

---

---

# 2C

## Information/Action

### *Educator Preparation Committee*

#### **Update on the Development of Draft Literacy Program Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations Pursuant to Senate Bill 488**

---

---

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents for the Commission’s review draft Literacy Program Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for Multiple Subject (MS), Single Subject (SS), Education Specialist – Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN), and the proposed PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Instruction Credential. The draft Standards and TPEs are currently undergoing a field review, and the agenda item includes a summary of early findings from the field. This item also presents an update on the work to implement Senate Bill 488 (Chap. 678, Stats. 2021). The Commission will review the work to date and provide staff direction in preparation for possible adoption of new standards and TPEs at the October 2022 Commission meeting.

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission review the draft Literacy Program Standards and TPEs and provide feedback and direction to staff regarding next steps.

**Presenters:** Nancy Brynelson and Roxann Purdue, Consultants, Professional Services Division

#### **Strategic Plan Goals**

##### ***II. Program Quality and Accountability***

- a) Develop and maintain rigorous, meaningful, and relevant standards that drive program quality and effectiveness for the preparation of the education workforce and are responsive to the needs of California’s diverse student population.

---

# Update on the Development of Draft Literacy Program Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations Pursuant to Senate Bill 488

---

## Introduction

This agenda item presents for the Commission’s review draft Literacy Program Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for Multiple Subject (MS), Single Subject (SS), Education Specialist – Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN), and the proposed PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist credential. The draft Standards and TPEs are currently undergoing a field review, and the agenda item includes a summary of early findings from the field. This item also presents an update on the work to implement [Senate Bill 488 \(Chap. 678, Stats. 2021\)](#). The Commission will review the work to date and provide staff direction in preparation for possible adoption of new standards and TPEs at the October 2022 Commission meeting.

## Requirements of SB 488

Senate Bill (SB) 488 amended Education Code sections [44283](#) and [44283.2](#) and revised the definition of “study of effective means of teaching literacy” in [Education Code 44259 \(b\)\(4\)\(A\) and \(B\)](#) and requires the Commission to complete a series of actions related to literacy instruction. These sections of statute apply to the MS, SS in English and Education Specialist credentials and specify that the study of effective means of teaching literacy include evidence-based means of teaching foundational reading skills in print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency to all pupils, including tiered supports for struggling readers, English learners, and pupils with exceptional needs. The Commission is required to update program standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) to ensure alignment with the current State Board of Education (SBE) adopted [English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework](#) and incorporate the [California Dyslexia Guidelines](#).

In February 2022, [Agenda Item 3C](#) provided information regarding the implementation of SB 488 along with a draft Resource Guide on Preparing Teachers for Effective Literacy Instruction that is a compilation of state adopted materials that impact literacy instruction in California and is intended to serve as a resource for teacher preparation programs to support effective preparation for literacy instruction. In June 2022, [Agenda Item 3C](#) provided the Commission’s first annual report to the Legislature on the implementation of SB 488. Some of the key requirements of SB 488 are as follows:

- a. By September 1, 2022, the Commission will ensure that all requirements regarding the content of teacher preparation in literacy instruction in [EC 44259 \(b\) \(4\) \(A\) and \(B\)](#) are included in the program standards of quality and effectiveness for the preliminary Multiple Subject, Education Specialist, and Single Subject English Language Arts credentials.

- b. By September 1, 2024, Commission program standards and TPEs for preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject English Language Arts, and Education Specialist credentials must include satisfactory completion of research-based comprehensive reading instruction, as specified, and incorporate the [California Dyslexia Guidelines](#).
- c. By July 1, 2025, the Commission must develop and implement a literacy instruction performance assessment that assesses all Multiple Subject and Education Specialist candidates for competence in effective means of teaching literacy, including but not limited to evidence-based methods of teaching foundational reading skills. This assessment must be aligned to the [ELA/ELD Framework](#), program standards of quality and effectiveness, and TPEs.
- d. Before requiring successful passage of the literacy performance assessment, the Commission must certify that the teacher education programs approved by the Commission pursuant to section [44227](#) offer instruction in the knowledge, skills, and abilities required by the assessment.

The Commission's Literacy Workgroup (see [Appendix A](#)) undertook a review of the Commission's adopted Educator Preparation Program Standards and related Literacy TPEs and made recommendations for additions and revisions for consideration by the Commission in accordance with SB 488. The initial focus of the workgroup has been on needed updates to program standards and TPEs for MS, SS, and Education Specialist- Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) and the proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist preliminary credential candidates.

Program Standards and TPEs for the remaining three Education Specialist Credentials (Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH), and Visual Impairments (VI)) credentials will be developed with content experts followed by a field review with focus groups and a possible survey. The intent will be to present them to the Commission at its October meeting.

Drafts of the MS/SS, Education Specialist (MMSN and ESN) and PK-3 ECE Specialist Literacy Program Standards and TPEs have been released to the field via surveys for review. The literacy workgroup will have a final meeting on September 13, 2022, to review the data from the field review surveys as well as feedback and direction from Commissioners and recommend any final revisions they think necessary and appropriate prior to staff presenting the full set of Literacy Program Standards and TPEs to the Commission for adoption in October 2022.

### **Background**

One primary role of the Commission is to create and adopt Program Standards for educator preparation programs that are consistent with research-based practice and requirements set forth in the law. Educator preparation programs must design and implement a program for candidates that meets those standards in a manner that best fits their local and institutional contexts, situation, and candidate populations. Educator preparation programs approved by the Commission must demonstrate how the program provides candidates with quality preparation that meets all the Commission's program standards and TPEs.

Program standards address both broad and specific topics, including the program’s overall design and curriculum, as well as opportunities for candidates to learn, practice, and be assessed on their progress towards meeting the TPEs. TPEs identify the knowledge, skills and abilities teacher candidates should be competent in when they complete their teacher preparation program. [Program Standard 2](#) requires educator preparation programs to provide candidates with opportunities to learn, practice, and be assessed on the knowledge, skills, and abilities of each TPE.

All educator preparation programs approved by the Commission must demonstrate that they meet all program standards and performance expectations applicable to their particular program. The process of demonstrating meeting program standards and TPEs occurs through a seven-year cycle of institutional accreditation that involves documentation, review, annual reporting, and institutional site visits. The Commission’s authority to accredit sponsors of educator preparation programs is detailed in [EC 44372 \(c\)](#) and is overseen by the Commission appointed [Committee on Accreditation](#). Through this process, the Commission *accredits* institutions that offer preparation programs that have been *approved* following intensive program review in response to the Commission’s adopted standards of quality and effectiveness. Only programs that have been individually approved based on the Commission’s standards can lead to a credential; only institutions that are accredited by the Commission’s Committee on Accreditation can offer approved programs leading to a credential. For more information on the accreditation system see the [Accreditation Framework](#).

#### *Draft Literacy Standards and Teaching Performance Expectations*

The draft Literacy Program Standards and TPEs, developed with guidance from the Literacy Workgroup and with input from a wide variety of experts in reading and literacy, are included as appendices in this item. The Literacy Program Standards and TPEs for the Preliminary MS/SS credentials may be found in [Appendix B](#), the Preliminary Education Specialist credentials (MMSN and ESN) in [Appendix C](#), and the proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist credential in [Appendix D](#).

Currently the TPEs are organized into six domains – Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning; Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning; Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning; Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students; Assessing Student Learning; and Developing as a Professional Educator. A seventh domain is proposed to be added to address literacy as required in SB 488. Table 1 illustrates the number of literacy TPE elements proposed for each credential type.

<b>Table 1: Proposed Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students/Children TPEs by Credential Type</b>	<b>Number of Proposed Literacy TPE Elements</b>
General Education Universal TPEs (MS/SS) ( <a href="#">Appendix B</a> )	12 Universal literacy TPE elements that will serve as the core for all teaching credentials
Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) ( <a href="#">Appendix C</a> )	6 MMSN + 12 Universal literacy elements
Education Specialist Extensive Support Needs (ESN) ( <a href="#">Appendix C</a> )	7 ESN + 12 Universal literacy elements
Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist ( <a href="#">Appendix D</a> )	12 Universal literacy TPEs adapted and augmented for PK-3 ECE
Education Specialist – Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE)	Under development; expected by October CTC meeting
Education Specialist – Visual Impairments (VI)	Under development; expected by October CTC meeting
Education Specialist – Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH)	Under development; expected by October CTC meeting

**Ensuring that the Literacy Program Standards and TPEs Address the Requirements of SB 488**

The intent of the draft Literacy Program Standard and TPEs for the MS, SS, Education Specialist – MMSN and ESN, and proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist credentials are both to exemplify the type of program that will prepare candidates to teach literacy effectively so that all California children and students learn to read, write, listen, speak, and think critically in all academic disciplines, and to fulfill the requirements of SB 488. The draft program standards and TPEs draw from and incorporate current research on the science of reading as well as state academic standards, frameworks, and other policy documents, as required in SB 488. Crosswalks have been prepared (see [Appendix E](#)) to identify where each element of SB 488 is addressed in the draft Literacy Program Standard and TPEs for MS and SS preliminary credentials. The crosswalks were developed using the MS and SS credentials since they are the basis for the Literacy Program Standards for the Education Specialist (MMSN and ESN) and proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist credentials. The crosswalks are organized by charts that compare the requirements of SB 488 to each paragraph of the program standard or TPE. Legislative text is repeated in numerous places as the requirements are addressed in many sections of the draft program standard and in many of the elements of the proposed Literacy TPEs.

**Field Review Surveys**

Three field review surveys were made available to the public beginning in July 2022 for constituents to provide feedback on the draft literacy program standard and TPEs for [Multiple Subject/Single Subject](#) (July 18, 2022), [Education Specialist- MMSN and ESN](#) (July 26, 2022), and the [Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist](#) (July 28, 2022). These surveys will remain available to any interested individuals to complete through September 2, 2022. Field review focus groups for ECSE, DHH, and VI are expected to be conducted prior to the October Commission meeting.

The language of the standard is organized into sections for all three surveys. The sections are:

- Introduction/Overarching Concepts
- Foundational Skills
- Meaning Making
- Language Development
- Effective Expression
- Content Knowledge
- Literacy Instruction for Students/Children with Disabilities
- Integrated and Designated English Language Development
- Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations and Clinical Practice

The survey questions for each section of the program standards are:

1. *Is the section clear?* This question addresses the need for the language of the section of the standard to be understood as written by the reader.
  - a. *If not, what language is not clear?* This question allows respondents who feel the language is unclear to identify what portions of the section of the standard need clarification.
2. *Is the proposed section appropriate for the credential area?* This question attends to the appropriateness of skills that the program must address in the identified credential area.
  - a. *If not, what is not appropriate?* This question allows respondents who determined skills to be inappropriate to identify those skills.
3. *Are there any additional concepts that should be included in the section?* This question provides respondents with the opportunity to determine if any additional skills may need to be included in the section of the standard.
  - a. *If yes, what concepts are missing?* This question allows respondents to supply any content they feel is not included and should be included in the section of the standard.

At the conclusion of the standard, respondents were asked:

4. *On a scale of 1-10, how confident do you feel that the development of the draft literacy standard is on track to be in accordance with SB 488? (1- not at all confident, 10- extremely confident). Please explain your rating.* This question allows respondents to provide their confidence rating in relation to SB 488 and the current draft of the standard, as well as an opportunity to explain their given rating.

The questions for the proposed literacy TPEs were the same for all three surveys:

1. *Is the TPE language clear?* This question addresses the need for the language of the TPE to be understood as written by the reader.
  - a. *If not, what language is not clear?* This question allows respondents who feel the language is unclear to identify what portions of the TPE elements need clarification.

2. *Are there any knowledge, skills, or abilities included in the proposed TPEs in this domain that should be removed?* This asks respondents to determine if the knowledge, skills, and abilities included in the TPE element are unreasonable for a beginning teacher.
  - a. *If yes, what content should be removed?* This question allows respondents who determined any TPE knowledge, skills, or abilities to be unreasonable to identify them here.
3. *Are there any knowledge, skills, or abilities missing that should be included in the proposed TPEs in this domain?* This question provides respondents with the opportunity to determine if any additional knowledge, skills, or abilities may need to be included in the TPE elements.
  - a. *If yes, what content is missing?* This question allows respondents to supply any content they feel should be included in the TPEs.
4. *Is the TPE language job-related for a beginning teacher for the credential area?* This question allows respondents to determine if the knowledge, skills, and abilities described in the TPEs are appropriate and relevant for a teacher just beginning their practice.
5. *Are the skills described in the TPE language needed by all beginning teachers for their credential area from their first day on the job?* This question provides respondents the opportunity to determine if the knowledge, skills, and abilities described in the TPEs are required for first day success.
6. *On a scale of 1-10, how confident do you feel that the development of the draft literacy TPEs are on track to be in accordance with SB 488? (1- not at all confident, 10- extremely confident). Please explain your rating.* This question allows respondents to provide their confidence rating in relation to SB 488 and the current draft of the TPE elements, as well as an opportunity to explain their given rating.

### **Discussion of the Preliminary Feedback from the Field Review Surveys**

Surveys remain open until September 2, 2022. A summary of preliminary results submitted as of August 9 are reported in the following tables.

At the time of the analysis, over half of the 91 respondents responded that the program standard and TPE language is clear, appropriate, job-related, and needed by all beginning teachers as they begin their first employment. In addition, the majority of respondents reported they were confident that the development of program standards and TPEs are on track to be in accordance with SB 488. Even though the majority of respondents agree that program standards and TPEs are clear, appropriate, job-related, and needed by all beginning teachers, specific suggestions were offered which will inform the further development of the program standards and TPEs. The full preliminary survey results including both Likert scales and open-ended comments are available in the following Google docs: [MS/SS Survey Results](#), [Education Specialist MMSN and ESN Survey Results](#), and Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Survey Results.

## Multiple Subject/Single Subject Survey Results

As of August 9, 2022, 91 respondents completed the field review survey for MS/SS. Table 2 provides information about who responded to the survey.

**Table 2: MS/SS Respondents**

Respondents*	N=91
Higher Education Faculty- Four Year Program	43
Higher Education Faculty- Community College	5
PK-12 Practitioner- Multiple Subject	18
PK-12 Practitioner- Single Subject English Language Arts	13
PK-12 Practitioner- Single Subject- Other	1
Literacy Researcher	10
Policy Advocate	6
Other	33

\*Respondents could select more than one option

The highest number of respondents represented Higher Education Faculty from Four Year Programs with 43 respondents. The lowest represented category was PK-12 Practitioner-Single Subject-Other with one respondent.

For respondents who reported that they work in teacher preparation, 44 work with Traditional Fifth Year Teacher Preparation Programs, 21 with University Intern Programs, four with District Intern Programs, 10 with Teacher Residency Programs and 14 with Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Programs. Respondents could report that they work in multiple teacher preparation settings.

Respondents to the survey were asked to make their ratings for each question on a five-point Likert scale – Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. They were asked to consider if the sections of the program standards were clear, appropriate for the credential, and if additional concepts needed to be added. To see the full range of Likert scale data for MS/SS respondents, see the [Google Document](#).

**Table 3: Percent of MS/SS Respondents Who Strongly Agree or Agree**

Multiple Subject/Single Subject Program Standard N=91	Clear	Appropriate for the Credential	Not Needing Additional Concepts to be Included
Introduction/Overarching Concepts	82%	92%	78%
Foundational Skills	84%	84%	77%
Meaning Making	85%	85%	84%
Language Development	84%	89%	82%
Effective Expression	75%	80%	85%
Content Knowledge	79%	81%	90%
Literacy Instruction for Students with Disabilities	71%	65%	66%



Multiple Subject/Single Subject Program Standard N=91	Clear	Appropriate for the Credential	Not Needing Additional Concepts to be Included
Integrated and Designated English Language Development	74%	75%	84%
Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations	70%	68%	77%

Data in Table 3 illustrates the number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that the components were clear, appropriate, or needed additional concepts. Data ranges between a low of 65% in agreement when reviewing the theme of Literacy Instruction for Students with Disabilities and a high of 92% in agreement when examining the Introduction and Overarching Concepts. Overall, 14 of the 27, about half of the respondent ratings, are at or above 80% agreement that the components are clear and appropriate for MS/SS candidates. For the questions for which respondents were asked whether additional concepts were needed, 66% up to 90% of respondents reported that no additional concepts were needed. The lowest point of 66% was in response to the question about additional concepts being needed for Literacy Instruction for Students with Disabilities.

**Table 4: Percent Strongly Agree or Agree**

Multiple Subject/Single Subject N=91	Clear	Job-Related	Needed for the First Day on the Job
TPE Domain 7	73%	86%	75%

Seventy-three percent reported that TPE elements for MS/SS were clear, 86% found that the TPE elements were job-related, and 75% of respondents reported that the TPE knowledge, skills, and abilities are needed for the first day on the job as a teacher. For open-ended comments on what language is not clear, what content should be removed, and what content should be added, see [the Google Document](#).

**Table 5: Confidence Rating in Accordance with SB 488 for MS/SS Program Standard and TPEs**

Multiple Subject/ Single Subject on 10- point scale N=91	Mean	Median	Mode	Range
MS/SS Program Standard	7.51	8	7	5-10
TPE Domain 7	7.70	8	8	3-10

On a scale of 1–10, with 1 representing not at all confident and 10 representing extremely confident, respondents were asked to rate to what degree the MS/SS program standard and TPE Domain 7 element descriptions are on track in accordance with SB 488. Of the 91 respondents, the data represents an initial sense of developing confidence in meeting the

requirements of SB 488 with a Mean rating of 7.51 on a 10-point scale for the program standard and a Mean rating of 7.70 regarding TPE Domain 7.

**Open Ended Response Summary for Program Standard: Literacy for Multiple and Single Subject General Education Credential Programs**

The open-ended responses for the draft MS and SS program standard indicate that the majority of respondents find it detailed, explicit, and meeting the mandates specified in SB 488. However, comments also indicate that there are definitional issues (e.g., syntax, discourse, handwriting, translanguaging) and applicability of language and expectations across the two general education credentials. Further clarification will be provided for both issues noted and definitional issues will also be further resolved with a glossary. Respondents questioned the emphasis on dyslexia while other respondents suggested more specificity related to dyslexia (e.g., universal screening). Respondents also thought that the overall emphasis of the standard is too skill based and not sufficiently broad and integrated; others thought the emphasis is appropriate. A theme that emerged was that there should be a greater emphasis on writing (printing and/or cursive), specifically more informal writing opportunities for students.

**MS/SS TPE Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for all Students**

The open-ended responses for the MS/SS TPEs indicate that the majority of respondents find them detailed and meeting the mandates specified by SB 488; however, ten respondents think a dedicated TPE element on dyslexia is needed. Five of the 91 respondents expressed concern about the concepts being a “heavy ask” for beginning teachers but expressed belief in being aspirational. Three respondents expressed concern over the breadth of skills and appropriateness of the TPEs as challenges for all single-subject candidates.

**Education Specialist-MMSN and ESN**

As of August 9, 2022, 16 respondents have completed the field review survey for Education Specialist- MMSN and ESN credential programs.

**Table 6: Education Specialist Respondents**

Respondents*	N=16
Higher Education Faculty- Four Year Program	9
Higher Education Faculty- Community College	0
PK-12 Practitioner- Mild/Moderate Support Needs	2
PK-12 Practitioner- Extensive Support Needs	1
PK-12 Practitioner- Deaf and Hard of Hearing	1
PK-12 Practitioner- Visual Impairments	1
PK-12 Practitioner- Early Childhood Special Education	1
PK-12 Practitioner- Other	3
Literacy Researcher	3
Policy Advocate	2
Other	4

\*Respondents could select more than one option

The highest number of respondents represented Higher Education Faculty from Four Year Programs with 9 respondents. The lowest represented categories were PK-12 Practitioner-Extensive Support Needs, PK-12 Practitioner - Deaf and Hard of Hearing, PK-12 Practitioner-Visual Impairments, and PK-12 Practitioner - Early Childhood Special Education with one respondent each. No Community College Faculty had responded as of August 9.

For respondents who work in teacher preparation, seven work with Traditional Fifth Year Teacher Preparation Programs, six with University Intern Programs, three with District Intern Programs, four with Teacher Residency Programs, and five with Integrated Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Programs. Results presented in Tables 7-10 should be interpreted with caution due to the low number (16) of responses as of August 9. Surveys are open until September 2, 2022. Additional survey analysis will be conducted by Commission staff and shared with the Literacy Workgroup at its September meeting.

Respondents were asked to make their rating on a five-point Likert scale – Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. To see the full range of Likert scale data for Education Specialist respondents see the [Google Document](#).

**Table 7: Percent of Education Specialist Respondents Who Strongly Agree or Agree**

<b>Education Specialist-MMSN and ESN Program Standard N=16</b>	<b>Clear</b>	<b>Appropriate for the Credential</b>	<b>Not Needing Additional Concepts to be Included</b>
Introduction/Overarching Concepts	100%	94%	63%
Foundational Skills	100%	100%	87%
Meaning Making	100%	94%	100%
Language Development	88%	81%	81%
Effective Expression	100%	94%	94%
Content Knowledge	94%	88%	100%
Literacy Instruction for Students with Disabilities	94%	94%	87%
Integrated and Designated English Language Development	100%	100%	94%
Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations	87%	87%	87%

Data in Table 7 illustrates the number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that the components were clear, appropriate, or needed additional concepts. Data ranges between a low of 63% in agreement when reviewing the Introduction/Overarching Concepts component when determining that no additional concepts need to be included and a high of 100% across multiple components related to clarity, appropriateness for the credential, and that additional concepts do not need to be added to the standard.

Overall, 26 of the 27 respondent ratings, are at or above 80% agreement that the components are clear, appropriate, and that no additional concepts are needed for Education Specialist

candidates. The lowest rating of 63% was in response to the question about additional concepts being needed for the Introduction/Overarching Concepts section.

**Table 8: Percent Strongly Agree or Agree**

Education Specialist-MMSN N=16	Clear	Job-Related	Needed for the First Day on the Job
TPE Domain 7 (6 MMSN + 12 Universal)	94%	94%	94%

Open-ended comments related to Table 8 may be found in [the Google Document](#). 94% of respondents found the TPEs to be clear, job-related, a needed for the first day on the job.

**Table 9: Percent Strongly Agree or Agree**

Education Specialist-ESN N=16	Clear	Job-Related	Needed for the First Day on the Job
TPE Domain 7 (7 ESN + 12 Universal)	94%	88%	81%

94% reported that TPE elements for Education Specialists were clear, 88% found that the TPE elements were job-related, and 81% of respondents reported that the TPE knowledge, skills, and abilities are needed for the first day on the job as a teacher. For open-ended comments on what language is not clear, what content should be removed, and what content is missing see the [Google Document](#).

**Table 10: Confidence Rating in Accordance with SB 488 for MMSN and ESN Standard and TPEs**

Education Specialist-MMSN and ESN on 10-point scale N=16	Mean	Median	Mode	Range
Program Standard	8.56	9	10	5-10
TPE Domain 7- MMSN	8.63	9	10	5-10
TPE Domain 7- ESN	8.44	9.5	10	1-10

On a scale of 1–10, with 1 representing not at all confident and 10 representing extremely confident, respondents were asked to rate to what degree the Education Specialist program standard and TPE Domain 7 are on track in accordance with SB 488. Of the 16 respondents, the data represents an initial sense of developing confidence with meeting the requirements of SB 488 with a mean rating of 8.56 on a 10-point scale for the program standard, a mean rating of 8.63 for the MMSN TPEs, and a mean rating of 8.44 for the ESN TPEs.

**Program Standard: Literacy for Education Specialist Credential Programs**

The open-ended responses for the Education Specialist program standard indicate that the majority of respondents find the program standard language to be clear, detailed, and aligned with the mandates specified in SB 488. Two respondents commented on the need to address evidence-based practices in literacy instruction, especially for students with extensive support needs. Additionally, the access to literacy instruction in the least restrictive environment and in inclusive settings was mentioned across various comment sections of the standard.

**MMSN and ESN TPE Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for all Students**

MMSN – The open-ended responses for the MMSN TPEs indicate that the majority of respondents find the TPE elements to be clear, job-related, and necessary for the first day of teaching.

ESN – The open-ended responses for the ESN TPEs indicate that the majority of respondents find the TPE elements to be clear, job-related, and necessary for the first day of teaching.

**Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Credential**

As of August 9, 2022, 25 respondents completed the field review survey for the proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Credential

**Table 11: Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Respondents**

<b>Respondents*</b>	<b>N=25</b>
Higher Education Faculty- Four Year Program	6
Higher Education Faculty- Community College	1
PK-12 Practitioner- Multiple Subject	5
PK-12 Practitioner- Single Subject	0
PK-12 Practitioner- Education Specialist	1
PK-12 Practitioner- Early Childhood Special Education Credential	0
Child Development Site Supervisor or Program Director Permit	2
Child Development Teacher or Master Teacher Permit	1
Child Development Assistant or Associate Teacher Permit	0
Literacy Researcher	3
Policy Advocate	5
Other	11

\*Respondents could select more than one option

The highest number of respondents represented Higher Education Faculty from Four Year Programs with 6 respondents. The lowest represented categories were Higher Education Faculty- Community College, PK-12 Practitioner - Education Specialist, and Child Development Teacher or Master Teacher Permit. No PK-12 Practitioners - Single Subject, PK-12 Practitioners - Early Childhood Special Education Credential, or Child Development Assistants or Associate Teacher Permits responded by August 9.

For respondents who work in teacher preparation, seven work with Traditional Fifth Year Teacher Preparation Programs, four with University Intern Programs, two with District Intern Programs, and two with Community College - Child Development Permit Programs. Results presented in Tables 12-14 should be interpreted with caution due to the low number (25) of responses at this time. Surveys are open until September 2, 2022. Additional survey analysis will be conducted by Commission staff and shared with the Literacy Workgroup at its September meeting.

Respondents were asked to make their rating on a five-point Likert scale – Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. To see the full range of Likert scale data for PK-3 respondents, see [the Google Document](#).

**Table 12: Percent Strongly Agree or Agree with the Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Standard**

<b>Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Credential Program Standard N=25</b>	<b>Clear</b>	<b>Appropriate for the Proposed Credential</b>	<b>Not Needing Additional Concepts to be Included</b>
Introduction/Overarching Concepts	96%	96%	80%
Foundational Skills	100%	100%	68%
Meaning Making	76%	72%	92%
Language Development	80%	76%	80%
Effective Expression	72%	72%	80%
Content Knowledge	64%	64%	84%
Literacy Instruction for Children with Disabilities	60%	60%	56%
Integrated and Designated English Language Development	68%	68%	88%
Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations	60%	60%	60%

Data in Table 12 illustrates the number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that the components were clear, appropriate, or needed additional concepts. Data ranges between a low of 56% in agreement when reviewing the Literacy Instruction for Children with Disabilities component that additional concepts need to be included and a high of 100% agreement that foundational skills are both clear and appropriate for the proposed PK-3 ECE credential.

Eleven of the 27 respondent ratings are at or above 80% agreement that the components are clear, appropriate, and that no additional concepts are needed for PK-3 ECE candidates. The lowest rating of 56% was in response to the question about Literacy Instruction for children with Disabilities and that additional concepts need to be added to this section of the program standard.

**Table 13: Percent Strongly Agree or Agree**

Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Credential N=25	Clear	Job-Related	Needed for the First Day on the Job
TPE Domain 7 (12 Elements)	64%	88%	96%

Sixty-four percent reported that TPE elements for the proposed PK-3 ECE credential were clear, 88% found that the TPE elements were job-related, and 96% of respondents reported that the TPE knowledge, skills, and abilities are needed for the first day on the job as a PK-3 ECE teacher. For open-ended comments on what language is not clear, what content should be removed, and what content is missing see in [the Google Document](#).

**Table 14: Confidence Rating in Accordance with SB 488 for the Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Program Standard and TPEs**

Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Credential on a 10-point scale N=25	Mean	Median	Mode	Range
Program Standard	7.92	8	7	4-10
TPE Domain 7	7.20	8	8	3-10

On a scale of 1–10, with 1 representing not at all confident and 10 representing extremely confident, respondents were asked to rate to what degree the proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist program standard and TPE Domain 7 are on track in accordance with SB 488. With a Mean of 7.92, respondents appear fairly confident that the standards are on track while a Mean of 7.20 of respondents have confidence that TPE Domain 7 is on track with SB 488.

#### ***Open Ended Responses for Program Standard: Literacy for Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Credential Programs***

The open-ended responses for the proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist program standard indicate that the majority of respondents found that the Introduction/Overarching Concepts and Foundational Skills sections are clear and appropriate for the credential. Nine respondents commented on the need to further address dyslexia in the Literacy for Children with Disabilities section. Two comments were made about the possibility of moving handwriting to foundational skills and to increase of the use of play-based learning.

The open-ended responses for the proposed PK-3 ECE TPEs indicate that the majority of respondents found the TPEs to be clear, appropriate, and meeting the mandates specified by SB 488; however, seven respondents reported that a dedicated TPE element on dyslexia is needed.

### **Staff Recommendation**

That the Commission review the draft Literacy Program Standards and TPEs for the MS/SS, MMSN and ESN Education Specialist, and Proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Credentials and provide feedback and direction to staff regarding next steps.

### **Dedicated Literacy Email and Listserv**

A dedicated mailbox for literacy questions related to SB 488 and the literacy workgroup is available at [literacy@ctc.ca.gov](mailto:literacy@ctc.ca.gov). Additionally, a new Literacy listserv was established to provide updates on upcoming meetings, resources, and other pertinent information related to the workgroup as well as any work of the Professional Services Division (PSD) related to the implementation of Senate Bill 488. Individuals may sign up for the listserv [here](#).

### **Next Steps**

Staff will continue to revise the draft Literacy Program Standards and TPEs based on both Commission feedback and the input from the field review surveys. Surveys will remain open until September 2, 2022. The Literacy Workgroup in consultation with Commission staff will review the survey findings and subsequent revisions of the Literacy Program Standards and TPEs at their September meeting and offer any further suggestions needed to address them. In addition, the Literacy Workgroup will discuss and potentially make recommendations to revise the current subject matter TPEs to be more inclusive and specific regarding the literacy development and expectations as provided in SB 488.

Staff will also work with experts from the Education Specialist Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE), Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH), and Visual Impairments (VI) communities to develop draft Literacy Program Standards and TPEs in preparation for the October meeting.

*Development of the Literacy Performance Assessment.* Upon approval of the set of TPEs for MS/SS, Education Specialist (MMSN and ESN), and the proposed PK-3 ECE credentials, the Commission will begin development of the literacy performance assessment (LPA) required by SB 488. In the fall of 2022, a design team will be appointed to work with the Commission's Performance Assessment team and Evaluation Systems group of Pearson, the Commission's identified technical assistance contractor on the design and development of the LPA. According to [EC 44283 \(b\) \(7\)](#), the design team must be "comprised of at least one-third classroom teachers with recent experience in teaching reading in the early grades." Pursuant to SB 488, the literacy performance assessment must:

- Assess competence in teaching foundational reading skills
- Align with [subparagraphs \(A\) and \(B\) of paragraph \(4\) of subdivision \(b\) of Section 44259](#), the proposed program standards and teaching performance expectations, and the current *English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework* adopted by the State Board of Education
- Meet the Commission's [Assessment Design Standards](#) for teaching performance assessments

Until a literacy performance assessment is brought to the Commission for approval, candidates for MS, Education Specialist, and the pending PK-3 Credential must continue to take and pass



the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) as specified in Education Code [44283\(c\)](#).

**Table 15: Literacy Performance Assessment Development Tasks and Timeline**

Contract Year	Overview of the Scope of Work
Year One: 2022-23 Fall 2022  Fall 2022-Spring 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begin development of literacy instruction performance assessment</li> <li>• Identify and appoint literacy design team</li> <li>• Develop draft literacy assessment with design team and Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (technical contractor)</li> </ul>
Year Two: 2023-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue development of literacy instruction performance assessment</li> <li>• Conduct Pilot Test</li> </ul>
Year Three: 2024-25  Spring 2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue development of literacy instruction performance assessment based on the pilot test findings</li> <li>• Conduct Field Test</li> <li>• Complete final revisions made based on field test findings</li> <li>• Conduct Standard Setting using field test findings</li> <li>• Present proposal of recommended passing standard and assessment to Commissioners</li> </ul>
Year Four: 2025-26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First operational administration of Literacy Performance Assessment</li> <li>• Manage ongoing administration, scoring, reporting, and maintenance of the literacy instruction performance assessment</li> </ul>

The literacy workgroup will meet again in September to review Commission input and review survey responses for possible additional amendments to the draft language presented in this item for the MS/SS, MMSN and ESN Education Specialist, and proposed PK-3 credentials. Given the timing of the full field review and Commission meeting dates, the final drafts of the Program Standards and TPEs for these credentials are expected to be presented to the Commission for potential adoption at the October Commission meeting.

**Table 16: Timeline for the Implementation of SB 488**

<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Activity: MS/SS, MMSN and ESN Education Specialist and proposed PK-3 Early Childhood Specialist Credentials</b>
Summer 2022	Draft Literacy Program Standards and TPEs out for field review
Summer 2022	Staff analyze field review feedback and edit program standards and TPEs as appropriate
August 25-26, 2022	August Commission Meeting – Present revised program standards and Literacy TPEs to Commission for information only to gather Commission and further public feedback
August-September 2022	Staff analyze feedback from Commission and public for potential edits to program standards and TPEs as appropriate
August-September 2022	Staff will convene experts to develop standard language and TPEs for VI, DHH, and Early Childhood Special Education
September 13, 2022	Reconvene workgroup to review all revised draft program standards and TPEs, discuss additional survey results, review subject specific TPEs
October 13-14, 2022	October Commission Meeting – Proposed adoption of draft literacy program standards and TPEs
Fall 2022	Begin Design team work on literacy instruction performance assessment
Fall 2022	Internal Commission staff training
2022 - 2024	Staff provides technical assistance to preparation programs in meeting updated literacy program standards and TPEs including but not limited to regional workshops, implementation/transition plan with feedback, webinars, and office hours
2023 - 2024	BIR training update to address literacy program standards and TPEs
2023 - 2024	MS/SS, Education Specialist, PK-3 ECE Specialist credential Literacy Performance Assessment Pilot Study and Technical Assistance
2024 - 2025	MS/SS, Education Specialist, PK-3 ECE Specialist credential Literacy Performance Assessment Field Test and Technical Assistance
2024 - 2025	Review and certify preparation program compliance with new literacy program standards and TPEs
Fall 2025	Literacy Performance Assessment becomes operational

## Appendix A

### Commission on Teacher Credentialing SB 488 Literacy Workgroup

<b>Members</b>	
Clara Amador-Lankster	Professor, National University
Angela Asch	Educational Policy Analyst, California School Boards Association
Jyothi Bathina	Co-Director, California State University Chancellor's Office, Center for the Advancement of Reading and Writing
Allison Briceño	Professor, San José State University
Crystal Buskirk	Teacher, Roseville Joint Union High School District
Nancy Cushen White	Professor (Retired), University of California, San Francisco
Jennifer Diehl	Coordinator of Supplemental Programs, Berryessa Union School District
Lucy Edwards	Director of Continuous Improvement and Academic Support, Napa County Office of Education
George Ellis	Regional Director, California Reading and Literature Project
Sucari Epps	Credential Program Coordinator, Five Keys Charter School and Programs, Los Angeles
Tanya Flushman	Co-Director, California State University, Center for the Advancement of Reading and Writing, and Professor, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
Young-Suk Kim	Professor and Senior Associate Dean, University of California, Irvine
Magaly Lavadenz	Professor, Loyola Marymount University
Marissa Luna Lopez	Professor, University of California, Merced
Bonnie Munguia	Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Brawley Union High School District
Angela Palmieri	Teacher, Glendale Unified School District
Mandy Redfern	Teacher, La Cañada Unified School District
Sue Sears	Professor, California State University, Northridge
Rebecca Silverman	Professor, Stanford University
Mara Shinn Smith	Senior Program Specialist, Los Angeles County Office of Education
Pamela Spycher	Senior Researcher, WestEd
Efrain Tovar	Teacher, Selma Unified School District
Juliet Wahleithner	Professor, Fresno State University, and Regional Director, California Writing Project
Dale Webster	Vice President of Language and Literacy, Consortium on Reaching Excellence in Education
Tamara Wilson	Director, Development and Training, Curriculum and Instruction, and Project Lead, California Dyslexia Initiative, Sacramento County Office of Education
Maryanne Wolf	Director, Center for Dyslexia, Diverse Learners and Social Justice, University of California, Los Angeles
Hallie Yopp Slowik	Professor, California State University, Fullerton

<b>Liaisons</b>	
Richard Gifford	Education Programs Consultant, California Department of Education
Martha Hernandez	Executive Director, Californians Together

## Appendix B

### Commission on Teacher Credentialing Draft Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program Standards

#### 7. Literacy for Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs

The credential program’s coursework and field experiences encompass the study of effective means of teaching literacy across all disciplines—including the strands of reading, writing, listening, and speaking—based on California’s State Board of Education (SBE)-adopted English Language Arts (ELA) and Literacy Standards and English Language Development (ELD) Standards in an organized and comprehensive manner that incorporates Universal Design for Learning. Program coursework and field experiences are aligned with the current, SBE-adopted *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework*,<sup>1</sup> including the crosscutting themes of foundational skills, meaning making, language development, effective expression, and content knowledge. The program emphasizes the relationship and importance of the foundational skills to student learning across all themes; it also acknowledges that progress in the other themes propels progress in the foundational skills. Instruction in each of the themes is essential.

The program supports the development of candidates’ knowledge, skills, and abilities to provide effective literacy instruction that is comprehensive, systematic, and evidence based. The program builds candidates’ understanding that high-quality literacy instruction integrates all strands of the language arts in ELA, ELD, and other disciplines to develop learners’ capacities as effective and critical readers, writers, listeners, and speakers. Candidates learn the power of oral and written language to understand and transform our world and promote social justice.

The study of high-quality literacy instruction also incorporates elements of California’s Comprehensive State Literacy Plan:

- a) Multi-Tiered System of Support, including best first instruction and Universal Design for Learning; targeted, supplemental instruction for students whose literacy skills are not progressing; and referrals for intensive intervention for individuals who have not benefited from supplemental support
- b) Principles of equity, diversity, and inclusion, including materials and practices that are asset based<sup>2</sup> and culturally and linguistically responsive and sustaining
- c) Instruction that is responsive to individual learners’ age and development and individual literacy goals

---

<sup>1</sup> See also the [Resource Guide to Foundational Skills of the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts](#).

<sup>2</sup> Although known by various names (culturally relevant pedagogy, culturally responsive teaching, culturally sustaining pedagogy, funds of knowledge, and many others), practices that affirm students’ cultural lives— both family and community—and incorporate this knowledge into the classroom, collectively deem students’ lived experiences as assets. These practices affirm the diversity that students bring to the classroom, including culture, language, disability, socioeconomic status, immigration status, sexual orientation, and gender identity as characteristics that add value and strength to classrooms and communities. They include instructional approaches that leverage the cultural and linguistic experiences of students to make learning more relevant and effective.

- d) Integrated and designated ELD and promotion of multiliteracy and multilingual programs
- e) Incorporation of the *California Dyslexia Guidelines*
- f) Assessment for various purposes, including formative and summative assessment; screening for reading, writing, and other difficulties, including risk of dyslexia; and referrals for additional assessment and intervention

Through coursework and field experiences, candidates learn literacy instructional practices that are active, motivating, and engaging; they learn that instructional practices vary according to students' learning goals and individual needs and include, as appropriate, direct instruction, collaborative learning, and inquiry-based learning. Candidates learn to build on students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, experiences, and knowledge in all instruction.

### **Foundational Skills**

**Multiple Subject and Single Subject English** credential programs offer coursework and field experiences that include evidence-based means of teaching the foundational skills of print concepts, phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition; decoding; and fluency to all learners as a part of a comprehensive literacy program. Through the program provides candidates learn that effective instruction in foundational reading skills is direct, systematic, and explicit and employs early intervention strategies informed by ongoing measures of student progress and diagnostic techniques, including tiered supports for students with reading, writing, or other literacy difficulties and disabilities, including students at risk for or with dyslexia. Programs ensure that candidates understand that instruction in phonological awareness and phonics includes phonemic awareness, letter-sound and spelling-sound correspondences, spelling patterns, and practice in connected, decodable text. The program also includes evidence-based means of teaching foundational skills to multilingual and English learner students while these learners are simultaneously developing oral English language proficiency, and in some cases literacy skills in an additional language<sup>3</sup>; this instruction is adapted based on students' previous literacy experiences in their home languages and how closely students' home languages are related to English. Candidates learn critical milestones of foundational skill development and how to adjust and differentiate instruction for students whose skills are not progressing.

**Multiple Subject** credential programs offer guided clinical practice experiences that allow candidates to provide initial or supplemental foundational skills instruction at beginning levels of reading (i.e., before children have typically developed fluency in decoding).

Through coursework and field experiences, **all Multiple Subject and Single Subject** credential candidates learn to identify and support learners' progress in the elements of foundational skills and language that support students as they read and write increasingly complex text both as readers and writers, including direct and explicit instruction in fluency, spelling patterns, syllable patterns, morphology, vocabulary, and syntax. All candidates learn how to identify and monitor the progress of learners with potential reading and writing difficulties, including

---

<sup>3</sup> See updated [Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and new Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations](#) for standards and expectations specific to multilingual programs.

dyslexia; provide accommodations and supplemental support; and collaborate with specialists and students' families to initiate needed referrals for additional and intensive intervention.

### **Meaning Making**

Coursework and field experiences for **Multiple Subject and Single Subject** credential programs emphasize meaning making as the central purpose for interacting with text, composing text, engaging in research, participating in discussion, speaking with others, and listening to, viewing, and giving presentations. Programs address literal and inferential comprehension at all grades and with all students, including making connections with prior knowledge and experiences; programs also address the importance of attending to higher order cognitive skills, such as reasoning, inferencing, perspective taking, and critical reading, writing, listening, and speaking in every discipline. Programs ensure that candidates understand that among the contributors to meaning making are language, knowledge, motivation, comprehension monitoring, and in the case of reading and writing, the ability to recognize printed words and use the alphabetic code to express ideas automatically and efficiently. Program highlight the importance of providing children and youth opportunities to interact with a range of high-quality literary and informational texts—both print and digital, including those that are culturally and linguistically relevant, as listeners, readers, speakers, and writers and to share their understandings, insights, and responses with others. Through coursework and field experiences, candidates learn to engage students in reading, listening, and viewing closely to draw evidence from texts, ask and answer questions, and support analysis, reflection, and research. Candidates also learn to plan instruction based on an analysis of the text complexity of instructional materials.

### **Language Development**

Coursework and field experiences for **Multiple Subject and Single Subject** credential programs emphasize language development as the cornerstone of literacy, learning, and relationship building; candidates learn that it is with and through language that children and youth learn, think, and express information, ideas, perspectives, and questions. The program presents ways to create environments and frame interactions that foster oral and written language development for all students, including academic language. The program focuses on instruction that values and leverages students' existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging. The program promotes multilingualism and addresses the development of languages other than English in multilingual programs. The program addresses the importance of vocabulary in children's literacy development and knowledge acquisition, highlighting effective teaching of vocabulary both indirectly (through rich and varied language experiences and word play/word consciousness) and directly (through the study of individual words and of independent word learning strategies, including morphology and etymology). The program also attends to grammatical and discourse-level understandings of language as a social process and meaning making system. Candidates learn that the interaction of syntax, sentence- and discourse-level understandings, and vocabulary forms registers that vary according to context, situation, and discipline. The program addresses ways to facilitate students' learning of complex sentence and text structures and emphasizes that learners enrich their language as they read, write, speak, and listen; interact with one another; learn about language; create diverse print and digital texts, and engage with rich content in all disciplines. Candidates learn to plan instruction based on the

analysis of instructional materials and tasks and assessment (formal and informal) of individual students' speaking and writing.

### **Effective Expression**

Coursework and field experiences for **Multiple Subject and Single Subject** credential programs address effective expression, including how children and youth learn to effectively express themselves as activity and discussion partners, presenters, and writers and to use digital media and visual displays to enhance their expression. Candidates learn how to engage students in a range of interactions and collaborative conversations, including extended conversations, with diverse partners on instructional topics and texts. Candidates learn to help students identify effective expression in what they read, listen to, and view as they examine the words, images, and organizational structure of written, oral, or visual text. Through the program, candidates learn to teach students to write, present, and discuss so that their meanings are conveyed clearly, logically, powerfully, and, when appropriate and desired, poetically. Candidates also learn how to help learners communicate in ways appropriate for their purpose, audience, context, and task and gain command over the conventions of written and spoken English as they create print and digital texts. The program focuses on instruction that values and leverages students' existing languages and dialects, including translanguaging, and that promotes effective expression in languages other than English in multilingual programs. Through coursework and field experiences, Candidates also learn to select appropriate teaching strategies to develop students' abilities to plan, develop, revise using feedback, edit, and produce their own writing and presentations in increasingly sophisticated genres drawing on the modes of opinion/argumentation, information, and narration. The program includes explicit instruction in handwriting and keyboarding for young learners and the use of digital tools by all students to produce and publish their own written texts and multimedia presentations. Candidates learn to plan instruction based on the analysis of instructional materials and tasks and assessment (formal and informal) of individual students' speaking and writing.

### **Content Knowledge**

Coursework and field experiences for **Multiple Subject and Single Subject** credential programs address content knowledge, which includes literary, cultural, and domain knowledge, as a powerful contributor to comprehension of text and sources of information and ideas. The program highlights the integration of literacy across disciplines and the reciprocal relationships between the development of academic language, literacy, and content knowledge. The program helps candidates understand that while building content knowledge enhances literacy development, it also serves to motivate many students, particularly when its relevance is clear and when it reflects and values students' diverse experiences and cultures and is responsive to their interests. The program emphasizes the importance of full access to content instruction—including through printed and digital texts and multimedia, discussions, experimentation, and hands-on explorations—regardless of students' language proficiency levels or learning differences and addresses inclusive practices and co-teaching models. The program helps candidates build students' understandings of disciplinary literacy—the ways in which disciplines use language and literacy to engage with content and communicate as members of discourse communities (e.g., historians, scientists). The program addresses the role of content knowledge in navigating increasingly complex informational texts, researching questions of interest, evaluating the credibility of sources, and sharing knowledge as writers and speakers. The



program also highlights the importance of deep reading, including being read to, and wide and independent reading in knowledge building. In addition, the program helps candidates learn to promote digital literacy, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate safely and responsibly, and to foster digital citizenship.<sup>4</sup>

### **Literacy Instruction for Students with Disabilities**

Coursework and field experiences for **Multiple Subject and Single Subject English** credential programs provide candidates an understanding of how various disabilities can impact literacy instruction (e.g., dyslexia, dysgraphia, autism, speech/language impairment, varied cognitive abilities) and how candidates can appropriately differentiate and accommodate instruction to provide access to the curriculum for all learners. Programs incorporate the *California Dyslexia Guidelines* through literacy coursework or field experiences that include the definition of dyslexia and its characteristics; screening for risk of dyslexia and other reading and/or writing disabilities; and effective approaches for teaching and differentiating instruction for students at risk for and with dyslexia and other disabilities. Candidates learn that guiding principles for educating students with dyslexia and other disabilities are anchored in instructional and assessment practices that are evidence based and that incorporate instruction that is comprehensive, systematic, explicit, cumulative, and multimodal and that includes phonology, orthography, phonics, morphology, syntax, and semantics. Programs help candidates understand their responsibility for providing initial and supplemental instruction and for collaborating with families and specialists to gain additional assessment and instructional support as needed.

### **Integrated and Designated English Language Development**

Coursework and field experiences for **Multiple Subject and Single Subject** credential programs highlight the relationships between ELD, ELA/literacy, and other content instruction and the distinctions between integrated and designated ELD. Programs build candidates' understanding of the purposes and strategies of integrated and designated ELD that are appropriate for students' levels of English language proficiency and prior educational experiences and that develop students' ability to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works. Through the program, all candidates learn to provide integrated ELD in which EL students are taught to use and understand English to access and make meaning of academic content throughout the school day and across disciplines. All candidates learn to use the ELA/literacy standards (or other content standards) and ELD standards in tandem to ensure that EL students strengthen their abilities to use academic English as they simultaneously learn content. **Multiple Subject** credential programs prepare candidates to provide designated ELD, a protected time during the regular school day, in which EL students are grouped together and are taught English language skills critical for engaging in grade-level content learning. Candidates learn to use the ELD standards as the focus of instruction in designated ELD in ways that connect to and support content instruction.

---

<sup>4</sup> See [California Digital Learning Integration and Standards Guidance](#) for additional information.

### **Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations**

Programs address all elements of the literacy teaching performance expectations and offer instruction in the knowledge, skills, and abilities required by any required literacy performance assessments. Guided practice in a clinical setting<sup>5</sup> provides opportunities for candidates to apply what they have learned.

---

<sup>5</sup> See [Preliminary Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Program Standard 3](#) on Clinical Practice for additional details.

**Draft [Teaching Performance Expectations](#)\* for Multiple Subject and  
Single Subject Preliminary Credential Candidates**

*\*Prior to reading Domain 7, review the current domains 1-6. Educator preparation programs will be required to demonstrate that their candidates have an opportunity to be introduced to, provided the opportunity to practice, and be assessed in each of the elements within each TPE domain.*

**Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students**

- 7.1 Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction (and/or integrated content and literacy instruction) grounded in an understanding of applicable literacy-related standard and the themes of the *ELA/ELD Framework* (Foundational Skills,<sup>1</sup> Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, and Content Knowledge) and their integration.
- 7.2 Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction (and/or integrated content and literacy instruction) grounded in an understanding of California’s Multi-Tiered System of Support (Tier 1–Best first instruction and Universal Design for Learning; Tier 2–Targeted, supplemental instruction; Tier 3–Referrals for intensive intervention) and the *California Dyslexia Guidelines*.
- 7.3 Incorporate asset-based<sup>2</sup> and inclusive approaches and culturally and linguistically sustaining practices in literacy instruction (and/or integrated content and literacy instruction), recognizing and incorporating the diversity of students’ cultures, languages, dialects, and home communities. Promote students’ literacy development in languages other than English in multilingual programs.<sup>3</sup>
- 7.4 Provide literacy instruction (and/or integrated content and literacy instruction) for all students that is active, motivating, and engaging, based on students’ assessed learning strengths and needs, analysis of instructional materials and tasks, and identified academic standards and learning goals.
- 7.5 **Multiple Subject Candidates:** Develop students’ Foundational Skills in print concepts; phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition; decoding; and fluency through instruction that is direct, systematic, and

---

<sup>1</sup> See also the [Resource Guide to Foundational Skills of the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts](#).

<sup>2</sup> Although known by various names (culturally relevant pedagogy, culturally responsive teaching, culturally sustaining pedagogy, funds of knowledge, and many others), practices that affirm students’ cultural lives — both family and community—and incorporate this knowledge into the classroom, collectively deem students’ lived experiences as assets. These practices affirm the diversity that students bring to the classroom, including culture, language, disability, socioeconomic status, immigration status, sexual orientation, and gender identity as characteristics that add value and strength to classrooms and communities. They include instructional approaches that leverage the cultural and linguistic experiences of students to make learning more relevant and effective.

<sup>3</sup> See updated [Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and new Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations](#) for program standards and teaching expectations specific to multilingual programs.

explicit and that includes practice in connected, decodable text. **Multiple Subject and Single Subject Candidates:** Identify and support students' progress in the elements of Foundational Skills and Language Development that support students as they read and write increasingly complex text, including direct and explicit instruction in fluency, spelling patterns, syllable patterns, morphology, vocabulary, and syntax.

- 7.6 Engage students in Meaning Making by building on prior knowledge and using complex print and digital literary and informational texts, questioning, and discussion to develop students' literal and inferential comprehension, including the higher order cognitive skills of reasoning, perspective taking, and critical reading, writing, listening, and speaking.
- 7.7 Promote students' Language Development by attending to vocabulary, syntax, and sentence- and discourse-level understandings as students read, write, listen, and speak. Create environments that foster oral and written language development, including academic language. Enhance language development by engaging students in the creation of diverse print and digital texts. Conduct instruction that leverages students' existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging.
- 7.8 Develop students' Effective Expression as students write, discuss, present, and use language conventions. Develop students' early writing skills through instruction in handwriting, keyboarding, and other language conventions. Teach students to engage in collaborative discussions and to plan, develop, revise, edit, and produce their own writing and presentations in various genres, drawing on the modes of opinion/argumentation, information, and narration.
- 7.9 Promote students' Content Knowledge through wide and deep reading of a variety of digital and printed texts, including disciplinary texts, and research to develop students' ability to acquire, construct, and convey knowledge as they read, write, listen, and speak. Promote digital literacy, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate safely and responsibly, and foster digital citizenship.<sup>4</sup>
- 7.10 Understand how to monitor students' progress in literacy development using ongoing, diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and learning;<sup>5</sup> screen for potential reading and writing difficulties, including students' risk for dyslexia; and collaborate with families and specialists to facilitate comprehensive assessment, in English and as appropriate in the home language, and plan and provide tiered instruction and early intervention for students who are not making adequate progress and initiate needed referrals.
- 7.11 Provide instruction in English language development (ELD) based on an understanding of the purposes and strategies of integrated and designated ELD that is connected to content learning, is appropriate for students' levels of English language proficiency, and develops students' ability to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works.

---

<sup>4</sup> See [California Digital Learning Integration and Standards Guidance](#) for additional information.

<sup>5</sup> See Universal [Teaching Performance Expectations](#), Domain 5, Assessing Student Learning, for additional details.

7.12 Understand how to provide literacy instruction in all content areas authorized by the credential—English language arts, English language development, history-social science, mathematics, science, arts education, health, physical education, world languages, career technical education, and computer science—that integrates reading, writing, listening, and speaking in discipline specific ways.

## Appendix C

### Commission on Teacher Credentialing Draft Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Program Standards

#### 7. Literacy for Education Specialist Credential Programs – Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs

The credential program’s coursework and field experiences encompass the study of effective means of teaching literacy across all disciplines—including the strands of reading, writing, listening, and speaking<sup>1</sup>—based on California’s State Board of Education (SBE)-adopted English Language Arts (ELA) and Literacy Standards and English Language Development (ELD) Standards in an organized and comprehensive manner that incorporates Universal Design for Learning. Program coursework and fieldwork are aligned with the current, SBE-adopted *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework*, including the crosscutting themes of foundational skills,<sup>2</sup> meaning making, language development, effective expression, and content knowledge. The program emphasizes the relationship and importance of the foundational skills to student learning across all themes; it also acknowledges that progress in the other themes propels progress in the foundational skills. Instruction in each of the themes is essential.

The program supports the development of candidates’ knowledge, skills, and abilities to provide effective literacy instruction that is comprehensive, systematic, evidence based, and collaborative with other service providers. The program builds candidates’ understanding that high-quality literacy instruction integrates all strands of the language arts in ELA, ELD, and other disciplines to develop learners’ capacities as effective and critical readers, writers, listeners, and speakers. Candidates learn the power of oral and written language to understand and transform our world and promote social justice.

The study of high-quality literacy instruction also incorporates elements of California’s Comprehensive State Literacy Plan:

- a) Multi-Tiered System of Support, including best first instruction and Universal Design for Learning; targeted, supplemental instruction for students whose literacy skills are not progressing; and intensive intervention for individuals who have not benefited from supplemental support
- b) Principles of equity, diversity, and inclusion, including materials and practices that are asset-based<sup>3</sup> and culturally and linguistically responsive and sustaining

---

<sup>1</sup> For students with disabilities the terms reading, writing, listening, and speaking should be broadly interpreted. For example, reading could include the use of Braille, screen-reader technology, or other assistive devices, while writing could include the use of a scribe, computer, or speech to text technology. In a similar vein, speaking and listening could include sign language or other means of communication.

<sup>2</sup> See also the [Resource Guide to Foundational Skills of the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts](#).

<sup>3</sup> Although known by various names (culturally relevant pedagogy, culturally responsive teaching, culturally sustaining pedagogy, funds of knowledge, and many others), practices that affirm students’ cultural lives— both

- c) Instruction that is responsive to individual learners’ age and development and individual literacy goals
- d) Integrated and designated ELD and promotion of multiliteracy and multilingual programs
- e) Incorporation of the *California Dyslexia Guidelines*
- f) Assessment for various purposes, including formative and summative assessment; screening for reading, writing, and other literacy difficulties, including risk of dyslexia; and diagnostic assessment in response to referrals for intensive intervention

Through coursework and field experiences, candidates learn literacy instructional practices and collaborate with other educators to provide instruction that is active, motivating, and engaging; they learn that instructional practices vary according to students’ learning goals and individual needs and include, as appropriate, direct instruction, collaborative learning, and inquiry-based learning. Candidates learn to build on students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds, experiences, and knowledge in all instruction. Candidates also learn the importance of trauma-informed approaches that are culturally sensitive and responsive to students’ family circumstances.

### **Foundational Skills**

Education Specialist credential programs offer coursework and field experiences that include evidence-based means of teaching the foundational skills of print concepts, phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition; decoding; and fluency to all learners as a part of a comprehensive literacy program. Through the program candidates learn that effective instruction in foundational reading skills is direct, systematic, and explicit, occurs in a print-rich environment, and employs early intervention strategies informed by ongoing measures of student progress and diagnostic techniques, including tiered supports in inclusive settings<sup>4</sup> for students with reading, writing, or other literacy difficulties and disabilities, including students at risk for or with dyslexia. Programs ensure that candidates understand that instruction in phonological awareness and phonics includes phonemic awareness, letter-sound and spelling-sound correspondences, spelling patterns, and practice in connected, decodable text. The program also includes evidence-based means of teaching foundational skills to multilingual and English learner students while these learners are simultaneously developing oral English language proficiency, and in some cases literacy skills in an additional language<sup>5</sup>; this instruction is adapted based on students’ previous literacy experiences in their home languages and how closely students’ home languages are related to

---

family and community—and incorporate this knowledge into the classroom, collectively deem students’ lived experiences as assets. These practices affirm the diversity that students bring to the classroom, including culture, language, disability, socioeconomic status, immigration status, sexual orientation, and gender identity as characteristics that add value and strength to classrooms and communities. They include instructional approaches that leverage the cultural and linguistic experiences of students to make learning more relevant and effective.

<sup>4</sup> See the California Department of Education/WestEd 2021 publication, [California’s Progress Toward Achieving ONE SYSTEM: Reforming Education to Serve All Students](#).

<sup>5</sup> See updated [Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and new Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations](#).

English. Candidates learn critical milestones of foundational skill development and how to adjust and differentiate instruction for students whose skills are not progressing.

Programs offer guided clinical practice experiences that allow candidates to provide initial, supplemental, or intensive intervention instruction in foundational skills, particularly at beginning levels of decoding.

Through coursework and field experiences, candidates learn to identify and support learners' progress in the elements of foundational skills and language that support students as they read and write increasingly complex text both as readers and writers, including direct explicit, and systematic instruction in fluency, spelling patterns, syllable patterns, morphology, vocabulary, and syntax. Candidates learn how to collaborate with classroom teachers, other specialists, and families to identify and monitor the progress of learners with potential reading and writing difficulties, including dyslexia; conduct comprehensive assessments in coordination with an assessment team; and provide accommodations, supplemental support, and intensive intervention as appropriate.

### **Meaning Making**

The program emphasizes meaning making as the central purpose for interacting with text, composing text, engaging in research, participating in discussion, speaking with others, and listening to, viewing, and giving presentations. This includes the use of assistive technology and/or Alternative and Augmentative Communication (AAC) devices as appropriate for students with disabilities. The program addresses literal and inferential comprehension at all grades and with all students, including making connections with prior knowledge and experiences; it also addresses the importance of attending to a range of higher order cognitive skills appropriate to students' development, such as analysis, synthesis, interpretation, evaluation, transfer, generalization, reasoning, inferencing, perspective taking, and critical reading, writing, listening, and speaking in every discipline. The program ensures that candidates understand that among the contributors to meaning making are language, knowledge, motivation, comprehension monitoring, and in the case of reading and writing, the ability to recognize printed words and use the alphabetic code to express ideas automatically and efficiently. The program highlights the importance of providing children and youth opportunities to interact with a range of high-quality literary and informational texts—both print and digital, including those that are developmentally appropriate and culturally and linguistically relevant, as listeners, readers, speakers, and writers and to share their understandings, insights, and responses with others. Through coursework and fieldwork, candidates learn to engage students in reading, listening, and viewing closely to draw evidence from texts, ask and answer questions, and support analysis, reflection, and research. Candidates also learn to plan instruction based on an analysis of the text complexity of instructional materials.

### **Language Development**

Coursework and field experiences emphasize language development as the cornerstone of literacy, learning, and relationship building; candidates learn that it is with and through language that children and youth learn, think, and express information, ideas, perspectives, and



questions. The program presents ways to create environments that foster oral and written language development for all students, including academic language. Candidates learn to facilitate communication for students who use American Sign Language, eye gaze, vocalizations, AAC devices, or other communication strategies. The program focuses on instruction that values and leverages students' existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging. The program promotes multilingualism and addresses the development of languages other than English in multilingual programs. The program addresses the importance of vocabulary in children's literacy development and knowledge acquisition, highlighting effective teaching of vocabulary both indirectly (through rich and varied language experiences and word play/word consciousness) and directly (through the study of individual words and of independent word learning strategies, including morphology and etymology). The program also attends to grammatical and discourse-level understandings of language as a social process and meaning making system. Candidates learn that the interaction of syntax, sentence- and discourse-level understandings, and vocabulary forms registers that vary according to context, situation, and discipline. The program addresses ways to facilitate students' learning of complex sentence and text structures and emphasizes that learners enrich their language as they read, write, speak, and listen; interact with one another; learn about language; create diverse print and digital texts, and engage with rich content in all disciplines. Candidates learn to plan instruction based on the analysis of instructional materials and tasks and assessment (formal and informal) of students' speaking, writing, or other communications.

### **Effective Expression**

Coursework and field experiences address effective expression, including how children and youth learn to effectively express themselves as activity and discussion partners; presenters; and writers and to use digital media and visual displays to enhance their expression in a manner that is appropriate for their age and development. Candidates learn how to engage students in a range of interactions and collaborative conversations with diverse partners on instructional topics and texts and to facilitate communication for students who use American Sign Language, eye gaze, vocalizations, AAC devices, or other communication strategies. Candidates learn to help students identify effective expression in what they read, listen to, and view as they examine the words, images, and organizational structure of written, oral, or visual text. Through the program, candidates learn to teach students to discuss, present, and write in ways appropriate to their age and development so that their meanings are conveyed clearly, logically, powerfully, and, when appropriate and desired, poetically. Candidates also learn how to help learners communicate in ways appropriate for their purpose, audience, context, and task and gain command over the conventions of written and spoken English as they create print and digital texts. The program focuses on instruction that values and leverages students' existing languages and dialects, including translanguaging, and that promotes effective expression in languages other than English in multilingual programs. Through coursework and fieldwork, candidates also learn to select appropriate teaching strategies to develop students' abilities to plan, develop, revise using feedback, edit, and produce their own writing and presentations in increasingly sophisticated genres drawing on the modes of opinion/ argumentation, information, and narration. The program includes explicit instruction in

handwriting, keyboarding, the use of assistive technology, as needed, and the use of digital tools by all students to produce and publish their own written text and multimedia presentations. Candidates learn to plan instruction based on the analysis of instructional materials and tasks and assessment (formal and informal) of students' speaking, writing, or other communications.

### **Content Knowledge**

Coursework and field experiences address content knowledge, which includes literary, cultural, and domain knowledge, as a powerful contributor to comprehension of text and sources of information and ideas. The program highlights the integration of literacy across disciplines and the reciprocal relationships between the development of academic language, literacy, and content knowledge. The program helps candidates understand that while building content knowledge enhances literacy development, it also serves to motivate many students, particularly when its relevance is clear and when it reflects and values students' diverse experiences and cultures and is responsive to their interests. The program emphasizes the importance of full access to content instruction—including through printed and digital texts and multimedia, discussions, experimentation, and hands-on explorations—regardless of students' language proficiency levels or learning differences and addresses inclusive practices and co-teaching models. The program helps candidates build students' understandings of disciplinary literacy—the ways in which disciplines use language and literacy to engage with content and communicate as members of discourse communities (e.g., historians, scientists). The program addresses the role of content knowledge in navigating increasingly complex informational texts, researching questions of interest, evaluating the credibility of sources, and sharing knowledge as writers and speakers in ways that are appropriate to students' age and development. The program also highlights the importance of deep reading, including being read to, and wide and independent reading in knowledge building. In addition, the program helps candidates learn to promote digital literacy, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate safely and responsibly, and to foster digital citizenship.<sup>6</sup>

### **Literacy Instruction for Students with Disabilities**

Programs provide candidates an understanding of how various disabilities can impact literacy instruction (e.g., dyslexia, dysgraphia, autism, speech/language impairment, varied cognitive abilities) and how candidates can appropriately differentiate and accommodate instruction to provide access to the curriculum for all learners. Candidates understand that a student's membership in a particular disability category represents a label for a qualifying condition and that the range of severity of disability and the educational needs within each category vary widely. Candidates understand that services should be based on individual need and not a qualifying condition. Programs incorporate the *California Dyslexia Guidelines* through literacy coursework and fieldwork that include the definition of dyslexia and its characteristics; screening and diagnostic assessment for risk of dyslexia and other reading and/or writing disabilities; and effective approaches for teaching and differentiating instruction for students at risk for and with dyslexia and other disabilities. Candidates learn that guiding principles for

---

<sup>6</sup> See [California Digital Learning Integration and Standards Guidance](#) for additional information.

educating students at risk for or with dyslexia and other reading and/or writing disabilities are anchored in instructional and assessment practices that are evidence based and that incorporate instruction that is comprehensive, systematic, explicit, cumulative, and multimodal and that includes phonology, orthography, phonics, morphology, syntax, and semantics). Programs ensure candidates understand Multi-Tiered System of Support and the value of providing initial, supplemental, and intensive instruction in inclusive settings, including co-teaching and the use of instructional support personnel (e.g., support during center rotations, working with students on individual goals, facilitating whole group activities to allow for candidates to work with students on individual goals). Programs address the importance of data-based decision making to plan intensive intervention that is responsive to students' age and development, including (as appropriate) continued emphasis on early literacy skills to permit access to literacy and content across all disciplines. Additionally, programs help candidates understand how to collaborate with families, multidisciplinary teams (including, but not limited to, general education teachers, reading/language arts specialists, speech-language pathologists, school psychologists, occupational therapists, physical therapists, and DHH and VI specialists), and others to offer additional assessment and instructional support, as well as appropriate adaptations (accommodations and modifications) and assistive technology that provide equitable access to the curriculum for students with disabilities, including strategies such as fingerspelling decoding or pre-pre-Braille skills to support students who are deafblind, when appropriate. Programs address the importance of facilitating and supporting students' self-advocacy skills based on their individual needs to ensure access to appropriate adaptations (accommodations, modifications, and when necessary, compensatory strategies).

### **Integrated and Designated English Language Development<sup>7</sup>**

Coursework and field experiences highlight the relationships between ELD, ELA/literacy, and other content instruction and the distinctions between integrated and designated ELD. The program builds candidates' understanding of the purposes and strategies of integrated and designated ELD that are appropriate for students' levels of English language proficiency and prior educational experiences and that develop students' ability to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works. The program addresses EL students with disabilities and how to distinguish English language development features from possible language-related learning issues. Candidates learn to select appropriate assessments, review multiple factors when determining special education eligibility, and use assessment accommodations. Through the program, all candidates learn to provide integrated ELD in which EL students are taught to use and understand English to access and make meaning of academic content throughout the school day and across disciplines. All candidates learn to use the ELA/literacy standards (or other content standards) and ELD standards in tandem to ensure that EL students strengthen their abilities to use academic English as they simultaneously learn content. Through the program, candidates learn the importance of designated ELD and

---

<sup>7</sup> See the California Department of Education 2019 publication, [California Practitioners Guide for Educating English Learners with Disabilities](#).

understand their role in coordinating with classroom teachers and other specialists so that EL students with disabilities receive appropriate instruction.

**Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations**

Programs address all elements of the literacy teaching performance expectations and offer instruction in the knowledge, skills, and abilities required by any required literacy performance assessments. Guided practice in a clinical setting<sup>8</sup> provides opportunities for candidates to apply what they have learned.

---

<sup>8</sup> See [Preliminary Education Specialist Credential Program Standard 3](#) for additional details.

## Draft [Teaching Performance Expectations\\*](#) for Education Specialist Preliminary Credential Candidates

*\*Prior to reading Domain 7, review the current domains 1-6. Educator preparation programs will be required to demonstrate that their candidates have an opportunity to be introduced to, provided the opportunity to practice, and be assessed in each of the elements within each TPE domain.*

### Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students – Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs

- 7.1 Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction grounded in an understanding of the standards for English language arts, literacy, and English language development and the themes of the *ELA/ELD Framework* (Foundational Skills,<sup>1</sup> Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, and Content Knowledge) and their integration.
- 7.2 Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction grounded in an understanding of California’s Multi-Tiered System of Support (Tier 1–Best first instruction and Universal Design for Learning; Tier 2–Targeted, supplemental instruction; and Tier 3–Referrals for intensive intervention) and the *California Dyslexia Guidelines*.
- 7.3 Incorporate asset-based<sup>2</sup> and inclusive approaches and culturally and linguistically sustaining practices in literacy instruction, recognizing and incorporating the diversity of students’ cultures, languages, dialects, and home communities. Promote students’ literacy development in languages other than English in multilingual programs.<sup>3</sup>
- 7.4 Provide literacy instruction for all students that is active, motivating, and engaging, based on students’ assessed learning strengths and needs, analysis of instructional materials and tasks, and identified academic standards and learning objectives.
- 7.5 Develop students’ Foundational Skills in print concepts; phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition; decoding; and fluency through instruction that is direct, systematic, and explicit and that includes practice in connected, decodable text. Identify and support students’ progress in the elements of Foundational Skills and Language Development that support students as they read and write

---

<sup>1</sup> See also the [Resource Guide to Foundational Skills of the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts](#).

<sup>2</sup> Although known by various names (culturally relevant pedagogy, culturally responsive teaching, culturally sustaining pedagogy, funds of knowledge, and many others), practices that affirm students’ cultural lives— both family and community—and incorporate this knowledge into the classroom, collectively deem students’ lived experiences as assets. These practices affirm the diversity that students bring to the classroom, including culture, language, disability, socioeconomic status, immigration status, sexual orientation, and gender identity as characteristics that add value and strength to classrooms and communities. They include instructional approaches that leverage the cultural and linguistic experiences of students to make learning more relevant and effective.

<sup>3</sup> See updated [Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and new Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations](#) for program standards and teaching expectations specific to multilingual programs.

increasingly complex text, including direct and explicit instruction in fluency, spelling patterns, syllable patterns, morphology, vocabulary, and syntax.

- 7.6 Engage students in Meaning Making by building on prior knowledge and using complex print and digital literary and informational texts, questioning, and discussion to develop students' literal and inferential comprehension, including the higher order cognitive skills of reasoning, perspective taking, and critical reading, writing, listening, and speaking.<sup>4</sup>
- 7.7 Promote students' Language Development by attending to vocabulary, syntax, and sentence- and discourse-level understandings as students read, write, listen, and speak. Create environments that foster oral and written language development, including academic language. Enhance language development by engaging students in the creation of diverse print and digital texts. Conduct instruction that leverages students' existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging.
- 7.8 Develop students' Effective Expression as students write, discuss, present, and use language conventions. Develop students' early writing skills through instruction in handwriting, keyboarding, and other language conventions. Teach students to engage in collaborative discussions and to plan, develop, revise, edit, and produce their own writing and presentations in various genres, drawing on the modes of opinion/argumentation, information, and narration.
- 7.9 Promote students' Content Knowledge through wide and deep reading of a variety of digital and printed texts, including disciplinary texts, and research to develop students' ability to acquire, construct, and convey knowledge as they read, write, listen, and speak. Promote digital literacy, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate safely and responsibly, and foster digital citizenship.<sup>5</sup>
- 7.10 Understand how to monitor students' progress in literacy development using ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and learning.<sup>6</sup> screen for potential reading and writing difficulties, including students' risk for dyslexia; and collaborate with families and specialists to facilitate comprehensive assessment, in English and as appropriate in the home language, and plan and provide tiered instruction and early intervention for students who are not making adequate progress and initiate needed referrals.
- 7.11 Provide instruction in English language development (ELD) based on an understanding of the purposes and strategies of integrated and designated ELD that is connected to content learning, is appropriate for students' levels of English language proficiency, and develops students' ability to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works.

---

<sup>4</sup> For students with disabilities, the terms listening, speaking, reading, and writing should be broadly interpreted. For example, speaking and listening could include sign language or other means of communication. In a similar vein, reading could include the use of Braille, screen-reader technology, or other assistive devices, while writing could include the use of a scribe, computer, or speech to text technology.

<sup>5</sup> See [California Digital Learning Integration and Standards Guidance](#) for additional information.

<sup>6</sup> See Universal [Teaching Performance Expectations](#), Domain 5, Assessing Student Learning, for additional details.

- 7.12 Understand how to provide literacy instruction in all content areas authorized by the credential—English language arts, English language development, history-social science, mathematics, science, arts education, health, physical education, world languages, career technical education, and computer science—that integrates reading, writing, listening, and speaking in discipline specific ways.

### **Mild to Moderate Support Needs TPEs**

- MM 7.1 Apply the knowledge of students’ assets and learning needs and use the results of screenings and informal, formal, and diagnostic assessment data to support supplemental (Tier 2) literacy instruction, formulate individualized intervention plans for students in need of Tier 3 intensive intervention, and frequently monitor students’ progress in literacy development.
- MM 7.2 Collaborate with multidisciplinary teams (e.g., general education teachers, reading specialists, speech-language therapists, school psychologists) when determining eligibility for special education services, interpreting assessment results, and planning necessary adaptations (accommodations and modifications) for students with dyslexia and other disabilities that impact literacy development.
- MM 7.3 Collaborate with other service providers (e.g., general education teachers, speech-language therapists) to provide day-to-day supplemental instruction and/or intensive intervention in literacy within a classroom or non-classroom environment (e.g., in-class support, co-teaching, inclusion, self-contained special education classrooms, small-group instruction specialized settings) that aligns with state-adopted standards, incorporates the *California Dyslexia Guidelines* and addresses individual IEP goals.
- MM 7.4 Provide intensive intervention that is evidence based and incorporates instruction that is comprehensive, systematic, explicit, cumulative, and multimodal and that includes phonology, orthography, phonics, morphology, syntax, and semantics.
- MM 7.5 Design and implement lessons that ensure access to grade-level literacy activities within a classroom or non-classroom environment (e.g., in-class support, co-teaching, inclusion, self-contained special education classrooms, small-group instruction in specialized settings).
- MM 7.6 Utilize assistive technology and Alternative and Augmentative Communication (AAC) as needed to support the teaching of literacy that integrates reading, writing, listening, and speaking in discipline specific ways.

### **Extensive Support Needs TPEs**

- EX 7.1 Apply the knowledge of student’s assets and learning needs and use the results of screenings and informal, formal, and diagnostic assessment data to support supplemental (Tier 2) literacy instruction, formulate individualized intervention plans for students in need of Tier 3 intensive intervention, and frequently monitor students’ progress in literacy development.
- EX 7.2 Collaborate with multidisciplinary teams (e.g., general education teachers, speech-language pathologists, school psychologists, occupational therapists, physical

therapists, DHH and VI specialists) when determining eligibility for special education services, interpreting assessment results, and planning necessary adaptations (accommodations and modifications) for students with dyslexia and other disabilities that impact literacy development.

- EX 7.3 Collaborate with other service providers (e.g., speech-language therapists, physical therapists, occupational therapists, paraprofessionals) to provide day-to-day supplemental instruction and/or intensive intervention in literacy within a classroom or non-classroom environment (e.g., in-class support, co-teaching, inclusion, self-contained special education classrooms, small-group instruction specialized settings), including early and/or functional literacy, as appropriate, that aligns with state-adopted standards incorporates the *California Dyslexia Guidelines* and addresses individual IEP goals.
- EX 7.4 Provide intensive intervention that is evidence based and incorporates instruction that is comprehensive, systematic, explicit, cumulative, and multimodal and that includes phonology, orthography, phonics, morphology, syntax, and semantics.
- EX 7.5 Design and implement lessons that ensure access to grade-level literacy activities within a classroom or non-classroom environment (e.g., in-class support, co-teaching, inclusion, self-contained classrooms, small-group instruction in a specialized setting).
- EX 7.6 Collaborate with specialists (e.g., speech-language therapists, DHH teacher, VI teacher) when planning literacy instruction for students with extensive support needs, including those who are deafblind, to address multiple means of communication (e.g., PECS [Picture Exchange Communication System], voice output devices), and, when appropriate, maximize residual hearing and vision.
- EX 7.7 Facilitate the use of multiple modalities of communication for students, including students who use assistive technology, Alternative and Augmentative Communication (AAC), American Sign Language, eye gaze, vocalizations, or other communications strategies to support the teaching of literacy.



## Appendix D

### Commission on Teacher Credentialing Draft PROPOSED Preliminary PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist Credential Program Standards

#### 7. Literacy for PK-3 ECE Specialist Credential Programs

The credential program’s coursework and field experiences encompass the study of effective means of teaching literacy to young children across all content areas—including the strands of reading, writing, listening, and speaking—based on California’s State Board of Education (SBE)-adopted English Language Arts (ELA) and Literacy Standards, English Language Development (ELD) Standards, and Preschool Learning Foundations in an organized and comprehensive manner that incorporates Universal Design for Learning. Program coursework and field experiences are aligned with the current, SBE-adopted *English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework*, including the crosscutting themes of Foundational Skills,<sup>1</sup> Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, and Content Knowledge, as well as the *Preschool Curriculum Framework*. The program emphasizes the relationship and importance of the foundational skills to student learning across all themes; it also acknowledges that progress in the other themes propels progress in the foundational skills. The program makes clear that instruction in each of the themes is essential.

The program supports the development of candidates’ knowledge, skills, and abilities to provide effective literacy instruction that is comprehensive, systematic, evidence based, and responsive to children’s age, grade, and development, including their linguistic, cognitive, and social strengths. The program builds candidates’ understanding that high-quality literacy instruction integrates all strands of the language arts in ELA, ELD, and other content areas to develop learners’ capacities as effective and critical readers, writers, listeners, and speakers. Candidates learn the power of language (both oral and written) to understand and transform our world and to promote social justice.

The study of high-quality literacy instruction in the program also incorporates the following elements of California’s Comprehensive State Literacy Plan:

- a) Multi-Tiered System of Support, including best first instruction and Universal Design for Learning; targeted, supplemental instruction for children whose literacy skills are not progressing; and referrals for intensive intervention for children who have not benefited from supplemental support
- b) Principles of equity, diversity, and inclusion, including materials and practices that are asset based<sup>2</sup> and culturally and linguistically responsive and sustaining

---

<sup>1</sup> See also the [Resource Guide to Foundational Skills of the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts](#).

<sup>2</sup> Although known by various names (culturally relevant pedagogy, culturally responsive teaching, culturally sustaining pedagogy, funds of knowledge, and many others), practices that affirm students’ cultural lives— both family and community—and incorporate this knowledge into the classroom, collectively deem students’ lived

- c) Instruction that is responsive to individual children’s age and developmental needs, as well as individual literacy goals
- d) Integrated and designated ELD and promotion of multiliteracy and multilingual programs
- e) Incorporation of the *California Dyslexia Guidelines*
- f) Assessment for various purposes, including formative and summative assessment; screening for reading, writing, and other difficulties, including risk of dyslexia; and referrals for additional assessment and intervention

Through coursework and field experiences, candidates learn literacy instructional practices that are active, motivating, and engaging; they learn that instructional practices vary according to children’s age and development, learning goals, and assessed individual strengths and needs and include, as appropriate, direct instruction, collaborative learning, and inquiry-based learning. Candidates learn to build on children’s cultural and linguistic backgrounds, experiences, and knowledge in all instruction. Importantly, candidates learn the importance of creating literacy environments for young children that are nurturing and joyful and that encourage active exploration and investigation and providing opportunities for children to engage freely in child-initiated, self-directed activities; work individually and in small groups; and take part in imaginative and dramatic play. Early childhood programs also emphasize the importance of families as the first, primary, and ongoing contributors to children’s literacy development. Candidates learn ways to collaborate and partner with families and communities and ensure that they are welcomed, informed, heard, and included in literacy development opportunities.

### **Foundational Skills**

PK-3 ECE Specialist credential programs offer coursework and field experiences that include evidence-based means of teaching the foundational skills of print concepts, including book handling; phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition; decoding; and fluency to all children as a part of a comprehensive literacy program. Through the program candidates learn that effective instruction in foundational reading skills is direct, systematic, and explicit and occurs in an environment that is print-rich and child centered. Candidates learn to 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. Candidates also learn that instruction employs early intervention strategies informed by ongoing measures of student progress and diagnostic techniques, including tiered supports for students with reading, writing, or other literacy difficulties and disabilities, including students at risk for or with dyslexia. Programs ensure that candidates understand that instruction in phonological awareness and phonics includes phonemic awareness, letter-sound and spelling-sound correspondences, spelling patterns, and practice in connected, decodable text. The program also includes evidence-based means of teaching foundational skills to multilingual and English learner students while these learners are

---

experiences as assets. These practices affirm the diversity that students bring to the classroom, including culture, language, disability, socioeconomic status, immigration status, sexual orientation, and gender identity as characteristics that add value and strength to classrooms and communities. They include instructional approaches that leverage the cultural and linguistic experiences of students to make learning more relevant and effective.

simultaneously developing oral English language proficiency, and in some cases literacy skills in an additional language;<sup>3</sup> this instruction is adapted based on children’s previous literacy experiences in their home languages and how closely children’s home languages are related to English. Candidates learn critical milestones of foundational skill development and how to adjust and differentiate instruction for children whose skills are not progressing.

Programs offer guided clinical practice experiences that allow candidates to provide initial or supplemental foundational skills instruction at beginning levels of reading (i.e., instruction beyond the earliest years and before children have typically developed fluency in decoding).

Through coursework and field experiences, credential candidates learn to identify and support children’s progress in the elements of foundational skills and language that support children as they interact with increasingly complex text both as readers and writers, including direct and explicit instruction in fluency, spelling patterns, syllable patterns, morphology, vocabulary, and syntax. All candidates learn how to identify and monitor the progress of children with potential reading and writing difficulties, including dyslexia; provide accommodations and supplemental support; and collaborate with specialists and children’s families to initiate needed referrals for additional and intensive intervention.

### **Meaning Making**

Coursework and field experiences emphasize meaning making as the central purpose for interacting with text, composing text, engaging in research, participating in discussion, speaking with others, and listening to, viewing, and giving presentations. Candidates learn that rich early literacy experiences include engaging children in interactions with print in ways that make meaning central. Candidates learn the value of reading aloud and strategies for modeling and assisting children in making predictions, retelling and reenacting, and responding to and generating questions about stories and other text. Programs address literal and inferential comprehension with all children, including making connections with prior knowledge and experiences; programs also address the importance of attending to higher order cognitive skills, such as reasoning, inferencing, perspective taking, and critical listening, speaking, reading, and writing across disciplines in ways that are appropriate for the age of the children. Programs ensure that candidates understand that among the contributors to meaning making are language, knowledge, motivation, comprehension monitoring, and in the case of reading and writing, the ability to recognize printed words and use the alphabetic code to express ideas automatically and efficiently. Programs highlight the importance of providing children opportunities to interact with a range of print and digital, high-quality literary and informational texts that are culturally and linguistically relevant as listeners, readers, speakers, and writers and to share their understandings, insights, and responses with others. Through coursework and field experiences, candidates learn to engage children in listening, reading, and viewing closely to draw information from texts, ask and answer questions, and support analysis,

---

<sup>3</sup> See updated [Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and new Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations](#) for standards and expectations specific to multilingual programs.

reflection, and research. Candidates also learn to plan instruction based on an analysis of the text complexity of instructional materials.

### **Language Development**

Coursework and field experiences emphasize language development as the cornerstone of literacy, learning, and relationship building; candidates learn that it is with and through language that children learn, think, and express information, ideas, perspectives, and questions. Candidates learn to provide young children with thoughtful and rich exposure to and experience with varied forms of language and to respond attentively to children's use of language. The program presents ways to create environments and frame interactions that foster oral and written language development for all children, including academic language. Candidates learn to express interest in and attend to children's verbalizations and expand and elaborate on their language, adding details or more complex sentence structures. The program focuses on instruction that values and leverages children's existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging. The program promotes multilingualism and addresses the development of languages other than English in multilingual programs. The program addresses the importance of vocabulary in children's literacy development and knowledge acquisition, highlighting effective teaching of vocabulary both indirectly (through rich and varied language experiences and word play/word consciousness) and directly (through the study of individual words and of independent word learning strategies, including morphology and etymology). The program also attends to grammatical and discourse-level understandings of language as a social process and meaning making system. Candidates learn that the interaction of syntax, sentence- and discourse-level understandings, and vocabulary forms registers that vary according to context, situation, and discipline. The program addresses ways to facilitate children's learning of complex sentence and text structures and emphasizes that children enrich their language as they listen, speak, read, and write; interact with one another; learn about language; create diverse print and digital texts, and engage with rich content in all disciplines. Candidates learn to plan instruction based on the analysis of instructional materials and tasks and assessment (formal and informal) of individual children's speaking and writing.

### **Effective Expression**

Coursework and field experiences address effective expression, including how children learn to effectively express themselves as activity, play, and discussion partners; presenters; and writers and to use digital media and visual displays to enhance their expression in ways that are appropriate for the age of the children. Candidates learn how to engage children in a range of interactions and collaborative conversations with diverse partners on instructional topics and texts and to engage young children in extended conversations in which multiple conversational turns are taken. Candidates learn to help children identify effective expression in what they listen to, view, and read, as they examine the words, images, and organizational structure of written, oral, or visual text. Through the program, candidates learn to teach children to discuss, present, and write in ways appropriate to their age and development so that their meanings are conveyed clearly, logically, powerfully, and, when appropriate and desired, poetically. Candidates also learn how to help children communicate in ways appropriate for their purpose,

audience, context, and task and gain command over the conventions of written and spoken English as they create print and digital texts. The program focuses on instruction that values and leverages children’s existing languages and dialects, including translanguaging, and that promotes effective expression in languages other than English in multilingual programs. Candidates also learn to select appropriate teaching strategies to develop children’s abilities to plan, develop, revise using feedback, edit, and produce their own writing and presentations in increasingly sophisticated genres drawing on the modes of opinion, information, and narration. The program includes explicit instruction in handwriting and keyboarding for young learners and the use of digital tools by all children to produce and publish their own written texts and multimedia presentations. Candidates learn to plan instruction based on the analysis of instructional materials and tasks and assessment (formal and informal) of individual children’s speaking and writing.

### **Content Knowledge**

Coursework and field experiences address content knowledge, which includes literary, cultural, and domain knowledge, as a powerful contributor to comprehension of text and sources of information and ideas. The program highlights the integration of literacy across disciplines and the reciprocal relationships between the development of academic language, literacy, and content knowledge. The program helps candidates understand that while building content knowledge enhances literacy development, it also serves to motivate many children, particularly when its relevance is clear and when it reflects and values children’s diverse experiences and cultures and is responsive to their interests. The program emphasizes the importance of full access to content instruction—including through print and digital texts and multimedia, discussions, experimentation, and hands-on explorations—regardless of children’s language proficiency levels or learning differences and addresses inclusive practice and co-teaching models. Candidates learn to foster new learning and provide choices that reflect and expand children’s interests; they engage children in learning experiences that connect to the worlds they know while enriching and extending those worlds. The program helps candidates build children’s understandings of the ways in which disciplines use language and literacy to engage with content and communicate as members of discourse communities (e.g., historians, scientists). The program addresses the role of content knowledge in navigating increasingly complex informational texts, researching questions of interest, evaluating the credibility of sources, and sharing knowledge as writers and speakers in ways that are appropriate to their age and development. The program also highlights the importance of deep reading, including being read to, and wide and independent reading in knowledge building. In addition, the program helps candidates learn to promote digital literacy, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate safely and responsibly, and to foster digital citizenship in ways that are appropriate for children’s age and development.

### **Literacy Instruction for Children with Disabilities**

Coursework and field experiences provide candidates an understanding of how various disabilities can impact literacy instruction (e.g., dyslexia, dysgraphia, autism, speech/language impairment, varied cognitive abilities) and how candidates can appropriately differentiate and accommodate instruction to provide access to the curriculum for all children. Programs

incorporate the *California Dyslexia Guidelines* through literacy coursework or field experiences that include the definition of dyslexia and its characteristics; screening for risk of dyslexia and other reading and/or writing disabilities; and effective approaches for teaching and differentiating instruction for children at risk for and with dyslexia and other disabilities. Candidates learn that guiding principles for educating children with dyslexia and other disabilities are anchored in instructional and assessment practices that are evidence based and that incorporate instruction that is comprehensive, systematic, explicit, cumulative, and multimodal and that includes phonology, orthography, phonics, morphology, syntax, and semantics. Programs help candidates understand their responsibility for providing initial and supplemental instruction and for collaborating with families and specialists to gain additional assessment and instructional support as needed.

### **Integrated and Designated English Language Development**

Coursework and field experiences highlight the relationships between ELD, ELA/literacy, and other content instruction and the distinctions between integrated and designated ELD. Programs build candidates' understanding of the purposes and strategies of integrated and designated ELD that are appropriate for learners' levels of English language proficiency and prior educational experiences and that develop children's ability to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works. Through the program, candidates learn to provide integrated ELD in which EL children are taught to use and understand English to access and make meaning of academic content throughout the school day and across disciplines. Candidates learn to use the ELA/Literacy Standards, Preschool Learning Foundations, or other applicable content standards and ELD Standards in tandem to ensure that EL children strengthen their abilities to use academic English as they simultaneously learn content. Programs also prepare candidates to provide designated ELD, a protected time during the regular school day, in which EL children are grouped together and are taught English language skills critical for engaging in grade-level content learning. Candidates learn to use the ELD standards as the focus of instruction in designated ELD in ways that connect to and support content instruction.

### **Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations and Clinical Practice**

Programs address all elements of the literacy teaching performance expectations and offer instruction in the knowledge, skills, and abilities required by any required literacy performance assessments. Guided practice in a clinical setting<sup>4</sup> provides opportunities for candidates to apply what they have learned.

---

<sup>4</sup> See proposed Preliminary PK-3 ECE Specialist Credential Program Standard 3 on Clinical Practice for additional details.

**Draft [PROPOSED Teaching Performance Expectations\\*](#) for  
PK-3 ECE Preliminary Specialist Credential Candidates**

*\*See Appendix D on page 17 in the linked Agenda Item for the complete list of TPEs for the Proposed PK-3 ECE Preliminary Specialist Credential.*

**Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Children**

- 7.1 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,<sup>1</sup> Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, and Content Knowledge) and their integration; and the *Preschool Curriculum Framework*.
- 7.2 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 California’s Multi-Tiered System of Support (Tier 1–Best first instruction and Universal Design for Learning; Tier 2–Targeted, supplemental instruction; Tier 3–Referrals for intensive intervention) and the *California Dyslexia Guidelines*.
- 7.3 Incorporate asset-based<sup>2</sup> and inclusive approaches and culturally and linguistically sustaining practices in literacy 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 programs, as applicable.<sup>3</sup>
- 7.4 Provide literacy instruction for all children that is active, motivating, and engaging, based on age and development, assessed learning strengths and needs, analysis of instructional materials and tasks, and identified academic standards and learning goals. Create literacy environments for young children that are nurturing and joyful and that encourage active exploration; interaction with others; child-initiated, self-directed activities; and imaginative and dramatic play.

---

<sup>1</sup> See also the [Resource Guide to Foundational Skills of the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts](#).

<sup>2</sup> Although known by various names (culturally relevant pedagogy, culturally responsive teaching, culturally sustaining pedagogy, funds of knowledge, and many others), practices that affirm students’ cultural lives— both family and community—and incorporate this knowledge into the classroom, collectively deem students’ lived experiences as assets. These practices affirm the diversity that students bring to the classroom, including culture, language, disability, socioeconomic status, immigration status, sexual orientation, and gender identity as characteristics that add value and strength to classrooms and communities. They include instructional approaches that leverage the cultural and linguistic experiences of students to make learning more relevant and effective.

<sup>3</sup> See updated [Bilingual Authorization Program Standards and new Bilingual Teaching Performance Expectations](#) for program standards and teaching expectations specific to multilingual programs.

- 7.5 Develop children’s Foundational Skills according to standards and expectations for children’s age and grade. Develop the Foundational Skills of print concepts, including book handling; phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition; decoding; and fluency through instruction that is direct, systematic, and explicit and that includes practice in connected, decodable text. 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. Identify and support students’ progress in the elements of Foundational Skills and Language Development that support students as they read and write increasingly complex text, including direct and explicit instruction in fluency, spelling patterns, syllable patterns, morphology, vocabulary, and syntax.
- 7.6 Engage children in Meaning Making by building on prior knowledge and using age-appropriate, print and digital, and complex literary and informational texts 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 young children in rich literacy experiences that 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 text.
- 7.7 Promote children’s 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, syntax, and sentence- and discourse-level understandings as children listen, speak, read, and write. Create environments that foster oral and written language development, including academic language. Enhance language development by engaging students in the creation of diverse print and digital texts. Conduct instruction that leverages children’s existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging.
- 7.8 Develop children’s Effective Expression as they discuss, present, write, and use language conventions. Engage children in a range of interactions and collaborative discussions, including extended conversations in which multiple conversational turns are taken. Develop children’s early writing skills by prompting children to share ideas, information, and stories using their developing knowledge of how print works, as well as through instruction and practice in handwriting, keyboarding, and other language conventions. Teach children in ways appropriate for their age and development to plan, develop, revise, edit, and produce their own writing and presentations in various genres, drawing on the modes of opinion, information, and narration.



- 7.9 Promote Content Knowledge by engaging children with books, multimedia, and other texts; discussions; experimentation; and hands-on explorations and by providing choices that reflect and expand their interests. Involve children in wide and deep reading of a variety of digital and print texts through independent reading and read alouds. Engage children with content-rich texts and research to develop their ability to acquire, construct, and convey knowledge as they listen, speak, read, and write. Promote digital literacy, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate safely and responsibly, and foster digital citizenship.<sup>4</sup>
- 7.10 Understand how to monitor children’s progress in literacy development using ongoing, diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and learning;<sup>5</sup> screen for potential reading and writing difficulties, including children’s risk for dyslexia; and collaborate with families and specialists to facilitate comprehensive assessment in English and as appropriate in the home language, plan and provide tiered instruction and early intervention for children who are not making adequate progress and initiate needed referrals.
- 7.11 Provide instruction in English language development (ELD) based on an understanding of the purposes and strategies of integrated and designated ELD that is connected to content learning, is appropriate for children’s levels of English language proficiency and prior educational experiences, and develops children’s ability to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works.
- 7.12 Understand how to provide literacy instruction in all content areas authorized by the credential—English language arts, English language development, history-social science, mathematics, science, arts education, health, physical education, world languages, career technical education, and computer science—that integrates reading, writing, listening, and speaking in discipline specific ways.

---

<sup>4</sup> See [California Digital Learning Integration and Standards Guidance](#) for additional information.

<sup>5</sup> See proposed PK-3 ECE Specialist Teaching Performance Expectations, Domain 5, Assessing and Documenting Children’s Development and Learning, for additional details.

## Appendix E

### Commission on Teacher Credentialing

#### Crosswalk of SB 488 and the Literacy Program Standard for Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credentials

The following charts identify the language or concepts in the Literacy Program Standard for Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credentials that correspond with the requirements stated in SB 488, Education Code 44259(b)(4). Corresponding language or concepts are indicated with underlined text. Correspondences were determined based on the use of the same or similar language in both documents or updated language consistent with the intent of the legislation. Special notes are indicated with asterisks and bold font. *Note: The content of SB 488 relative to literacy instruction is addressed across the 14 paragraphs (¶) of this literacy standard. As a result, the text of SB 488 is repeated several times in these charts to highlight the specific aspects of the legislation that are addressed in each section of the standard.*

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p><u>...The study of effective means of teaching literacy shall be in accordance with the commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current teaching performance expectations, shall be aligned to the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the state board, ...</u></p> <p>The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:</p> <p>(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, <u>and the relationship of direct, systematic, explicit phonics to the components set forth in clauses (i) to (v), inclusive, of subparagraph (A).</u></p>	<p><b>Overview, ¶1</b></p> <p>The credential program’s coursework and field experiences encompass <u>the study of effective means of teaching literacy</u> across all disciplines—including the strands of reading, writing, listening, and speaking—based on California’s State Board of Education (SBE)-adopted English Language Arts (ELA) and Literacy Standards and English Language Development (ELD) Standards in an organized and comprehensive manner that incorporates Universal Design for Learning. Program coursework and field experiences are <u>aligned with the current, SBE-adopted English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework</u>, including the crosscutting themes of Foundational Skills, Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, and Content Knowledge. <u>The program emphasizes the relationship and importance of the foundational skills to student learning across all themes</u>; it also acknowledges that progress in the other themes propels progress in the foundational skills. The program makes clear that instruction in each of the themes is essential.</p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>Study of effective means of teaching literacy, including, but not limited to, the study of reading as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), and <u>evidence-based</u> means of teaching ... The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of <u>comprehensive reading instruction</u> that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p><u>(ii) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.</u></p> <p>(C) A program for the multiple subject teaching credential and the education specialist teaching credential also shall include the <u>study of integrated methods of teaching language arts.</u></p>	<p><b>Overview, ¶12</b></p> <p>The program supports the development of candidates' knowledge, skills, and abilities to provide effective literacy instruction that is <u>comprehensive</u>, systematic, <u>evidence based</u>, and responsive to students' age and development. The program builds candidates' understanding that high-quality literacy instruction <u>integrates all strands of the language arts in ELA, ELD, and other disciplines</u> to develop learners' capacities as <u>effective and critical readers, writers, listeners, and speakers.</u> Candidates learn the <u>power of language (both oral and written)</u> to understand and transform our world and promote social justice.</p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>Study of effective means of teaching literacy, including, but not limited to, the study of reading as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), and evidence-based means of teaching foundational reading skills in print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency to all pupils, <u>including tiered supports for pupils with reading difficulties, English learners, and pupils with exceptional needs.</u> The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall be aligned to the current <b>English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework*</b> adopted by the state board, <u>and shall incorporate the program guidelines for dyslexia developed pursuant to Section 56335.</u> The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following:</p> <p><u>(iii) Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.</u></p> <p><u>(iv) Early intervention techniques.</u></p>	<p><b>Overview, ¶13</b></p> <p>The study of high-quality literacy instruction in the program also incorporates the following elements of California’s Comprehensive State Literacy Plan:</p> <p>g) <u>Multi-Tiered System of Support, including best first instruction and Universal Design for Learning; targeted, supplemental instruction for students whose literacy skills are not progressing; and referrals for intensive intervention for individuals who have not benefited from supplemental support</u></p> <p>h) Principles of equity, diversity, and inclusion, including materials and practices that are asset based and culturally and linguistically responsive and sustaining*</p> <p>i) Instruction that is responsive to individual learners’ age and development and individual literacy goals*</p> <p>j) Integrated and designated ELD and promotion of multiliteracy and multilingual programs*</p> <p>k) <u>Incorporation of the <i>California Dyslexia Guidelines</i></u></p> <p>l) <u>Assessment for various purposes, including formative and summative assessment; screening for reading, writing, and other difficulties, including risk of dyslexia; and referrals for additional assessment and intervention</u></p> <p><b><i>*Elements b-d are also discussed in the ELA/ELD Framework.</i></b></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>...The study of effective means of teaching literacy shall be in accordance with the commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current teaching performance expectations, shall be aligned to the current <b>English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework*</b> adopted by the state board, ...</p>	<p><b>Overview, ¶14</b></p> <p>Through coursework and field experiences, candidates learn literacy instructional practices* that are active, motivating, and engaging; they learn that instructional practices vary according to students’ learning goals and assessed individual strengths and needs and include, as appropriate, direct instruction, collaborative learning, and inquiry-based learning. Candidates learn to build on students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds, experiences, and knowledge in all instruction.</p> <p><i><b>*The instructional practices described in this section of the literacy standard are consistent with those described in the ELA/ELD Framework.</b></i></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>Study of effective means of teaching literacy, including, but not limited to, the study of reading as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), and <u>evidence-based means of teaching foundational reading skills in print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency to all pupils, including tiered supports for pupils with reading difficulties, English learners, and pupils with exceptional needs.</u> ...The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall be aligned to the current <b>English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework*</b> adopted by the state board. ... The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of <u>comprehensive reading instruction</u> that is research based and includes all of the following:</p> <p>(i) The study of organized, <u>systematic, explicit skills including phonemic awareness, direct, systematic, explicit phonics, and decoding skills.</u> ...</p> <p>(iii) <u>Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.</u></p> <p>(iv) <u>Early intervention techniques.</u> ...</p> <p>(B) For purposes of this section, “<u>direct, systematic, explicit phonics</u>” means <u>phonemic awareness, spelling patterns, the direct instruction of sound/symbol codes and practice in connected text,</u> ...</p>	<p><b>Foundational Skills,* ¶15</b></p> <p>Multiple Subject and Single Subject English credential programs offer coursework and field experiences that include <u>evidence-based means of teaching the foundational skills of print concepts, phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition; decoding; and fluency to all learners</u> as a part of a comprehensive literacy program. Through the program, candidates learn that effective instruction in foundational reading skills is <u>direct, systematic, and explicit and employs early intervention strategies informed by ongoing measures of student progress and diagnostic techniques, including tiered supports for students with reading, writing, or other literacy difficulties and disabilities, including students at risk for or with dyslexia.</u> Programs ensure that candidates understand that <u>instruction in phonological awareness and phonics includes phonemic awareness, letter-sound and spelling-sound correspondences, spelling patterns, and practice in connected, decodable text.</u> The program also includes evidence-based means of teaching foundational skills to multilingual and English learner students while these learners are simultaneously developing oral English language proficiency, and in some cases literacy skills in an additional language; this instruction is adapted based on students’ previous literacy experiences in their home languages and how closely students’ home languages are related to English. <u>Candidates learn critical milestones of foundational skill development and how to adjust and differentiate instruction for students whose skills are not progressing.</u></p> <p><b><i>*Foundational Skills is one the key themes of ELA/Literacy and ELD instruction described in the ELA/ELD Framework.</i></b></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p>(v) <u>Guided practice in a clinical setting.</u></p>	<p><b>Foundational Skills, ¶6</b></p> <p>Multiple Subject credential programs offer <u>guided clinical practice experiences</u> that allow candidates to provide initial or supplemental foundational skills instruction at beginning levels of reading (i.e., before children have typically developed fluency in decoding).</p>
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of <u>comprehensive reading instruction</u> that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p><u>(iii) Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.</u></p> <p><u>(iv) Early intervention techniques.</u> ...</p>	<p><b>Foundational Skills, ¶7</b></p> <p>Through coursework and field experiences, all Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential candidates learn to identify and support learners’ progress in the elements of foundational skills and language that support students as they read and write increasingly complex text both as readers and writers, including direct and explicit instruction in fluency, spelling patterns, syllable patterns, morphology, vocabulary, and syntax. <u>All candidates learn how to identify and monitor the progress of learners with potential reading and writing difficulties, including dyslexia; provide accommodations and supplemental support; and collaborate with specialists and students’ families to initiate needed referrals for additional and intensive intervention.</u></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>...The study of effective means of teaching literacy shall be in accordance with the commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current teaching performance expectations, shall be aligned to the current <b>English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework*</b> adopted by the state board, ...</p> <p>The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p><u>(ii) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.</u> <i>(Note: This specific language does not appear in the literacy standard; however, the language of the standard addresses similar content and is consistent with current research and practice.)</i></p>	<p><b>Meaning Making,* ¶18</b></p> <p>Coursework and field experiences for Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs emphasize <u>meaning making as the central purpose for interacting with text</u>, composing text, engaging in research, participating in discussion, speaking with others, and listening to, viewing, and giving presentations. Programs <u>address literal and inferential comprehension at all grades and with all students, including making connections with prior knowledge and experiences; programs also address the importance of attending to higher order cognitive skills, such as reasoning, inferencing, perspective taking, and critical reading, writing, listening, and speaking in every discipline.</u> Programs ensure that candidates understand that among the contributors to meaning making are <u>language</u>, knowledge, motivation, <u>comprehension monitoring</u>, and in the case of reading and writing, the ability to recognize printed words and use the alphabetic code to express ideas automatically and efficiently. Programs highlight the importance of providing children and youth opportunities to interact with a range of print and digital, <u>high-quality literary and informational texts</u> that are culturally and linguistically relevant, as listeners, readers, speakers, and writers and to share their understandings, insights, and responses with others. Through coursework and field experiences, candidates learn to engage students in <u>reading, listening, and viewing closely to draw evidence from texts, ask and answer questions, and support analysis, reflection, and research.</u> Candidates also learn to plan instruction based on an analysis of the text complexity of instructional materials.</p> <p><b><i>*Meaning Making is one the key themes of ELA/Literacy and ELD instruction described in the ELA/ELD Framework.</i></b></p>



Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>...The study of effective means of teaching literacy shall be in accordance with the commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current teaching performance expectations, shall be aligned to the current <b>English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework*</b> adopted by the state board, ...</p> <p>The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p><u>(ii) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.</u> <i>(Note: This specific language does not appear in the literacy standard; however, the language of the standard addresses similar content and is consistent with current research and practice.)</i></p>	<p><b>Language Development,* ¶19</b></p> <p>Coursework and field experiences for Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs emphasize <u>language development as the cornerstone of literacy, learning,</u> and relationship building; candidates learn that it is with and through language that children and youth learn, think, and express information, ideas, perspectives, and questions. The program presents ways to <u>create environments and frame interactions that foster oral and written language development for all students, including academic language.</u> The program focuses on instruction that values and leverages students’ existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging. The program promotes multilingualism and addresses the development of languages other than English in multilingual programs. The program addresses the <u>importance of vocabulary in children’s literacy development and knowledge acquisition,</u> highlighting effective teaching of vocabulary both indirectly (through rich and varied language experiences and word play/word consciousness) and directly (through the study of individual words and of independent word learning strategies, including morphology and etymology). The program also attends to <u>grammatical and discourse-level understandings of language</u> as a social process and meaning making system. Candidates learn that the interaction of syntax, sentence- and discourse-level understandings, and vocabulary forms registers that vary according to context, situation, and discipline. The program addresses ways to facilitate students’ learning of complex sentence and text structures and emphasizes that learners enrich their language as they read, write, speak, and listen; interact with one another; learn about language; create diverse print and digital texts, and engage with rich content in all disciplines. Candidates learn to plan instruction based on the analysis of instructional materials and tasks and assessment (formal and informal) of individual students’ speaking and writing.</p> <p><b><i>*Language Development is one the key themes of ELA/Literacy and ELD instruction described in the ELA/ELD Framework.</i></b></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>...The study of effective means of teaching literacy shall be in accordance with the commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current teaching performance expectations, shall be aligned to the current <b>English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework*</b> adopted by the state board, ...</p> <p>The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p><u>(ii) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.</u> <i>(Note: This specific language does not appear in the literacy standard; however, the language of the standard addresses similar content and is consistent with current research and practice.)</i></p>	<p><b>Effective Expression,* ¶10</b></p> <p>Coursework and field experiences for Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs address effective expression, including how children and youth learn to <u>effectively express themselves as activity and discussion partners, presenters, and writers</u> and to use digital media and visual displays to enhance their expression. Candidates learn how to engage students in a <u>range of interactions and collaborative conversations, including extended conversations</u>, with diverse partners on instructional topics and texts. Candidates learn to help students <u>identify effective expression in what they read, listen to, and view as they examine the words, images, and organizational structure of written, oral, or visual text</u>. Through the program, candidates learn to teach students to <u>write, present, and discuss so that their meanings are conveyed clearly, logically, powerfully, and, when appropriate and desired, poetically</u>. Candidates also learn how to help learners <u>communicate in ways appropriate for their purpose, audience, context, and task and gain command over the conventions of written and spoken English</u> as they create print and digital texts. The program focuses on instruction that values and leverages students’ existing languages and dialects, including translanguaging, and that promotes effective expression in languages other than English in multilingual programs. Through coursework and field experiences, Candidates also learn to select appropriate teaching strategies to develop students’ abilities to plan, develop, revise using feedback, edit, and produce their own writing and presentations in increasingly sophisticated genres drawing on the modes of opinion/ argumentation, information, and narration. The program includes explicit instruction in handwriting and keyboarding for young learners and the use of digital tools by all students to produce and publish their own written texts and multimedia presentations. Candidates learn to plan instruction based on the analysis of instructional materials and tasks and assessment (formal and informal) of individual students’ speaking and writing.</p> <p><b><i>*Effective Expression is one the key themes of ELA/Literacy and ELD instruction described in the ELA/ELD Framework.</i></b></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>...The study of effective means of teaching literacy shall be in accordance with the commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current teaching performance expectations, shall be aligned to the current <b>English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework*</b> adopted by the state board, ...</p> <p>The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p><u>(ii) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.</u> <i>(Note: This specific language does not appear in the literacy standard; however, the language of the standard addresses similar content and is consistent with current research and practice.)</i></p>	<p><b>Content Knowledge,* ¶11</b></p> <p>Coursework and field experiences for Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential programs address content knowledge, which includes literary, cultural, and domain knowledge, as a powerful contributor to comprehension of text and sources of information and ideas. The program highlights the integration of literacy across disciplines and the reciprocal relationships between the development of academic language, literacy, and content knowledge. The program helps candidates understand that while building content knowledge enhances literacy development, it also serves to motivate many students, particularly when its relevance is clear and when it reflects and values students’ diverse experiences and cultures and is responsive to their interests. The program emphasizes the importance of full access to content instruction—including through printed and digital texts and multimedia, discussions, experimentation, and hands-on explorations—regardless of students’ language proficiency levels or learning differences and addresses inclusive practices and co-teaching models. The program helps candidates build students’ understandings of disciplinary literacy—the ways in which disciplines use language and literacy to engage with content and communicate as members of discourse communities (e.g., historians, scientists). The program addresses the role of content knowledge in navigating <u>increasingly complex informational texts, researching questions of interest, evaluating the credibility of sources, and sharing knowledge as writers and speakers.</u> The program also highlights the <u>importance of deep reading, including being read to, and wide and independent reading in knowledge building.</u> In addition, the program helps candidates learn to promote digital literacy, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate safely and responsibly, and to foster digital citizenship.</p> <p><b><i>*Content Knowledge is one the key themes of ELA/Literacy and ELD instruction described in the ELA/ELD Framework.</i></b></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>Study of effective means of teaching literacy, including, but not limited to, the study of reading as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), and evidence-based means of teaching foundational reading skills in print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency to all pupils, <u>including tiered supports for pupils with reading difficulties, English learners, and pupils with exceptional needs.</u> The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall be aligned to the current <b>English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework*</b> adopted by the state board, and <u>shall incorporate the program guidelines for dyslexia developed pursuant to Section 56335.</u> The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p><u>(iii) Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.</u></p> <p><u>(iv) Early intervention techniques.</u></p>	<p><b>Literacy Instruction for Students with Disabilities,* ¶12</b></p> <p>Coursework and field experiences for Multiple Subject and Single Subject English credential programs provide candidates an understanding of how various disabilities can impact literacy instruction (e.g., dyslexia, dysgraphia, autism, speech/language impairment, varied cognitive abilities) and how candidates can appropriately differentiate and accommodate instruction to provide access to the curriculum for all learners. Programs <u>incorporate the <i>California Dyslexia Guidelines</i> through literacy coursework and/or field experiences that include the definition of dyslexia and its characteristics; screening for risk of dyslexia and other reading and/or writing disabilities; and effective approaches for teaching and differentiating instruction for students at risk for and with dyslexia and other disabilities.</u> Candidates learn that <u>guiding principles for educating students with dyslexia and other disabilities are anchored in instructional and assessment practices that are evidence based and that incorporate instruction that is comprehensive, systematic, explicit, cumulative, and multimodal and that includes phonology, orthography, phonics, morphology, syntax, and semantics.</u> Programs help candidates understand <u>their responsibility for providing initial and supplemental instruction and for collaborating with families and specialists to gain additional assessment and instructional support as needed.</u></p> <p><b><i>*This section of the standard corresponds with the description of instruction for students with disabilities in the ELA/ELD Framework.</i></b></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>...The study of effective means of teaching literacy shall be in accordance with the commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current teaching performance expectations, shall be aligned to the current <b>English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework*</b> adopted by the state board, ...</p>	<p><b>Integrated and Designated English Language Development,* ¶13</b></p> <p>Coursework and field experiences for <b>Multiple Subject and Single Subject</b> credential programs highlight the relationships between ELD, ELA/literacy, and other content instruction and the distinctions between integrated and designated ELD. Programs build candidates’ understanding of the purposes and strategies of integrated and designated ELD that are appropriate for students’ levels of English language proficiency and prior educational experiences and that develop students’ ability to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works. Through the program, all candidates learn to provide integrated ELD in which EL students are taught to use and understand English to access and make meaning of academic content throughout the school day and across disciplines. All candidates learn to use the ELA/literacy standards (or other content standards) and ELD standards in tandem to ensure that EL students strengthen their abilities to use academic English as they simultaneously learn content. <b>Multiple Subject</b> credential programs prepare candidates to provide designated ELD, a protected time during the regular school day, in which EL students are grouped together and are taught English language skills critical for engaging in grade-level content learning. Candidates learn to use the ELD standards as the focus of instruction in designated ELD in ways that connect to and support content instruction.</p> <p><i><b>*This section of the standard corresponds with the description of integrated and designated ELD instruction in the ELA/ELD Framework.</b></i></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of MS/SS Literacy Program Standard
<p><b>EC 44259(b)(4)</b></p> <p>...The study of effective means of teaching literacy shall be in accordance with the commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and <u>current teaching performance expectations</u>, ...</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p>(v) <u>Guided practice in a clinical setting</u>.</p>	<p><b>Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations and Clinical Practice, ¶14</b></p> <p>Programs address all elements of the literacy <u>teaching performance expectations</u> and offer instruction in the knowledge, skills, and abilities required by any required literacy performance assessments. <u>Guided practice in a clinical setting</u> provides opportunities for candidates to apply what they have learned.</p>

## Crosswalk of SB 488 and Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations for Multiple Subject and Single Subject Preliminary Credential Candidates

The following chart identifies the language or concepts in the Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential candidates that correspond with the requirements stated in SB 488, Education Code 44259(b)(4).

Corresponding language or concepts are indicated with underlined text. Correspondences were determined based on the use of the same or similar language in both documents or updated language consistent with the intent of the legislation. *Note: The content of SB 488 relative to literacy instruction is addressed across the 12 elements of the literacy TPEs. As a result, the text of SB 488 is repeated several times in the chart to highlight the specific aspects of the legislation that are addressed in each TPE element.*

Text of SB 488	Text of Literacy TPEs
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) Study of <u>effective means of teaching literacy</u>, including, but not limited to, the study of reading as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), and <u>evidence-based means of teaching</u> foundational reading skills ... The study of <u>effective means of teaching literacy</u> ... shall be <u>aligned to the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework</u> adopted by the state board, ...</p>	<p>7.1 Plan and implement <u>evidence-based literacy instruction</u> (and/or integrated content and literacy instruction) grounded in an understanding of applicable literacy-related standards<sup>1</sup> and the themes of the <u>ELA/ELD Framework (Foundational Skills, Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, and Content Knowledge)</u> and their integration.</p>
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) Study of effective means of teaching literacy, including, but not limited to, the study of reading as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), and evidence-based means of teaching foundational reading skills ... to all pupils, including <u>tiered supports for pupils with reading difficulties</u>, English learners, and <u>pupils with exceptional needs</u>. The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall <u>incorporate the program guidelines for dyslexia</u> developed pursuant to Section 56335.</p>	<p>7.2 Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction (and/or integrated content and literacy instruction) grounded in an understanding of <u>California’s Multi-Tiered System of Support (Tier 1–Best first instruction and Universal Design for Learning; Tier 2–Targeted, supplemental instruction; Tier 3–Referrals for intensive intervention)</u> and the <u>California Dyslexia Guidelines</u>.</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicable literacy-related standards for **Multiple Subject and Single Subject English** candidates are English Language Arts, Literacy, and English Language Development. Applicable literacy-related standards for other **Single Subject** candidates are Literacy and English Language Development.

Text of SB 488	Text of Literacy TPEs
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) .... The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall <u>be aligned to the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework</u> adopted by the state board</p>	<p>7.3 Incorporate <u>asset-based and inclusive approaches and culturally and linguistically sustaining practices in literacy instruction</u> (and/or integrated content and literacy instruction), recognizing and incorporating the diversity of students’ cultures, languages, dialects, and home communities. Promote students’ <u>literacy development in languages other than English in multilingual programs.</u></p>
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) ... The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall <u>be aligned to the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework</u> adopted by the state board, ...</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p>(iii) <u>Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.</u></p>	<p>7.4 Provide literacy instruction (and/or integrated content and literacy instruction) for all students that is <u>active, motivating, and engaging, based on students’ assessed learning strengths and needs, analysis of instructional materials and tasks, and identified academic standards and learning goals.</u></p>
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) Study of ... evidence-based means of teaching <u>foundational reading skills in print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency</u> to all pupils, including tiered supports for pupils with reading difficulties, English learners, and pupils with exceptional needs. ...</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following:</p> <p>(i) The study of organized, <u>systematic, explicit skills including phonemic awareness, direct, systematic, explicit phonics, and decoding skills.</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language...</u></p>	<p>7.5 <b>Multiple Subject Candidates:</b> <u>Develop students’ Foundational Skills of print concepts; phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition; decoding; and fluency through instruction that is direct, systematic, and explicit and that includes practice in connected, decodable text.</u> <b>Multiple Subject and Single Subject Candidates:</b> Identify and support students’ progress in the elements of Foundational Skills and Language Development that support students as they <u>read and write increasingly complex text, including direct and explicit instruction in fluency, spelling patterns, syllable patterns, morphology, vocabulary, and syntax.</u></p>



Text of SB 488	Text of Literacy TPEs
<p>(B) For purposes of this section, <u>“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).</u> ...</p>	
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) ... (A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p>(ii) <u>A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.</u></p>	<p>7.6 Engage students in <u>Meaning Making by building on prior knowledge and using complex print and digital literary and informational texts, questioning, and discussion to develop students’ literal and inferential comprehension, including the higher order cognitive skills of reasoning, perspective taking, and critical reading, writing, listening, and speaking.</u></p>
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) ... The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall <u>be aligned to the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the state board,</u> ...</p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p>(ii) <u>A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.</u></p>	<p>7.7 Promote students’ <u>Language Development by attending to vocabulary, syntax, and sentence- and discourse-level understandings as students read, write, listen, and speak. Create environments that foster oral and written language development, including academic language.</u> Enhance language development by engaging students in the creation of <u>diverse print and digital texts. Conduct instruction that leverages students’ existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging.</u></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of Literacy TPEs
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) ... The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall <u>be aligned to the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the state board, ...</u></p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following: ...</p> <p>(ii) <u>A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.</u></p>	<p>7.8 Develop students' <u>Effective Expression as students write, discuss, present, and use language conventions.</u> Develop <u>students' early writing skills through instruction in handwriting, keyboarding, and other language conventions.</u> Teach students to <u>engage in collaborative discussions and to plan, develop, revise, edit, and produce their own writing and presentations in various genres, drawing on the modes of opinion/argumentation, information, and narration.</u></p>
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) ... The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall be <u>aligned to the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the state board, ...</u></p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following:</p> <p>(ii) <u>A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.</u></p>	<p>7.9 Promote students' <u>Content Knowledge through wide and deep reading of a variety of digital and printed texts, including disciplinary texts, and research to develop students' ability to acquire, construct, and convey knowledge as they read, write, listen, and speak.</u> Promote <u>digital literacy, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate safely and responsibly, and foster digital citizenship.</u></p>
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) Study of effective means of teaching literacy, ... including <u>tiered supports for pupils with reading difficulties, English learners, and pupils with exceptional needs.</u> The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall <u>incorporate the program guidelines for dyslexia developed pursuant to Section 56335. ...</u></p> <p>(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following:</p> <p>(iii) <u>Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.</u></p> <p>(iv) <u>Early intervention techniques. ...</u></p>	<p>7.10 <u>Understand how to monitor students' progress in literacy development using ongoing, diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and learning; screen for potential reading and writing difficulties, including students' risk for dyslexia; and collaborate with families and specialists to facilitate comprehensive assessment in English and as appropriate in the home language, and plan and provide tiered instruction and early intervention for students who are not making adequate progress and initiate needed referrals.</u></p>

Text of SB 488	Text of Literacy TPEs
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) ... The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall <u>be aligned to the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the state board, ...</u></p>	<p>7.11 <u>Provide instruction in English language development (ELD) based on an understanding of the purposes and strategies of integrated and designated ELD that is connected to content learning, is appropriate for students' levels of English language proficiency, and develops students' ability to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works.</u></p>
<p>EC 44259(b)(4) ... The study of effective means of teaching literacy ... shall <u>be aligned to the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the state board, ...</u></p> <p>(C) A program for the multiple subject teaching credential and the education specialist teaching credential also shall include the study of <u>integrated methods of teaching language arts.</u></p>	<p>7.12 <u>Understand how to provide literacy instruction in all content areas authorized by the credential—English language arts, English language development, history-social science, mathematics, science, arts education, health, physical education, world languages, career technical education, and computer science—that integrates reading, writing, listening, and speaking in discipline specific ways.</u></p>