction: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Assessments with some level of pedagogy in general include knowledge of development of those areas as well as reading assessment and instruction. Candidates in these assessments generally are asked to apply their knowledge of those areas.

² Format: Embedded Content (E)/ Stand-Alone (S) Exam

REVISED

Appendix F

Responses entered directly into Socrative.com by participants of December 20, 2017 meeting

1A. What are the benefits and advantages with RICA?

- Determining next steps and strategies from student work samples in the short constructed responses and case study.
- Focus on Foundational Skills, the technical knowledge that teachers must have to teach reading, the application of that knowledge, and accountability within our preparation programs.
- Outside assessment and necessary. Special education important for inclusion and push in. Demonstration given may not teach reading daily.
- One benefit is a consistent measurement of teacher knowledge.
- There are no benefits/advantages with the RICA.
- Inspires EPPs to prepare candidates to teach Reading, provides data to the institutions, passing rates show that teaching reading is not an easy subject to teach.
- Testing is an easy way to check for understanding and make students accountable for the information and generates money for the Commission.
- Reading content knowledge is tested and in a variety of ways- multiple choice, case studies, short essays.
- A single measure exclusively for reading.
- Prioritizes reading instruction in multiple subjects and education specialists programs.
- An external assessment that confirms that candidates have the knowledge and skills needed.
- Puts an emphasis on literacy for candidates.
- RICA ensures breadth of grade level, especially early literacy, in absence of two placements.
- RICA ensures consistency among IHEs.
- Helps craft curriculum for Teacher prep programs.
 - Students pay attention during coursework when it relates to RICA.
 - Connection between assessment and instruction -we learn strategies to identify growth and areas of strength in our students.
 - Standardized test with an option (standardized and performance task).
 - Emphasizes for Students that reading is important.
 - Helps drive conversations for Students learning and coaching.
- All multiple subject and SPED candidates are required to take the RICA.
- Standard & Accountability.
- Standardized assessment.
- We barely got started, and then our breakout room was closed. (Zoom breakout group 1)

1B. What are the challenges and difficulties with RICA?

- The test is outdated and not well aligned to current ELA/ELD standards and framework.

REVISED

- The financial burden on the candidates and the disparities among racial, ethnic, and multilingual groups of test takers in terms of the number of times they have to take the test in order to pass.
- No connection between the assessment and teacher competency.
- Creates an obstacle from teachers who are coming from low-socioeconomic communities and candidates of colors from entering the teacher profession.
- The COST is a major issue for students; creates an equity issue (looking at groups of students who do (not) pass on the first try and are required to pay to take it again); contributes to teacher shortage, in that students drop out of program or leave profession for cost or other reasons.
- Exam has NOT impacted student reading achievement and does not adequately assess credential students' abilities to teach reading or the current ELA/ELD framework.
- Too long of a test in one sitting- give them a break- Test anxiety is a barrier.
- Does this test really capture real life situations?
- Test is limited to just reading leaves out ELA.
- Linguistically and culturally diverse students have the lowest passing rates and their test anxiety is already higher and they don't want to take it.
- Scores show a strong correlation between the testing and course date- is it a short-term knowledge test? Or do we want these skills to carry over throughout the career.
- Is there a duplication between RICA and CalTPA?
- Is there a correlation between RICA and better prepared teachers?
- Difficult to keep up with changes in standards. Lag time.
- Test is not aligned to current framework.
- Should be CTC/CDE decision; not legislature decision (fixed effect).
- Teacher candidates who were ELs have a lower pass rate; does that affect diversity and the teacher pipeline?
- Can a single test match the complexity of knowledge needed to teach literacy?
- Not authentic to teaching – maybe best to move to the video based. You cannot implement it. There should be better ways to do this.
- The multiple choice questions on test seemed rigged. There are ten that do not count but are just “try out questions.” That is Vegas-like behavior.
- The RICA does not align with DOK and common core. Students will not be prepared for today's classroom.
- Students are not assessed on writing very much. The content is focused on foundational skills. They do not address needs of struggling readers in the 5th grade very well.
- Disproportionally impacts EL teacher candidates.
- Cost
- Teacher shortage, bias, cost.
- Bias, in gender, ethnicity, race, linguistic, sped.
- For a teacher candidate who speaks 1 or more languages, 14% of those teacher candidates do not pass (based on data). Systemic inequity.
- Content of the test is misaligned to current ELA/ELD standards.

REVISED

- Is RICA measuring that you know how to teach these skills (reading & literacy) or that you can TALK about teaching these skills?
- Content & Design Issues
 - Design problems with RICA re: poor questions and super narrow focus on early reading and heavy phonics; language of test is tricky and not authentic assessment of teacher knowledge; language is a barrier for candidates who use languages other than English.
 - Does not address expansive nature of literacy particularly writing and CCSS emphasis on cross-genre reading comprehension.
 - Constrains opportunities to teach literacy pedagogy in TED programs.
- Framework calls for integrated literacy and RICA isolates reading to give a skewed view of effective instruction.

2. What are some options for candidates to demonstrate their knowledge of teaching reading and literacy?

- Create some options for candidates with serious test anxiety and/or who have just missed passing by a few points multiple times.
- Option 1 - Incorporate assessment of deep knowledge of teaching literacy into an existing assessment, e.g., TPA.
- Option 2 - Revamp RICA to reflect current standards and framework; eliminate costs for repeat test takers, give more specific feedback to test takers on what the sections they did not pass, allow test takers to only retake the section they didn't pass.
- Why not apply some of the computer adaptive strategies from CAASPP to a literacy assessment? Aren't there advances in assessment that could improve the outcomes for candidates?
- Incorporate into program standards and focus on within the program. Another option is to add on to the EdTPA. ED Specialists do not have TPAs at this time but hopefully will in the near future. Once that occurs if it could become the mechanism for authentic evaluation that is preferred over an exam at a testing center.
- Passing a certain amount of credits in literacy instruction focused coursework that has been approved by the State.
- A literacy instruction focused TPA Cycle.
- Class that is embedded as part of the teacher credentialing program that is mindful of diverse populations. Focus on language.
- Tech integrated models in multiple grade levels (watching and analyzing)
- TPAs need to assess reading specifically.
 - Incorporate how to teach students with dyslexia.
 - Observations through videos.
 - Special courses are needed including struggling readers and students with special needs.
 - Document how universities are meeting needs.
- We really need to define what we want our candidates to know and be able to do and then design an assessment that measures that- we do believe in accountability.

REVISED

- A hybrid where content is embedded within the program like other content and the TPA assesses instruction of reading in addition to assessment by the program.
- With EdTPA, cannot imagine candidates being required to write more about teaching reading.
- Integrate into CalTPA for both multiple and single subject candidates or add Literacy as an extra module or cycle in TPA. The module can address the foundations of reading for multiple subjects, and reading in the content areas (e.g., PE, Music, ELA, etc.) for single subject candidates.
- RICA has not impacted K12 reading achievement. Time to drop it.
- Update the RICA to address today's approach to Foundational skills and require all prospective teachers (MS, SS, and Ed Sp) to pass it.
- Use current coursework, observation, and participation requirements to ensure that candidates are able to demonstrate KSAs of best practices in early literacy.
- Demonstrate through TPA (adding a 3rd cycle that assess for reading and literacy foundational skills).
Embed in coursework through an assignment in a Teacher prep program.
- A combination of content area knowledge competency along with video evaluations submitted after a certain number of hours of supervised instruction, particularly in Structured Literacy approaches in conjunction with CCSS. All candidates need to know how to identify, assess and effectively teach students with dyslexia.
- Completion of course work with high grade that includes assessment of early literacy instruction and case study requirement as signature assignment for course. Field work with documented demonstration of effective and responsive literacy skills instruction.
- We need to be consistent with what we know in education about assessment for teachers too! What makes acceptable assessment? Multiple measures. So if the RICA is used, it should only be ONE of the measures used to determine preparation. Also, video or portfolio or lesson plans and/or grades from a course. So, say you need to be within a certain range on two of the three criteria, etc. to demonstrate skill. The other option is if you are close to being in the range of passing, then you can petition with video or other to demonstrate your preparation. This allows good test takers as well as qualified candidates the fair chance to pass.

3. After mapping the Circles of Implementation (Current ELA/ELD Framework) to Standards 7A and 7B, are there things missing from 7A and 7B?

- Comprehensive ELD, including integrated and designated ELD, are not addressed in standards 7A/7B. The standards also use language and promote approaches that stem from a deficit perspective.
- Standards 7A/7B do not address the five themes in the ELA/ELD framework, nor the elements of the instructional context in the circles of implementation. Focuses more narrowly on reading and foundational skills and direct/explicit methods of instruction.
- Single subject teachers need more K & S related to literacy.
- The ELD content that is included in the Foundational Skills should be included in what is taught, practiced, and assessed.

REVISED

- Foundational literacy skills should be taught to all teacher candidates, practiced, and all candidates should demonstrate they have the K & S.
- They do not align. 7a and 7b are very specific, but focus on reading and not literacy as a concept.
 - No text structures. RICA does not approach a text which is needed in common core. No pedagogy in 7a & 7b.
 - Comprehension is very thin in the RICA.
 - RICA is input information, not output information. RICA is recall instead of production.
- This is a multi-day activity that should be done by people who are intimately knowledgeable about each of the documents. Given that, the content specifications are fairly comprehensive, however not aligned to the current ELA and ELD content standards and Framework. If the RICA is redesigned, the alignment should start with getting the content specifications aligned to the ELA/ELD Framework.
- Expectations for content areas, especially in single subject programs.
- Writing assessment (e.g., rubrics, grammar, etc.) and writing development - beyond spelling development.
- What is missing from RICA is attention to writing, listening, and speaking (evident in both 7A and new framework). 7A/7B does not align with the big picture of implementation and the framework's articulation of integrated and designated ELD. The new TPE ELA Standard 1 emphasizes purposeful reading and listening to build discipline-specific knowledge in the content areas.
- 7-A and 7-B.
- Integrated and designated ELD are missing from St. 7.
- Content area literacy is missing from St. 7.
- Oral language development.

4A. What should candidates know now about the teaching of reading and literacy? (Comments in no particular order – based on recorded information on the poster paper following the gallery walk activity).

- The role of motivation/learning how to read
- The ability to read and cite evidence
- The ability to express point of view
- Understanding language dialect variations
- How a teacher teaches reading/literacy and Analyzing assessments
- Comparing text to self, world and other texts
- Vocabulary
- Text analysis and relationship to digital text
- Discipline specific literature and knowledge
- Morphology, syntax, and phonology
- Interest level and where it intersects
- Reading and literacy should be fun and engaging
- How do we define engaging

REVISED

- Foundational importance of reading and literacy
- Reading and literacy should be across all subjects
- ELD framework and content specifications
- Technical skills of reading
- California standards/frameworks
- Scientifically-based reading research for best practices
- Balanced approach to reading, writing, speaking and listening strategies and skills
- Gradual release model
- Assessment links assessment to instruction
- Diagnosing and intervening
- How to differentiate instruction
- Reading process
- Matching activities to objectives
- Content literacy
- ELD Instruction
- Dialects (AAVE) or second language
- How to select assessment based on what students show (decision making)
- Love for reading, literacy, how to teach using authentic activities
- Application of reading, writing, speaking list
- Progression mindfulness
- Normative assessment
- Diagnostic intervention
- Foundational skills and application
- Creating a culture for optimal learning, motivating, challenging, integrated, respectful engaging
- Writing – how to write to learn versus how to write to show learning
- Integrating the literacies
- Integrating the literacies across content
- Research evidence based strategies
- Ages, stages of development
- Authentic reading, writing culture (time to read, choice, response)
- Parental engagement
- Metacognition
- Fostering life-long literacy
- Addressing diverse learners, meeting needs, identifying funds of knowledge
- Linguistic diversity
- Variety of literature across genres to represent students from all backgrounds
- Literacy for empowerment (critical literacy, social justice connections)
- Media literacy, visual literacy for ELs
- Honoring student voices and experiences space for home languages (with growing dual language programs in CA)

REVISED

- English as language of power – need to address power dynamics regarding all languages not a deficit lens

4B. How is this knowledge best assessed – in programs and/or larger scale assessments?

- Program based performance assessment
- Early literacy should be assessed through already required observation in primary grades
- Best assessed in programs gives a holistic approach and provides candidates time to reflect
- Multiple measures, multiple indicators, multiple opportunities to demonstrate skills
- Part of Credential, Induction, and beyond
- Case Studies
- Embedded assignments in Teacher Ed programs
- Induction by video
- Signature assignment in Teacher Ed Programs aligned to TPEs
- Performance based – teach, observe, conference, in-person, reteach (cycle)
- Rubric aligned with standards
- Student growth
- Tech integrated performance assessment that can be used with rubric that can be used beyond a large scale assessment
- Example of above, video of 2nd grade students reading, teacher develops implementation plan based on rubric
- Performance
- Context specific with authentic format
- Embedded in coursework
- Portfolio assessment
- Identifying foundational skills and a lesson plan
- Really integrate them
- Separate task on TPA
- In programs