# 2E

## Information/Action

*Educator Preparation Committee*

**Education Specialist Teaching Performance Assessments: Review and Potential Approval of edTPA and FAST**

**Executive Summary:** This agenda item presents for the Commission's potential approval the edTPA and Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) teaching performance assessments for the Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) credential areas of emphasis. A description of each performance assessment and the model sponsors' plans for conducting standard setting studies is provided.

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission approve the Special Education edTPA (MMSN and ESN) for California, the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers – Mild to Moderate (FAST: ES-MMSN), and the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers – Extensive Support Needs (FAST: ES-ESN) as having met the requirements laid out in the Commission's Assessment Design Standards and direct the sponsors to conduct standard setting studies for their assessments.

**Presenters:** David DeGuire, Director, and Mike Taylor, Consultant, Professional Services Division; Nicole Merino, edTPA National Director, Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE); and Juliet Wahleithner, Assistant Director of Teacher Education, Fresno State University

**Strategic Plan Goal**

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

# Education Specialist Teaching Performance Assessments: Review and Potential Approval of edTPA and FAST

**Introduction**

This agenda item presents for the Commission's potential approval the edTPA and Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) teaching performance assessments for the Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) credential areas of emphasis. A description of each performance assessment and the model sponsors' plans for conducting standard setting studies is provided.

**Background**

At the August 2018 Commission meeting, the Commission adopted program standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for the MMSN and ESN Education Specialist teaching credentials, and in April 2019 adopted authorization statements for these education specialist credentials. In addition, the Commission acted in December 2020, to make the successful demonstration of proficiency on a performance assessment for education specialist candidates a requirement for the preliminary credential. Education Code section 44259 was amended to include this requirement for earning an education specialist credential.

At its June 2022 meeting, the Commission heard an update on the development, field test, and standard setting study of the Commission's Education Specialist CalTPA for the Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) credentials and approved. The Commission adopted the MMSN and ESN CalTPAs for operational administration beginning October 2022, established passing standards for initial implementation, and directed staff to conduct a second standard setting review/study in spring 2024.

The other two model sponsors with Commission approved teaching performance assessments, the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE) and Fresno State University, are submitting the MMSN and ESN versions of their assessments for Commission review and approval.

In 2018, the Multiple and Single Subject forms of edTPA, FAST and CalTPA underwent a significant review for validity and reliability pursuant to the Assessment Design Standards adopted by the Commission (see below). The review was conducted by the Human Resources Research Organization (humRRO) and found that all three models met the Assessment Design Standards. All three models were approved for use in California Multiple and Single Subject teacher preparation programs in August 2018. The adaptations made by SCALE and CSU Fresno to the edTPA and FAST teaching performance assessments for the Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs credentials build off these core models approved previously by the Commission.

**The Commission's Assessment Design Standards**
TPA models adopted for use by the Commission must meet the Commission's [Assessment Design Standards](#). The current Assessment Design Standards were adopted by the Commission in 2015 and updated in 2021. An overview of each of the three standards is provided here:

*Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness*
The sponsor of a teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in California (model sponsor) designs a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated (i.e., to serve as a determination of a candidate's status with respect to the TPEs and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness), anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment's validation process. The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program. A passing standard is recommended by the model sponsor based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning teachers to meet prior to licensure.

*Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness*
The sponsor of the performance assessment requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical performance to serve as a valid basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary General Education Teaching Credential. The model sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with this stated purpose of the assessment. The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate and maintain assessor calibration over time. The model sponsor periodically evaluates the assessment system to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment system and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.

*Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities*
The sponsor of the performance assessment provides technical support to teacher preparation programs using that model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a national scorer approach and/or the local scoring option. The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the Commission, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the Commission, and to maintain the currency of the model over time.

**Review of edTPA Special Education for California**
In July 2022, the review of the Education Specialist CalTPAs for Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Extensive Support Needs consisted of two separate analyses: a content review and a review for compliance with the Commission's Assessment Design Standards. The content

review was conducted by subject matter experts from Education Specialist programs and was based on Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness:

*1(a) The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring rubrics that are clearly related to the TPEs that the task measures.*

Reviewers found that each task on the assessment and their associated rubrics measure two or more of both the MMSN and ESN TPEs (see Appendix B). The assessment is not required to assess all TPEs, but collectively, the tasks and rubrics for the assessment were found to address key aspects of the six major domains of the MMSN and ESN TPEs, and the performance assessment properly documented the relationships between the TPEs, tasks and rubrics.

SCALE submitted an addendum to their original submission to address Assessment Design Standards 2 and 3. With the addendum, the assessment was found to have clearly met all the requirements in the Assessment Design Standards pending completion of the planned standard setting study (see Appendix C).

**Review of the FAST: ES-MMSN and FAST: ES-ESN**
In July 2022, the review of the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers – Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate consisted of two separate analyses: a content review and a review for compliance with the Commission's Assessment Design Standards. The content review was conducted by subject matter experts for Education Specialist programs and was based on Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness:

*1(a) The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring rubrics that are clearly related to the TPEs that the task measures.*

Reviewers found that each task on the assessment and their associated rubrics measure two or more TPEs. The assessment is not required to assess all TPEs, but collectively, the tasks and rubrics for each assessment were found to address key aspects of the six major domains of the TPEs, and the performance assessment properly documented the relationships between TPEs, tasks and rubrics (see Appendices D and F).

Outside of the planned standard setting study, the assessment was also found to have met all the requirements in the Assessment Design Standards (see Appendices E and G).

The next sections provide overviews on the edTPA Special Education for California Handbook for MMSN and ESN and the FAST:ES-MMSN and FAST:ES-ESN, including how these assessments

differ from their general education versions, lessons learned in/plans for the field test, and plans for completing a standard setting study.

**Overview of edTPA**

The edTPA was developed by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE). The edTPA was field tested beginning in 2009 and has been used operationally outside of California since September 2013. The edTPA was initially approved for use by the Commission in August 2014, and the Commission adopted a minimum passing standard for edTPA in California at the October 2014 meeting. After the Commission adopted updated Assessment Design Standards and TPEs in December 2015 and June 2016, respectively, the edTPA was updated and reapproved by the Commission in 2018. More information about edTPA can be found by visiting SCALE's website: https://scale.stanford.edu/teaching/edtpa.

As a performance-based assessment system for learning, edTPA is designed to engage candidates in demonstrating their understanding of teaching and student learning in authentic ways. Unlike other evaluations of teaching, edTPA is not a "one size fits all" assessment system; rather, it focuses on subject matter and pedagogy modeled after the development of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) assessments. Each of the 28 edTPA handbooks embeds a subject-specific focus into a common architecture addressing the integration of planning, instruction, and assessment. In each credential area, candidates are required to support student learning of highly valued knowledge and skills within that field. Subject-specific features embedded in the edTPA rubrics were identified by the design team for each content area, including special education, and informed by pedagogical standards determined by national subject matter organizations and verified in the content validation process (see the 2013 edTPA Field Test: Summary Report for a full description).

The edTPA assessment system contains an integrated cycle of planning, instruction, and assessment, documenting and analyzing a candidate's field-specific pedagogical practices. These tasks represent the cycle of effective teaching that teachers repeat many times during an academic year. Stanford's extensive Review of Research on Teacher Education provides the conceptual and empirical rationale for edTPA's three-task design and the 15 rubrics representing the high-leverage teaching skills needed to be ready to teach. The assessment systematically examines an authentic cycle of teaching aimed at subject-specific student learning goals, using evidence derived from candidates' practice in their student teaching or internship placement.

The development of the National edTPA Special Education Handbook was informed by the general design and shared framework developed for the 2013 Field Test. The edTPA Special Education Handbook was reviewed by the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) and faculty members with expertise in the various areas within Special Education, including MMSN and ESN, for appropriateness within the discipline and when teaching birth–22 content standards and curriculum frameworks. The edTPA Special Education handbook requires candidates to provide a thorough and in-depth approach to supporting a focus learner. The candidate identifies an appropriate learning goal to work toward over 3–5 lessons. If the focus learner is

working on academic content (including academics in a community setting or early literacy/numeracy), the learning goal must be related to academic content in literacy, mathematics, social studies, or science. A candidate for a special education credential must also draw from both the IEP (or other individualized plan) to identify appropriate supports to meet the learner's multiple learning needs and move the focus learner toward the learning goal. This focus on matching supports to individualized needs is consistent not only with the California Education Specialist TPEs (adopted April 2021) but also the national Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Education Specialist candidates must combine knowledge of high-leverage practices—Universal Design for Learning (UDL) principles as well as disability and content-specific practices—together with knowledge of supports for other individual learning needs (e.g., control over emotions, mobility, assistive or alternative communication) to create a plan to move learners toward the learning goal.

The edTPA handbooks and rubrics are designed with a common architecture — with language and identical constructs with the exception of Rubric 9. However, each edTPA handbook includes the subject-specific language embedded throughout the handbook instructions, prompts, and rubrics. In the edTPA Special Education Handbook, the rubric constructs focus on the same general area as the corresponding rubric in other fields. For example, Rubric 2 focuses on support for student learning, and Rubric 11 focuses on assessing student learning. Additional differences throughout the edTPA Special Education Handbook, as compared to other handbooks, reflect specific attention to teaching in the special educational context.

Candidates are allowed to choose evidence from a wide range of pedagogical practices within the types of artifacts and evidence that should be included in submissions to support valid judgments about their pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. Each field-specific portfolio assessment is presented to candidates through a "handbook" which follows a common architecture and contains the instructions, tasks, and prompts for candidates to complete as they are assembling their electronic portfolio of teaching materials associated with the three integrated tasks:
- Task 1 Planning: Planning for Instruction and Assessment
- Task 2 Instruction: Instructing and Engaging the Focus Learner
- Task 3 Assessment: Assessing Student Learning

As shown in the following table, to complete edTPA, all candidates submit artifacts and reflective commentaries as evidence of how they planned and implemented instruction to deepen student learning, addressing the subject-specific central focus of the learning segment. For Special Education, this is an in-depth case study of a focus learner with a learning goal, lesson objectives, and supports for 3–5 lessons.
- _Artifacts_ represent authentic work completed by the teacher candidate and students. These include lesson plans, copies of instructional and assessment materials, video clip(s) of the candidate's teaching, and student work samples.
- _Commentaries_ require candidates to explain the artifacts, justify the rationale behind the choice of artifact or instructional decision, and analyze what they have learned about students' learning and the effectiveness of their teaching practice.

**Table 1: edTPA Tasks, Artifacts, and Rubric Criteria**

| Task | Artifacts | Size | Rubrics by Title |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1: Planning | Context for Learning | Template, 4 pages | Planning for Alignment and Development of Knowledge and Skills |
| | Lesson Plans for Learning Segment | 4 pages/lesson | Planning Challenge and Support for the Focus Learner |
| | Instructional Materials | 5 pages/lesson No limit | Justification of Instruction and Support |
| | Assessments and/or Data Collection Procedures | 12 pages | Supporting the Focus Learner's Use of Expressive/Receptive Communication |
| | Planning Commentary | | Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Learning |
| 2: Instruction | Video Clip(s) Instruction Commentary | 3–20 minutes<br><br>8 pages | Learning Environment<br><br>Engaging the Focus Learner<br><br>Deepening Learning<br><br>Supporting Teaching and Learning<br><br>Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness |
| 3: Assessment | Work Sample | 3 samples | Analyzing the Focus Learner's Performance |
| | Completed Daily Assessment Records and Baseline Data | 3 samples | Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning |
| | Evidence of Feedback | 3 samples | Learner Understanding and Use of Feedback |
| | Evidence of Use of Communication Skill | 5 min. oral; no limit written | Explaining the Focus Learner's Use of Communication |
| | Assessment Commentary | 8 pages | Using Assessment to Inform Instruction |

Within the edTPA handbooks, candidates are directed to consider the strengths and needs of the learners they are teaching and to attend to the academic language development of all students (including English learners) across all three tasks. For Special Education, the candidate explains how they will support the focus learner to develop the targeted communication skill in the Planning task and provides evidence in the Instruction and/or Assessment tasks of the extent to which the focus learner has learned and can use the communication skill to participate in learning tasks and/or demonstrate learning related to the learning goal.

*Special Education edTPA for California*
The edTPA Special Education for California Handbook was designed for both MMSN and ESN candidates. As in the National version, the edTPA Special Education for California Handbook centers on a focus learner with an identified disability who has multiple learning needs. This approach was chosen because it provides detailed and in-depth evidence of a candidate's ability to tailor planning, instruction, and assessment to individual strengths and needs, which is at the heart of IDEA. By focusing on a single learner, a substantial amount of information about the learner is collected, including their strengths and learning needs across multiple developmental domains. This design gives evidence of the candidate's ability to address various learning needs, as required by this TPA Design Standard.

California candidates completing the edTPA Special Education for California Handbook focus on teaching English learners, underserved education groups, groups that need to be served differently, and students with disabilities in order to effectively teach all students. California candidates must select a focus learner who (a) has an individualized learning plan that identifies learning goals and required special instruction and related services for an individual learner with a disability; (b) is an English learner; and (c) is a representative of an underserved group or a group that needs to be served differently. Since the focus learner must have multiple learning needs as described above, the candidate must consider in each lesson the focus learner's different learning needs (e.g., being an English learner with a specific disability or a student with a disability who needs to be supported to manage their emotions to participate in groupwork). This demonstrates their ability to address the type of learner needs required in Assessment Design Standard 1(d).

The single focus learner allows flexibility across learning environments. The candidate is instructed to teach the focus learner in the setting where instruction usually occurs. This could be within a general education classroom, in a small group, or for a small number of learners, one-on-one instruction, including working with a child with disabilities while also demonstrating for a parent how to work with their child between visits. The TPA tasks focus on how the candidate uses the learner's strengths and tailors instruction and support to meet the learner's learning needs, as well as offering appropriate challenge to promote learning and developmentally appropriate independence.

For California Candidates, the edTPA Special Education for California Handbook also requires that candidates collaborate with parents, teachers, and other community and/or school personnel to collect information about the focus learner and design appropriate instruction

and supports for learning the designated California academic standard(s) in alignment with the requirements outlined in the [Preliminary Education Specialist Teacher Credential Preconditions, Program Standards, and Teaching Performance Expectations](). Candidates are directed to collaborate with parents and other educators or specialists who work with the focus learner to describe the focus learner's present level of performance in five different developmental areas. Candidates must describe what they shared and what they learned about the focus learner and/or strategies for supporting them and explain how the collaboration informed planned outcomes and/or actions for supporting the learning, citing specific examples. To assess this performance, we added a criterion in Rubric 2, Planning Challenge and Support for the Focus Learner, to include collaborating with others to support the learning; this revision measures the clarity and depth of the description and explanation of the collaboration.

The edTPA Special Education for California Handbook also requires California candidates to identify a communication skill in English and, for candidates for the MMSN credential, the skill must be academic language. The edTPA Special Education for California Handbook requires that if candidates select a focus learner who is working on academic content, including academics in a community setting, early literacy, or early numeracy, the learning goal that is the focus of the portfolio must be academic. The academics in a community setting most often consist of mathematics (e.g., calculating if they have enough money to buy their chosen items in a store) or, more often, literacy (e.g., reading signs in the community, reading or writing a daily list of tasks in their work placement, or adjusting their oral communication to be appropriate for their audience [e.g., a supervisor]). In practice, virtually every focus student is working on academic content.

The handbook was designed to be flexible to accommodate placements in general education classrooms, small groups, or one-on-one settings. For example, in the Instruction Task when instruction is occurring in a group setting, the focus learner is presumed to learn from interactions between the candidate and other learners, unless the description of the focus learner indicates otherwise, and not all of the candidate attention is expected to be directed to the focus learner. However, the candidate is expected to maintain the focus learner's active engagement throughout the instruction seen in the video clips.

*edTPA Special Education for California Handbook Tasks and Rubrics*
In Task 1: Planning, candidates are required to describe the focus learner's strengths and needs in multiple developmental areas and submit plans that draw upon strengths and address needs in relation to a learning goal across 3–5 days of instruction with related learning objectives for each lesson. The framing for candidates provides flexibility through numerous possible developmental domains, including an "other" domain. This flexibility is intended to capture focus learner strengths and needs in

- English language development,
- specific disability(ies),
- the nature of the underserved group or,
- differences that the focuser learner represents.

Candidates are also asked to justify their plans considering their description of the focus learner and research and theory, including disability-specific research.

In Task 2: Instruction, video evidence of instruction in the usual setting (i.e., individual instruction or within a class or group) shows how the candidate keeps the focus learner engaged during instruction while still attending to other students in a group setting and provides needed supports as well as feedback and opportunities to apply it.

In Task 3: Assessment, the candidate provides an analysis of the focus learner's progress based on the baseline data provided and a daily assessment log. The analysis includes whether or not the lesson objectives were achieved and analyzes the effectiveness of the supports provided.

Candidates explain the focus learner's strengths and needs and how they tailor planning, instruction, and assessment, accordingly, in reference to the following commentary prompts:

- *Task 1: Planning Prompts 1d and 3a–d, planning instructional supports and appropriate challenge, given the focus learner's strengths and needs*
- *Task 1: Planning Prompts 2a–e, data-based description of the focus learner's strengths and needs in multiple developmental domains to inform planning*
- *Task 1: Planning Prompts 5a–b, design and adaptation of assessments to monitor learning over time*
- *Task 2: Instruction Prompts 6a–b, providing supports that both address the focus learner's needs and that offer manageable challenge (via video clips)*
- *Task 2: Instruction Prompts 7a–b, analyzing teaching effectiveness (via video clips)*
- *Task 3: Assessment Prompts 1d–f, analyzing focus learner progress and the effectiveness of supports based on both baseline data and daily assessment records*
- *Task 3: Assessment Prompt 4a, using assessment information to plan next steps for instruction*

The candidate designs accommodations based both on principles of UDL and additional individual needs and, when appropriate, modifies the curriculum to enable the focus student to access the curriculum and demonstrate learning. The upper levels of many of the rubrics reflect the ability to help focus learners learn to independently apply strategies for learning or for accomplishing subject-specific tasks. The candidate designs assessments to monitor progress toward the learning goal through ongoing data collection. Through their analyses of the baseline data, daily assessment records, and the level of supports provided, the candidate draws conclusions about the learner's progress toward the goal as well as the effectiveness of the supports. For learners requiring very extensive support who require more than 3–5 lessons to reach a learning goal, the series of lessons focuses on gradually withdrawing supports and analyzing subtle signs of progress toward the learning goal.

*15 Rubrics, Five-Point Scales*
edTPA portfolios are evaluated on a multi-level score scale with five points for each of the 15

edTPA rubrics (as listed in the previous table). The rubrics used to score performance, which address common outcomes across all fields and are uniquely adapted to address learning and pedagogy specific to each individual field, include descriptors and address a wide range of performance. See Appendix H for further details.

*What was learned in field test*
During the spring 2022, Stanford University and the Evaluation Systems group of Pearson (Evaluation Systems) conducted a field test of the edTPA Special Education for California assessment. Recruitment for the field test was conducted through announcements in the Commission's PSD e-News, monthly California edTPA Coordinator Checkpoint meetings, and via direct outreach by Stanford University. In total, two California programs participated in the edTPA Special Education for California field test. From one program, 19 candidates submitted scorable portfolios; two candidates from the other program registered for the edTPA Special Education for California field test, but neither submitted a portfolio.

While the participation in the edTPA Special Education for California field test was limited to these programs, other California candidates have completed the edTPA Special Education (national) assessment as a program completion requirement since 2014. During the initial years of operational use, the edTPA Special Education (national) handbook underwent several revisions. The current version of the edTPA Special Education (national) became available in 2018.

Because of the lower number of scorable edTPA Special Education for California portfolios, the sponsor has reviewed the field test data combined with the data from the 75 examinees from California candidates who completed the edTPA Special Education (national) assessment between October 2018 and April 2022. This is appropriate because the two assessments share many requirements, including exact prompts and scoring criteria for 14 of the 15 rubrics. This combined data will be used for the initial standard setting study. Descriptive statistics for both sample populations, as well as psychometric analyses and interpretation of field test data, will be provided in an October agenda item.

The field test provided an opportunity to assess the implementation of the following Assessment Materials:
- edTPA Special Education for California field test Assessment Handbook, including:
  - edTPA Special Education for California field test Task 1, Planning for Instruction and Assessment Commentary Template
  - edTPA Special Education for California field test Task 2, Instructing and Engaging the Focus Learner Commentary Template
  - edTPA Special Education for California field test Task 3, Assessing Learning Commentary Template
- edTPA Special Education for California field test Context for Learning Template
- edTPA Special Education for California field test Academic Language Handout

- edTPA Special Education for California field test Understanding Rubric Level Progressions

Additional Support Materials:
- edTPA Special Education for California field test Making Good Choices

Lead contacts for participating institutions were provided with communications about the field test, regular check-ins during the field test, and invited to attend weekly Zoom meetings with Evaluation Systems staff to address questions and/or support needs.

While most communication with candidates was provided by their EPP, Evaluation Systems did provide an initial communication to all participating candidates to share their voucher code, the link to the edTPA Special Education for California field test website, and registration instructions. Upon edTPA Special Education for California field test registration, candidates were provided with access to the same assessment materials as listed above via a secure Field Test website. All direct support for candidates was provided by their EPP.

*Plan for standard setting study*
Evaluation Systems will conduct a standard setting event for the edTPA Special Education for California assessment on September 28, 2022. The panelists will be recruited from California EPP and K-12 faculty and staff who have expertise in Special Education, with specific recruitment from those individuals with expertise in MMSN and ESN.

Consistent with prior edTPA Standard Settings, the Briefing Book Method will be utilized to review sample submissions, field test data and through multiple rounds of collaborative orientation, review, and discussion, establish an agreed upon recommended passing standard to bring forward to the Commission in October 2022.

**Overview of the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers: Education Specialist (FAST: ES-MMSN and FAST: ES-ESN)**
Based on the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers 2.0 (FAST 2.0) for Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates, the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers: Education Specialist-Mild to Moderate Support Needs (FAST: ES-MMSN) and the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers: Education Specialist-Extensive Support Needs (FAST: ES-ESN) include both a Site Visitation Project, to be completed in the second semester of the three-semester program, and a Teaching Sample Project, to be completed in the final semester of the program.
Within the FAST: ES-MMSN and FAST: ES-ESN Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project, candidates are expected to complete the same tasks as candidates completing the FAST 2.0.

*FAST Tasks*
For the Site Visitation Project (SVP), this means candidates complete the following for each task:

Planning:
- Class Profile
- Lesson Plan
- Activities/Strategies Table

Implementation:
- Video Recording of the Teaching of the Lesson

Reflection:
- Selected Video Clip
- Self-Evaluation of the Lesson

For the Teaching Sample Project (TSP), candidates complete the following for each task:

Students in Context:
- Students in Context chart
- Instructional Implications responses
- Classroom Management Plan Narrative or Graphic Organizer

Learning Outcomes:
- Description of Unit
- Table of Outcomes
- Rationale of Unit

Assessment Plan:
- Description of Learning Outcome A Pre- and Summative Assessment Instruments
- Description of Learning Outcome B Pre- and Summative Assessment Instruments
- Description of Specific Formative Assessments
- Rationale for Assessments

Design for Instruction:
- Summary of Pre-Assessment
- Unit Overview
- Three Lesson Plans
- Responses to Questions about Lessons

Instructional Decision Making:
- Two Examples of Lesson Adjustments

Analysis of Student Learning:
- Class Analysis
- Progress Report

Reflection and Self-Evaluation:
- Reflection on Instruction and Assessment
- Reflection on Professional Development

*Modifications to Tasks & Rubrics*
While the overall tasks are the same between the FAST 2.0 and the FAST: ES assessments, tasks have been modified to align with instruction in a MMSN or ESN context. Examples of modifications to the tasks include the following:

Site Visitation Project:
- Planning: Within the Class profile, candidates are asked to include information about their students' accommodations/modifications, specially designed instruction, related services, and primary mode of communication At least one of the selected focal students must have an IEP and at least one must have an IEP and be identified as an English Learner
- Lesson Plan: Candidates must address how they are taking into account students' IEPs and any accommodations/modifications
  *note: MMSN candidates must also address 504 Plans*
- Reflection: When completing the Self-Evaluation of the lesson, candidates are required to consider the learning of an identified focal student with an IEP in their evaluation of the lesson

Teaching Sample Project:
- Students in Context: Candidates must explain how they will design instruction to meet the identified special needs of their students. Additionally, they must describe the specific learning needs and methods used to support the learning of two students with IEPs, one of whom must also be identified as an English Learner. Candidates must also identify how they will coordinate, collaborate, and/or co-teach with other service providers to support the instructional needs of their students.
- Learning Outcomes: Candidates are required to detail the relevance of the unit for the learning goals of specific students in the class, including their IEP goals
- Assessment Plan: When providing the rational for their selected assessments, candidates must provide details about the appropriateness of the assessments for supporting students in meeting their specific IEP goals
- Design for Instruction: In their responses to Questions About Their Lessons, candidates must describe how they designed their lessons to provide access to the content for all students in ways that align with students' IEPs.
- Analysis of Student Learning: For the Progress Report, candidates must select a student who has an IEP who struggled with the instruction in the unit and write a progress report that could be shared with other service providers— including paraprofessionals, general education teachers, and parents— summarizing the student's strengths and areas for growth with specific connections to the student's IEP goals. The candidate should also include suggestions for the student that align with what is articulated within the IEP.

In addition to the modifications to the specific SVP and TSP tasks, the rubrics for each task were also revised to align with the ES MMSN TPEs and ES ESN TPEs. Revised rubrics with the MMSN-specific language highlighted in the level 4 descriptions can be found in Appendix I, and those with ESN-specific Language can be found in Appendix J.

*Plan for Field Test*

The Fresno State Education Specialist program, in collaboration with the FAST coordinator, intend to field test the FAST: ES-MMSN and FAST:ES-ESN in the 2022-23 academic year with candidates currently enrolled in the Education Specialist: Mild to Moderate Support Needs and Education Specialist: Extensive Support Needs programs. Specifically, the Site Visitation Project will be field-tested in fall 2022 and again during the spring 2023 semester. The Teaching Sample Project will be field-tested during the spring 2023 semester. Field tests will be designed to evaluate the validity and reliability of the assessment.

Orientation for Coaches and Faculty:

In early fall 2022, the FAST Coordinator and the Assistant Director of Teacher Education will provide an orientation for coaches and faculty separately on the FAST: ES-MMSN and FAST: ES-ESN, giving an overview of the Site Visitation Project and the Teaching Sample Project, the corresponding TPEs, and what is required of candidates to complete each task. Faculty and coaches will receive a copy of the FAST: ES-MMSN Manual or the FAST: ES-ESN Manual as appropriate, and the specific resources provided to candidates will be discussed.

In fall 2022, faculty and coaches will also be guided in a discussion of how they might support candidates in their completion of the SVP during coursework and field placement experiences. A similar discussion will be held in early spring 2023 to discuss how faculty and coaches can support candidates in completing the Teaching Sample Project.

Orientation for Candidates:

At the beginning of the fall 2022 semester, candidates enrolled in the second semester of the ES-MMSN program will attend an orientation to the FAST: ES-MMSN led by the FAST Coordinator. Candidates enrolled in the ES-ESN program will receive a similar orientation. In those sessions, candidates will receive the appropriate Manual for the version of the FAST: ES they will be completing. At that time, they will be introduced to the TPE language and the Site Visitation Project, the task they are to complete that semester. Additionally, candidates will be walked through the resources available to them in the manual. Candidates will also receive step-by-step instructions for how to upload their completed documents into TK20 for scoring. Printed versions of the SVP directions and rubrics will be provided to candidates and also made available electronically.

Similarly, in spring 2023, candidates will be introduced to the TPE language and the Teaching Sample Project, the task they are to complete that semester. Additionally, candidates will be walked through the TSP resources available to them in the manual. Again, candidates will receive step-by-step instructions for how to upload their completed documents into TK20 for scoring. Printed versions of the TSP directions and rubrics will be provided to candidates and also made available electronically.

Completion of Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project

During the fall 2022 semester, FAST: ES-MMSN and ES-ESN candidates will be supported in completing and submitting the Site Visitation Project, following the same timeline as Multiple

Subject and Single Subject candidates completing the FAST 2.0.

In spring 2023, FAST: ES-MMSN and ES-ESN candidates will be supported in completing and submitting the Teaching Sample Project, following the same timeline as Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates completing the FAST 2.0.

At the completion of each semester, candidates will be invited to respond to a survey to gather their feedback on the clarity of task instructions, clarity of the rubrics, and the support they received completing the SVP or TSP.

*Plan for Conducting Standard Setting Study*
Like the FAST 2.0, a minimum score of 2 on each rubric (three task rubrics for the SVP and five task rubrics for the SVP) will be required for candidates to successfully complete each of the FAST: ES-MMSN and FAST: ES-ESN components.

Following the submission of the SVP by both sets of candidates in late fall 2022, two focus groups will be convened by the FAST Coordinator and the Assistant Director of Teacher Education to review sample projects and their alignment with the SVP task-specific rubrics (Planning, Implementation, and Reflection) within the FAST: ES-MMSN and the FAST: ES-ESN. These focus groups will consist of, at a minimum, two individuals from each of the following groups: university faculty, coaches, mentor teachers, and support providers of new teachers, all of whom must have experience supporting with experience Education Specialist – Mild to Moderate Support Needs teachers or Education Specialist – Extensive Support Needs teachers. In particular, the focus group will be responsible for ensuring that the level 2 for each SVP rubric reflects a reasonable level of proficiency for an entry-level Education Specialist – Mild to Moderate Support Needs or Education Specialist – Extensive Support Needs teacher.

Additionally, the focus groups will be responsible for selecting exemplar Site Visitation Projects to represent each rubric score point. These exemplar projects will then be used in calibration sessions with scorers of both the FAST: ES-MMSN SVP and the FAST: ES-ESN SVP.

A similar process will be used in Spring 2023 for ensuring that the level 2 for each TSP rubric reflects a reasonable level of proficiency for an entry-level Education Specialist – Mild to Moderate Support Needs or Extensive Support Needs teacher and for selecting exemplar projects for calibration sessions. Again, the groups will consist of, at a minimum, two individuals from each of the following groups: university faculty, coaches, mentor teachers, and support providers of new teachers, all of whom must have experience supporting with experience Education Specialist—Mild-to-Moderate Support Needs or Education Specialist – Extensive Support Needs teachers. The groups will review sample projects and their alignment with the TSP task-specific rubrics (Students in Context, Learning Outcomes, Assessment Plan, Design for Instruction, Instructional Decision-Making, Analysis of Student Learning, and Reflection and Student-Evaluation).

<u>Field Test Scoring:</u>
Building on the existing FAST system, the FAST: ES-MMSN and the FAST:ES-ESN will include a comprehensive program to train assessors who score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. As outlined here, certain elements of the training model are similar for both tasks while others are unique to a specific task.

*Scorer Training Elements Common to Both Tasks:*
- Scorer training is provided prior to scheduled task-specific scoring deadline.
- Scoring is facilitated by an experienced trainer with special task-related expertise.
- Training is specific to each task
  - In-depth exploration of TPEs to be scored, task directions and rubric; bias training; calibration based on scoring exemplars selected by standard-setting group, discussion of the scores, and reaching consensus.
- Only trained scorers may score candidate performance tasks, including double scoring.
- Only scorers with pedagogical expertise in the content area(s) assessed in the task may score that task. An individual is considered to have pedagogical expertise if they have taught that subject at the university or have a credential to teach it in a K-12 school.

*Psychometric Analyses and Interpretation of Field Test Data*
Fifteen percent of responses to each task will be carefully selected for double scoring to ensure representation across participants.

Reliability statistics for the field-testing will be pursued by producing a percent agreement statistic calculated using a procedure adapted from Worthen, et al, (1999). This test will be used rather than a Pearson correlation statistic because the data are at best ordinal, and with a four-point scale, the resulting lack of scoring variability conspires against correlation values. In addition to reliability statistics, data will be analyzed to identify any ethnic or gender group differences. The test performed for ethnic group differences will be Kruskal-Wallis H, a non-parametric test for significant differences among more than two groups when the dependent variable is ordinal. For gender differences, Mann-Whitney U, the equivalent test for two groups, will be used.

At the end of each semester, candidates and assessors will be invited to respond to a survey specific to the task completed (for example, those who completed or assessed the SVP will respond to a survey about the SVP). The survey will include items soliciting feedback about the clarity of the task directions and rubrics and the adequacy of appropriate support in preparing for the tasks, including the adequacy of support for technical aspects (such as videotaping and uploading) of the Site Visitation Project.

**Staff Recommendation**
1. That the Commission approve the Special Education edTPA for California as having met the requirements laid out in the Commission's Assessment Design Standards for use with MMSN and ESN candidates.

2.  That the Commission approve the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers – Mild to Moderate (FAST: ES-MMSN) and the Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers – Extensive Support Needs (FAST: ES-ESN) as having met the requirements laid out in the Commission's Assessment Design Standards for use with MMSN and ESN candidates.

3.  That the Commission direct both model sponsors to conduct standard setting studies for their assessments and recommend passing standards to the Commission for approval.

**Next Steps**
If the Commission approves the assessments, this will be communicated to the field. In addition, staff will work with the assessment sponsors on completing their standard setting studies and bring an item back to the Commission with recommended passing standards.

# Appendix A

## California Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards

### Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness

The sponsor* of a teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in California (model sponsor) designs a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated (i.e., to serve as a determination of a candidate's status with respect to the TPEs and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness), anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment's validation process. The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program. A passing standard is recommended by the model sponsor based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning teachers to meet prior to licensure.

*Note: the "model sponsor" refers to the entity that represents the assessment and is responsible to programs using that model and to the Commission. Model sponsors may be a state agency, individual institutions, a consortium of institutions and/or partners, a private entity, and/or combinations of these.*

**Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness**

1(a)   The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring rubrics that are clearly related to the TPEs that the task measures. Each task and its associated rubrics measure two or more TPEs. Collectively, the tasks and rubrics in the assessment address key aspects of the six major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the performance assessment documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks and rubrics.

1(b)   1. The **general education** TPA model sponsor must include a focus on content-specific pedagogy within the design of the TPA tasks and scoring scales to assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach the content area(s) authorized by the credential.

   **2. The education specialist TPA model sponsor must include a focus on content-specific pedagogy and provide consultative, collaborative, and coordinating specially designed instruction with students, parents, teachers, and other community and school personnel within the design of the TPA tasks and scoring scales to assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach the content area(s) authorized by the credential.**

1(c)   Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the model sponsor defines scoring rubrics so candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different content-specific pedagogical practices that support implementation of the **state-adopted** content standards and curriculum frameworks. The model sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use a wide range of pedagogical practices that are educationally effective and builds scoring protocols to take these variations into account.

1(d)   1. **For Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates**, the model sponsor must include within the design of the TPA candidate tasks a focus on addressing the teaching of English learners, all underserved education groups or groups that need to be served differently, and students with **disabilities** in the general education classroom-to adequately assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach all students.

**2. For Education Specialist candidates, the model sponsor must include within the design of the TPA candidate tasks a focus on addressing teaching students who have an IEP (students aged 3 through 22), who have an IEP and English learners, and who have an IEP who are underserved education groups or groups that need to be served differently to adequately assess the candidate's ability to effectively teach all students with disabilities.**

1(e)   1. For Multiple Subject candidates, the model sponsor must include assessments of the core content areas of at least Literacy and Mathematics. Programs use local program performance assessments for History/Social Science and Science if not already included as part of the TPA.

2. For Education Specialist candidates, the model sponsor must include assessments that allow for either Multiple Subject (Literacy and Mathematics) or Single Subject content (as deemed appropriate for special education) and that aligns with the student teaching and/or clinical practice placement.

1(f)   The model sponsor must include a teaching performance within the TPA **during the required clinical experience**, including a video of the candidate's teaching performance with candidate commentary describing the lesson plan and rationale for teaching decisions shown and evidence of the effect of that teaching on student learning.

1 (g)   The TPA model sponsor must provide materials appropriate for use by programs in helping faculty become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks and the scoring rubrics so that faculty can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment. The TPA model sponsor must also provide candidate materials to assist candidates in understanding the nature of the assessment, the specific assessment tasks, the scoring rubrics, submission processes and scoring processes.

1(h)   The model sponsor develops scoring rubrics and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that

are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include (depending on the circumstances) factors such as personal attire, appearance, demeanor, speech patterns and accents or any other bias that are not likely to affect job effectiveness and/or student learning.

1(i)   The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor's clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for candidates, preparation programs, public schools, and **birth-22** students **within the authorization of the credential**. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.

1(j)   The model sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that pedagogical assessment tasks and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically sensitive, fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds.

1(k)   The model sponsor completes initial and periodic basic psychometric analyses to identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring rubrics that show differential effects in relation to candidates' race, ethnicity, language, gender or disability. When group pass-rate differences are found, the model sponsor investigates the potential sources of differential performance and seeks to eliminate construct-irrelevant sources of variance.

1(l)   In designing assessment administration procedures, the model sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities or learning needs.

1(m)  In the course of determining a passing standard, the model sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, supervisors of teachers, support providers of new teachers, and other preparers of teachers regarding necessary and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level teachers. The model sponsor periodically reviews the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard, when and as directed by the Commission.

1(n)   To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the model sponsor may need to develop and field test new pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring rubrics to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the model sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring rubrics to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs, and serve as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and student population of California's **birth-22 public schools**. The model sponsor documents the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and

rubrics as needed.

1(o)  The model sponsor must make all TPA materials available to the Commission upon request for review and approval, including materials that are proprietary to the model sponsor. The Commission will maintain the confidentiality of all materials designated as proprietary by the model sponsor.

1(p)  For concurrent bilingual candidates, no candidate can be required to translate student work or provide English transcriptions for the video component(s) of the TPA if in a language other than English. Model sponsors must ensure that Multiple Subject candidates may demonstrate their knowledge and skills teaching literacy in the language of instruction, including in a language other than English.

1(q)  All candidates must demonstrate as part of the TPA effective strategies teaching an English learner, in English with the use of the language of instruction as appropriate, within the content area of the intended credential. Each candidate must submit his or her analyses and reflections primarily in English.

**Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness**
The sponsor of the performance assessment requests approval of an assessment that will yield, in relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, enough collective evidence of each candidate's pedagogical performance to serve as a valid basis to judge the candidate's general pedagogical competence for a Preliminary Teaching Credential. The model sponsor carefully monitors assessment development to ensure consistency with this stated purpose of the assessment. The Teaching Performance Assessment includes a comprehensive program to train, calibrate and maintain assessor calibration over time. The model sponsor periodically evaluates the assessment system to ensure equitable treatment of candidates. The assessment system and its implementation contribute to local and statewide consistency in the assessment of teaching competence.

**Required Elements for Assessment Design Standard 2: Assessment Designed for Reliability and Fairness**
2(a)  In relation to the key aspects of the major domains of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks, rubrics, and the associated directions to candidates are designed to yield enough valid evidence for an overall judgment of each candidate's pedagogical qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential as one part of the requirements for the credential.

2(b)  Pedagogical assessment tasks and scoring rubrics are extensively field tested in practice before being used operationally in the Teaching Performance Assessment. The model sponsor evaluates the field test results thoroughly and documents the field test design, participation, methods, results and interpretation.

2(c)  The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive process to

select and train assessors who score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the multi-level scoring rubrics. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor's scoring accuracy and calibration in relation to the scoring rubrics associated with the task. The model sponsor establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to appropriate pedagogical expertise in the content areas assessed within the TPA. The model sponsor selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who successfully calibrate during the required TPA model assessor training sequence. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring rubrics are incorporated into the assessment, the model sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.

2(d)   In conjunction with the provisions of the applicable Teacher Preparation Program Standards relating to the Teaching Performance Assessment, the model sponsor plans and implements periodic evaluations of the assessor training program, which include systematic feedback from assessors and assessment trainers, and which lead to substantive improvements in the training as needed.

2(e)   The model sponsor provides a consistent scoring process for all programs using that model, including programs using a local scoring option provided by the model sponsor. The scoring process conducted by the model sponsor to assure the reliability and validity of candidate outcomes on the assessment may include, for example, regular auditing, selective back reading, and double scoring of candidate responses near the cut score by the qualified, calibrated scorers trained by the model sponsor. All approved models must include a local scoring option in which the assessors of candidate responses are program faculty and/or other individuals identified by the program who meet the model sponsor's assessor selection criteria. These local assessors are trained and calibrated by the model sponsor, and whose scoring work is facilitated and their scoring results are facilitated and reviewed by the model sponsor. The model sponsor provides a detailed plan for establishing and maintaining scorer accuracy and inter-rater reliability during field testing and operational administration of the assessment. The model sponsor demonstrates that the assessment procedures, taken as a whole, maximize the accurate determination of each candidate's overall pass-fail status on the assessment. The model sponsor must provide an annual audit process that documents that local scoring outcomes are consistent and reliable within the model for candidates across the range of programs using local scoring, and informs the Commission where inconsistencies in local scoring outcomes are identified. If inconsistencies are identified, the sponsor must provide a plan to the CTC for how it will address and resolve the scoring inconsistencies both for the current scoring results and for future scoring of the TPA.

2(f)   The model sponsor's assessment design includes a clear and easy to implement appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program, if the program is using centralized scoring provided by the model sponsor. If the program is implementing a local scoring option, the program must provide an appeal process as described above for candidates who do not pass the assessment. Model sponsors must document that all candidate appeals granted a second scoring are scored by a new assessor unfamiliar with the candidate or the candidate's response.

2(g)   The model sponsor conducting scoring for the program provides results on the TPA to the individual candidate based on performance relative to TPE domains and/or to the specific scoring rubrics within a maximum of three weeks following candidate submission of completed TPA responses. The model sponsor provides results to programs based on both individual and aggregated data relating to candidate performance relative to the rubrics and/or domains of the TPEs. The model sponsor also follows the timelines established with programs using a local scoring option for providing scoring results.

2(h)   The model sponsor provides program level aggregate results to the Commission, in a manner, format and time frame specified by the Commission, as one means of assessing program quality. It is expected that these results will be used within the Commission's ongoing accreditation system.

### Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities

The sponsor of the performance assessment provides technical support to teacher preparation programs using that model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a national scorer approach and/or the local scoring option. The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the Commission, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the Commission, and to maintain the currency of the model over time.

3(a)   The model sponsor provides technical assistance to programs implementing the model to support fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. Clear implementation procedures and materials such as a candidate and a program handbook are provided by the model sponsor to programs using the model.

3(b)   A model sponsor conducting scoring for programs is responsible for providing TPA outcomes data at the candidate and program level to the program within three weeks and to the Commission, as specified by the Commission. The model sponsor supervising/moderating local program scoring oversees data collection, data review with programs, and reporting.

3(c)　The model sponsor is responsible for submitting at minimum an annual report to the Commission describing, among other data points, the programs served by the model, the number of candidate submissions scored, the date(s) when responses were received for scoring, the date(s) when the results of the scoring were provided to the preparation programs, the number of candidate appeals, first time passing rates, candidate completion passing rates, and other operational details as specified by the Commission.

3(d)　The model sponsor is responsible for maintaining the currency of the TPA model, including making appropriate changes to the assessment tasks and/or to the scoring rubrics and associated program, candidate, and scoring materials, as directed by the Commission when necessitated by changes in **state-adopted content** standards and/or in teacher preparation standards.

3(e)　The model sponsor must define the retake policies for candidates who fail one or more parts of the TPA which preserve the reliability and validity of the assessment results. The retake policies must include whether the task(s) on which the candidate was not successful must be retaken in whole or in part, with appropriate guidance for programs and candidates about which task and/or task components must be resubmitted for scoring by a second assessor and what the resubmitted response must include.

# Appendix B

## edTPA TPE Content Review

### Mild to Moderate Support Needs TPEs

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| U TPE 1.1 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 1.2 | Yes | Task 3 |
| U TPE 1.3 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 1.4 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 1.5 | No | |
| U TPE 1.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 1.7 | No | |
| U TPE 1.8 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 1.1 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 1.2 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| MM 1.3 | Not explicitly | Task 1, 2, 3 – Unclear how the tasks address language development across disabilities |
| MM 1.4 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| MM1.5 | No | |
| MM 1.6 | Not explicitly | Tasks 1, 2 – Unclear how the tasks will support students in assuming increasing responsibility for learning and self-advocacy |
| MM 1.7 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 2.1 | Yes | Task 2 |
| U TPE 2.2 | Yes | Task 2 |
| U TPE 2.3 | Yes | Task 2 |
| U TPE 2.4 | No | |
| U TPE 2.5 | No | |
| U TPE 2.6 | Yes | Task 2 |
| MM 2.1 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 2.2 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 2.3 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 2.4 | Yes | Task 1 |
| MM 2.5 | Yes | Task 1 |
| MM 2.6 | Not explicitly | Task 1, 2 – Unclear how the tasks address the student's behavior and developing a positive behavior intervention plan |
| MM 2.7 | Yes | Task 1 |
| MM 2.8 | Yes | Task 1, 2, 3 |

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
| --- | --- | --- |
| MM 2.9 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 2.10 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 2.11 | No | |
| U TPE 3.1 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.2 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.3 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.4 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.5 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.7 | No | |
| U TPE 3.8 | No | |
| MM 3.1 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 3.2 | Yes | Task 1 |
| MM 3.3 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 4.1 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 4.2 | No | |
| U TPE 4.3 | No | |
| U TPE 4.4 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 4.5 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 4.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 4.7 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 4.8 | No | |
| MM 4.1 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 4.2 | Not explicitly | Task 1, 2, 3 – Unclear how the tasks would allow the candidate to demonstrate the ability to use evidence-based high leverage practices with a range of student needs |
| MM 4.3 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 4.4 | Yes | Task 1, 2, 3 |
| MM 4.5 | Yes | Task 1 |
| MM 4.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| MM 4.7 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 5.1 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| U TPE 5.2 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| U TPE 5.3 | Yes | Task 1, 2, 3 |
| U TPE 5.4 | No | |
| U TPE 5.5 | Yes | Task 3 |
| U TPE 5.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 5.7 | Yes | Task 1 |

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| U TPE 5.8 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| MM 5.1 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| MM 5.2 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| MM 5.3 | No | |
| MM 5.4 | No | |
| MM 5.5 | No | |
| MM 5.6 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| U TPE 6.1 | Yes | Task 2 |
| U TPE 6.2 | No | |
| U TPE 6.3 | No | |
| U TPE 6.4 | No | |
| U TPE 6.5 | Yes | Task 2 |
| U TPE 6.6 | No | |
| U TPE 6.7 | No | |
| MM 6.1 | Yes | Task 1 |
| MM 6.2 | No | |
| MM 6.3 | No | |
| MM 6.4 | No | |
| MM 6.5 | Yes | Task 1 |
| MM 6.6 | No | |

**Extensive Support Needs TPEs**

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---------|---------|---------|
| U TPE 1.1 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 1.2 | Yes | Task 3 |
| U TPE 1.3 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 1.4 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 1.5 | No | |
| U TPE 1.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 1.7 | No | |
| U TPE 1.8 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 1.1 | No | |
| EX 1.2 | Yes | Task 1 |
| EX 1.3 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 1.4 | Not Explicitly | Task 1, 2 – Unclear how the tasks address having candidates use strategies to support positive psychosocial development and self-determined behavior |
| EX 1.5 | Yes | Task 1 |
| EX 1.6 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 1.7 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| EX 1.8 | Not explicitly | Task 1, 2, 3 – Unclear how the tasks address language development across disabilities |
| EX 1.9 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| EX 1.10 | No | |
| EX 1.11 | Not explicitly | Tasks 1, 2 – Unclear how the tasks will support students in assuming increasing responsibility for learning and self-advocacy |
| U TPE 2.1 | Yes | Task 2 |
| U TPE 2.2 | Yes | Task 2 |
| U TPE 2.3 | Yes | Task 2 |
| U TPE 2.4 | No | |
| U TPE 2.5 | No | |
| U TPE 2.6 | Yes | Task 2 |
| EX 2.1 | Not explicitly | Tasks 1, 2 – Unclear how the tasks will allow the candidate to demonstrate using appropriate procedures, materials, education technology, assistive technology, and other adaptive equipment for students with extensive support needs |
| EX 2.2 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| EX 2.3 | Not explicitly | Task 1, 2 – Unclear how the tasks address developing communication-rich environments that support communication and social engagement within the context of age-appropriate, functional, and meaningful activities |
| EX 2.4 | Yes | Task 1 |
| EX 2.5 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 2.6 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 2.7 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 2.8 | Yes | Task 1 |
| EX 2.9 | Not explicitly | Task 1, 2 – Unclear how the tasks address the student's behavior and developing a positive behavior intervention plan |
| EX 2.10 | Yes | Task 1 |
| EX 2.11 | Yes | Task 1, 2, 3 |
| EX 2.12 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 2.13 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 2.14 | No | |
| U TPE 3.1 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.2 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.3 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.4 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.5 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 3.7 | No | |
| U TPE 3.8 | No | |
| EX 3.1 | Not explicitly | Tasks 1, 2 – Unclear how the tasks address demonstrating a depth of knowledge and skills in the teaching of strategies for early literacy skills, reading, writing, math, and science. |
| EX 3.2 | Yes | Tasks 1, 2 |
| EX 3.3 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 3.4 | Yes | Task 1 |
| EX 3.5 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 4.1 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 4.2 | No | |
| U TPE 4.3 | No | |
| U TPE 4.4 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 4.5 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| U TPE 4.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 4.7 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 4.8 | No | |
| EX 4.1 | Not Explicitly | Tasks 1, 2 – Unclear how the tasks will allow candidates to identify and utilize behaviorally based teaching strategies in the design and implementation of instruction…with the understanding that behaviors are communicative and serve a function |
| EX 4.2 | No | |
| EX 4.3 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 4.4 | Not Explicitly | Task 1, 2, 3 – Unclear how the tasks would allow the candidate to demonstrate the ability to use evidence-based high leverage practices with a range of student needs |
| EX 4.5 | Yes | Task 1, 2, 3 |
| EX 4.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| EX 4.7 | Yes | Task 1 |
| EX 4.8 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| U TPE 5.1 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| U TPE 5.2 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| U TPE 5.3 | Yes | Task 1, 2, 3 |
| U TPE 5.4 | No | |
| U TPE 5.5 | Yes | Task 3 |
| U TPE 5.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 5.7 | Yes | Task 1 |
| U TPE 5.8 | Yes | Task 1, 2 |
| EX 5.1 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| EX 5.2 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| EX 5.3 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| EX 5.4 | No | |
| EX 5.5 | No | |
| EX 5.6 | No | |
| EX 5.7 | Yes | Task 1, 3 |
| U TPE 6.1 | Yes | Task 2 |
| U TPE 6.2 | No | |
| U TPE 6.3 | No | |
| U TPE 6.4 | No | |
| U TPE 6.5 | Yes | Task 2 |

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| U TPE 6.6 | No | |
| U TPE 6.7 | No | |
| EX 6.1 | No | |
| EX 6.2 | Yes | Task 1 |
| EX 6.3 | No | |
| EX 6.4 | No | |
| EX 6.5 | No | |
| EX 6.6 | Yes | Task 1 |
| EX 6.7 | No | |

# Appendix C

## edTPA Assessment Design Standards Review

| ADS Element | Does the TPA model meet this standard? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 1a | Yes | |
| 1b | Yes | |
| 1c | Yes | |
| 1d | Yes | |
| 1e | Yes | |
| 1f | Yes | |
| 1g | Yes | |
| 1h | Yes | |
| 1i | Yes | |
| 1j | Yes | |
| 1k | Yes | |
| 1l | Yes | |
| 1m | Pending | Standard setting to be conducted following the field test |
| 1n | Yes | |
| 1o | Yes | |
| 1p | Yes | Addressed in Addendum |
| 1q | Yes | Addressed in Addendum |
| 2a | Yes | |
| 2b | Yes | |
| 2c | Yes | |
| 2d | Yes | |
| 2e | Yes | |
| 2f | Yes | |
| 2g | Yes | |
| 2h | Yes | |
| 3a | Yes | |
| 3b | Yes | |
| 3c | Yes | |
| 3d | Yes | |
| 3e | Yes | |

# Appendix D

## FAST: ES-MMSN TPE Content Review

### Mild to Moderate Support Needs TPEs

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| U TPE 1.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project (LP, Obs) |
| U TPE 1.2 | No | |
| U TPE 1.3 | Yes | Site Visitation Project (LP, Obs) |
| U TPE 1.4 | No | |
| U TPE 1.5 | Yes | Site Visitation Project (LP, Obs) & Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 1.6 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 1.7 | No | |
| U TPE 1.8 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 1.1 | No to developing IEP | |
| MM 1.2 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 1.3 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 1.4 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM1.5 | No | |
| MM 1.6 | No – self-advocacy | |
| MM 1.7 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 2.1 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 2.2 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| U TPE 2.3 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 2.4 | No | |
| U TPE 2.5 | No | |
| U TPE 2.6 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 2.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 2.2 | No | |
| MM 2.3 | No | |
| MM 2.4 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 2.5 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| MM 2.6 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 2.7 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 2.8 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 2.9 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| MM 2.10 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| MM 2.11 | No | |
| U TPE 3.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 3.2 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 3.3 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 3.4 | No | |
| U TPE 3.5 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| U TPE 3.6 | No | |
| U TPE 3.7 | No | |
| U TPE 3.8 | No | |
| MM 3.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 3.2 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 3.3 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 4.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 4.2 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| U TPE 4.3 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 4.4 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 4.5 | No | |
| U TPE 4.6 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 4.7 | No | |
| U TPE 4.8 | No | |
| MM 4.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 4.2 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| MM 4.3 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 4.4 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 4.5 | No | |
| MM 4.6 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 4.7 | No | |
| U TPE 5.1 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 5.2 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 5.3 | No | |
| U TPE 5.4 | No | |
| U TPE 5.5 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 5.6 | No | |
| U TPE 5.7 | No | |
| U TPE 5.8 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 5.1 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 5.2 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| MM 5.3 | No | |
| MM 5.4 | No | |
| MM 5.5 | No | |
| MM 5.6 | No | |
| U TPE 6.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project & Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 6.2 | No | |
| U TPE 6.3 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 6.4 | No | |
| U TPE 6.5 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 6.6 | No | |
| U TPE 6.7 | No | |
| MM 6.1 | No | |
| MM 6.2 | No | |
| MM 6.3 | No | |
| MM 6.4 | No | |
| MM 6.5 | No | |
| MM 6.6 | No | |

# Appendix E

## FAST: ES-MMSN Assessment Design Standards Review

| ADS Element | Does the TPA model meet this standard? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 1a | Yes | |
| 1b | Yes | |
| 1c | Yes | |
| 1d | Yes | |
| 1e | Yes | |
| 1f | Yes | |
| 1g | Yes | |
| 1h | Yes | |
| 1i | Yes | |
| 1j | Yes | Currently met + additional reviews planned |
| 1k | Pending | Analysis to be performed following pilot testing, analyses to be performed are described |
| 1l | Yes | |
| 1m | Pending | Standard setting to be conducted following the field test |
| 1n | Yes | |
| 1o | Yes | |
| 1p | Yes | |
| 1q | Yes | |
| 2a | Yes | |
| 2b | Pending | Field test planned for Fall 2022/Spring 23 |
| 2c | Yes | |
| 2d | Yes | |
| 2e | Yes | |
| 2f | Yes | |
| 2g | Yes | |
| 2h | Yes | |
| 3a | Yes | |
| 3b | Yes | |
| 3c | Yes | |
| 3d | Yes | |
| 3e | Yes | |

## Appendix F

### FAST: ES-ESN TPE Content Review

**Extensive Support Needs TPEs**

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------|----------|
| U TPE 1.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| U TPE 1.2 | No | |
| U TPE 1.3 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| U TPE 1.4 | No | |
| U TPE 1.5 | Yes | Site Visitation Project & Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 1.6 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 1.7 | No | |
| U TPE 1.8 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 1.1 | No | |
| ESN 1.2 | No | |
| ESN 1.3 | No | |
| ESN 1.4 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 1.5 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| ESN 1.6 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 1.7 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 1.8 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 1.9 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 1.10 | No | |
| ESN 1.11 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| U TPE 2.1 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 2.2 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| U TPE 2.3 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 2.4 | No | |
| U TPE 2.5 | No | |
| U TPE 2.6 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.1 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.2 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| ESN 2.3 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.4 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.5 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.6 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.7 | No | |
| ESN 2.8 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.9 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.10 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.11 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.12 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.13 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 2.14 | No | |
| U TPE 3.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 3.2 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 3.3 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 3.4 | No | |
| U TPE 3.5 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| U TPE 3.6 | No | |
| U TPE 3.7 | No | |
| U TPE 3.8 | No | |
| ESN 3.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 3.2 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 3.3 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 3.4 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 3.5 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| U TPE 4.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 4.2 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| U TPE 4.3 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 4.4 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 4.5 | No | |
| U TPE 4.6 | No | |
| U TPE 4.7 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 4.8 | No | |
| ESN 4.1 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 4.2 | No | |
| ESN 4.3 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 4.4 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 4.5 | No | |
| ESN 4.6 | No | |
| ESN 4.7 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| ESN 4.8 | Yes | Site Visitation Project |
| U TPE 5.1 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 5.2 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 5.3 | No | |
| U TPE 5.4 | No | |
| U TPE 5.5 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 5.6 | No | |
| U TPE 5.7 | No | |
| U TPE 5.8 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 5.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project and Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 5.2 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 5.3 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| ESN 5.4 | No | |
| ESN 5.5 | No | |
| ESN 5.6 | No | |
| ESN 5.7 | No | |
| U TPE 6.1 | Yes | Site Visitation Project & Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 6.2 | No | |
| U TPE 6.3 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |

| Element | Is the TPE element measured by the model? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| U TPE 6.4 | No | |
| U TPE 6.5 | Yes | Teaching Sample Project |
| U TPE 6.6 | No | |
| U TPE 6.7 | No | |
| ESN 6.1 | No | |
| ESN 6.2 | No | |
| ESN 6.3 | No | |
| ESN 6.4 | No | |
| ESN 6.5 | No | |
| ESN 6.6 | No | |
| ESN 6.7 | No | |

# Appendix G

**FAST: ES-ESN Assessment Design Standards Review**

| ADS Element | Does the TPA model meet this standard? (yes/no) | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 1a | Yes | |
| 1b | Yes | |
| 1c | Yes | |
| 1d | Yes | |
| 1e | Yes | |
| 1f | Yes | |
| 1g | Yes | |
| 1h | Yes | |
| 1i | Yes | |
| 1j | Yes | Currently met + additional reviews planned |
| 1k | Pending | Analysis to be performed following pilot testing, analyses to be performed are described |
| 1l | Yes | |
| 1m | Pending | Standard setting to be conducted following the field test |
| 1n | Yes | |
| 1o | Yes | |
| 1p | Yes | |
| 1q | Yes | |
| 2a | Yes | |
| 2b | Pending | Field test planned for Fall 2022/Spring 23 |
| 2c | Yes | |
| 2d | Yes | |
| 2e | Yes | |
| 2f | Yes | |
| 2g | Yes | |
| 2h | Yes | |
| 3a | Yes | |
| 3b | Yes | |
| 3c | Yes | |
| 3d | Yes | |
| 3e | Yes | |

# Appendix H

## edTPA Rubrics

edTPA portfolios are evaluated on a multi-level score scale with five points for each of the 15 rubrics (as listed in table 1). The rubrics used to score performance, which address common outcomes across all fields and are uniquely adapted to address learning and pedagogy specific to each individual field, include descriptors and address a wide range of performance:

- *Level 1 represents the low end of the range of scores, representing the knowledge and skills of a struggling candidate who is not ready to teach.*
- *Level 2 represents the knowledge and skills of a candidate who is possibly ready to teach.*
- *Level 3 represents the knowledge and skills of a candidate who is qualified to teach.*
- *Level 4 represents a candidate with a solid foundation of knowledge and skills for a beginning teacher.*
- *Level 5 represents the advanced skills and abilities of a candidate very well qualified and ready to teach.*

Across the five levels, each rubric represents a learning progression or trajectory of practice that evaluates a range of performance. In addition, the progression addresses candidates' expanding repertoire of field- specific skills and strategies and their deepening rationale and reflection on practice.

For each rubric and score-scale point, clear and detailed descriptors provide further elaboration of the characteristics of performance at each level. Because the portfolio submissions address the focus learner's content learning, planned supports, and candidates' pedagogical skills, the artifacts and reflective commentaries are evaluated by scorers with field-specific expertise for the edTPA field for which they are scoring. Scorers for the Special Education handbook are matched to portfolios according to their experience and expertise with different disabilities. For California candidates submitting the edTPA Special Education for California Handbook, scorers would have expertise in Mild/Moderate Supports or Extensive Supports settings.

The scoring rubrics are provided to candidates in their edTPA handbooks so that they are informed of how their portfolio submissions are evaluated. Because the rubrics reflect core and high leverage teaching practices, within and across subject areas and disabilities, programs are encouraged to use them in formative assessments and assignments throughout candidate preparation, further supporting candidate learning and program coherence.

The 15 rubrics for the edTPA edTPA Special Education for California Handbook address the three edTPA tasks within five scoring components: planning, instruction, assessment, communication skill, and analyzing teaching.

Candidate evidence for the first three components is embedded in the corresponding tasks and the other two components are defined and scored as follows:

- Analyzing teaching**:** Throughout the portfolio, candidates provide reflective analysis justifying a rationale for instructional decisions, what they learned about teaching practice

- Communication skill**:** Attention to communication skills related to participating in the learning tasks or demonstrating learning is embedded in all three tasks. For a focus learner with a mild/moderate disability, the communication skill needs to be academic language. For a focus learner needing extensive support, depending on the learning goal and disability, it may be academic language, peer communication to participate in learning groups, communication related to applying academic skills (particularly literacy and mathematics) in the community or use of alternative or assistive communication.

For edTPA, the candidate explains how he or she will support the focus learner to develop the targeted communication skill in the Planning task and provides evidence in the Instruction and/or Assessment tasks of the extent to which the focus learner has learned and can use the communication skill to participate in learning tasks and/or demonstrate learning related to the learning goal.

# Appendix I

## FAST:ES-MMSN Site Visitation Project Scoring Rubrics

### PLANNING

| Rating →<br>Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Subject Specific Pedagogy**<br><br>Universal TPE 3.1, 3.3, 3.5<br><br>MM TPE 1.1, 1.3, 3.1 | The lesson plan includes content and related activities or strategies inconsistent with current subject specific pedagogy and standards, with limited support for acquisition or use of academic language.<br><br>Little/no documentation of alignment with IEP goals is provided. | The lesson plan includes content and related activities or strategies:<br><br>(a) consistent with current subject specific pedagogy and standards,<br><br>(b) that support the acquisition or use of academic language,<br><br>c) that generally align with students' IEP goals. | The lesson plan includes content and related activities and strategies:<br><br>(a) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and standards,<br><br>(b) that provide multiple opportunities for students to acquire and use academic language,<br><br>c) with some evidence of a plan to monitor students' access to content that aligns with students' IEP goals. | The lesson plan includes content and related activities and strategies adapted for specific needs of students:<br><br>(a) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and standards,<br><br>(b) that provide multiple opportunities for students to acquire and use academic language.<br><br>(c) with clear evidence of a plan to monitor students' access to content ==that aligns with the specifications articulated in students' IEPs.== |
| **Applying Knowledge of Students**<br><br>Universal TPE 3.2, 4.1, 4.2<br><br>MM TPE 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 4.3 | Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides little or no useful information for planning.<br><br>Candidate plans activities or | Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides useful information for planning.<br><br>Based on a general knowle | Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides useful information for planning.<br><br>Based on knowledge of students in this class, including the | Candidate gathers relevant and detailed information on students to be used for planning.<br><br>Based on knowledge of individuals or |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | strategies that demonstrate little or no understanding of the connection between knowledge of students and promoting access to the content. | dge of students at this grade level, candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies to promote access to the content. | details of their IEPs, candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies that include accommodations or modifications to promote access to the content. | groups of students in the class, <mark>including their specialized learning and communication needs as specified in IEPs,</mark> candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies that include accommodations and/or modifications to promote access to the content specifically referencing these students. |
| **Student Engagement**<br><br>Universal TPE 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 4.7<br><br>MM TPE 1.1, 4.1 | Candidate plans few or inappropriate methods for student engagement. | Candidate's plan for engaging students is appropriate to the developmental level (e.g. real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, varied communication strategies/supports). | Candidate's plan for engaging students Includes varied methods appropriate to students, as specified in students' IEPs (e.g. real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, varied communication strategies/supports). | Candidate's plan for engaging students includes varied methods specifically connected to the backgrounds and needs of individuals or groups of students, as <mark>specified in students' IEPs</mark> (e.g. real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, varied communication strategies/supports). |

**IMPLEMENTATION**

| Rating →<br>Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Subject Specific Pedagogy**<br><br>TPE 3.1, 3.3, 3.5<br><br>MM TPE 3.1 | Candidate implements instruction inconsistent with subject-specific pedagogy or not in alignment with the identified academic content standard(s).<br><br>Instruction fails to or inadequately Supports students' acquisition of academic language and/or their specific IEP goals | Candidate effectively implements instruction consistent with subject-specific pedagogy to teach the identified academic content standard(s).<br><br>Instruction supports the acquisition or use of academic language appropriate for students at this grade level and the development of students' specific IEP goals | Candidate effectively implements and monitors instruction consistent with subject-specific pedagogy and addressing students' specific learning, as documented in their IEPs, to teach the identified academic content standard(s).<br><br>Incorporates effective instructional strategies and materials to support the acquisition and use of academic language for students in this class. | Candidate effectively implements and monitors instruction consistent with subject-specific pedagogy that clearly matches the level and content of the identified academic content standard(s) ==and the specific learning needs of the students, as specified in their IEP==<br><br>Demonstrates effective integration of instructional strategies and materials to support the acquisition and use of academic language for specific needs of individuals or groups of students in this class. |
| **Applying Knowledge of Students**<br><br>TPE 1.1, 3.2 | Candidate demonstrates little or no awareness of the learning needs, backgrounds, and interests of | Candidate uses knowledge of the learning needs, communicative needs, backgrounds, or interests of | Candidate uses knowledge of the learning needs, communicative needs, backgrounds, and/or interests of the students in | Candidate adjusts instruction in response to the specific learning needs, ==communicative needs,== |

| MM TPE 1.2, 1.3, 3.2, 4.2, 4.3 | students at this grade level. | students at this developmental level to provide access to the content for all students. | this class to increase access to the content for all students. | backgrounds, interests, and experiences of individuals or groups of students in the class in order to <mark>provide all students equitable access to the content and experiences</mark>. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Student Engagement**<br><br>TPE 1.3, 1.5, 1.8, 2.2, 2.6<br><br>MM TPE 1.6, 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10 | Candidate uses inadequate techniques to promote and monitor participation by students in the learning activities.<br><br>Candidate inadequately expresses or reinforces expectations for behavior.<br><br>The candidate models few or no positive interactions. | Candidate uses primarily management techniques to promote and monitor participation by students in the learning activities.<br><br>Candidate expresses and reinforces expectations for social or academic behavior.<br><br>Candidate models generally positive interactions. | Candidate uses both management and instructional techniques with strategies (e.g. universal design, differentiated instruction, scaffolding, accommodations and/or modifications, real life contexts, opportunities for critical or creative thinking) addressed in student IEPs to promote and monitor active participation by students in the learning activities.<br><br>Candidate expresses and reinforces expectations for social and academic behavior.<br><br>Candidate models interactions that create a positive | Candidate is able to use primarily instructional techniques, strategies <mark>and individualized supports (e.g. universal design, differentiated instruction, scaffolding, accommodations and/or modifications, real life contexts, opportunities for critical or creative thinking) addressed in student IEPs</mark> to ensure and monitor active and equitable participation by students in the learning activities.<br><br>Candidate expresses and reinforces expectations for social and academic behavior <mark>as well as supports students with developing positive</mark> |

| | | | learning environment of respect for diversity and multiple perspectives. | ==communication skills and systems to promote positive behavior.==<br><br>Both the candidate and the students consistently model interactions that create a positive learning environment of mutual respect for diversity and multiple perspectives. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

**REFLECTION**

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Subject Specific Pedagogy**<br><br>TPE 6.1 | Candidate's description of strengths and weaknesses of lesson is unrealistic or inadequate.<br><br>Provides inadequate justification for how the activity or strategy in the selected video clip represents subject specific pedagogy.<br><br>Demonstrates little awareness of the relationship between content knowledge and planning or teaching. | Candidate realistically describes strengths and weaknesses of lesson.<br><br>Provides general justification for how the activity or strategy in the selected video clip represents subject specific pedagogy.<br><br>Demonstrates a realistic understanding of the relationship between content knowledge and planning or teaching. | Candidate realistically evaluates, with evidence, strengths and weaknesses of lesson.<br><br>Provides specific justification for how the activity or strategy in the selected video clip represents subject specific pedagogy.<br><br>Demonstrates a realistic understanding of the relationship between content knowledge and effective planning and teaching. | Candidate realistically justifies, with evidence of student learning, strengths, and weaknesses of lesson.<br><br>Provides specific justification, using a variety of sources, for how the activity or strategy represents subject specific pedagogy.<br><br>Demonstrates a realistic understanding of the relationship between content knowledge and effective planning and teaching, with relevant evidence. |
| **Applying Knowledge of Students**<br><br>TPE 3.2<br><br>MM TPE 3.2, 3.3 | Candidate's description of the effectiveness of the lesson to promote access to the content for the focus student are unrealistic or inadequate.<br><br>Provides unrealistic or inappropriate suggestions to improve access to content for | Candidate realistically describes how the lesson promotes access to the content for the focus student, using evidence of participation.<br><br>Provides appropriate suggestions to improve access to content for | Candidate realistically evaluates the effectiveness of the lesson to promote access to the content for the focus student, using evidence of student learning.<br><br>Provides specific and appropriate suggestions to improve access | Candidate realistically evaluates and justifies the effectiveness of the lesson to promote access to the content for the focus student, citing specific evidence of student learning.<br><br>Provides specific and appropriate suggestions to improve access to content and justifies why the suggestions will be effective for the focus student. |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | students, in general. | students, in general. | to content for the focus student. | |
| **Student Engagement**<br><br>TPE 2.2<br><br>MM TPE 1.4, 2.1, 2.9 | Candidate provides few or inappropriate examples of interactions from the lesson.<br><br>Shows little awareness of the effectiveness of engaging students through interactions to promote productive student learning, multiple perspectives, or equitable participation. | Candidate provides general examples of interactions from the lesson.<br><br>Realistically describes how these interactions promote productive student learning, multiple perspectives, or equitable participation. | Candidate provides specific examples of interactions from the lesson.<br><br>Realistically evaluates the effectiveness of these specific interactions to engage students in learning and promote multiple perspectives or equitable participation. | Candidate provides specific examples of interactions from the lesson.<br><br>Candidate realistically evaluates and justifies the effectiveness of these specific interactions to engage students in learning and provides clear evidence of how these interactions promoted multiple perspectives, learning related to the specific content, and equitable participation. |

# Teaching Sample Project Scoring Rubrics
## Students in Context

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Implications for Instruction<br><br>TPE 1.6, 4.1, 5.8<br><br>MM TPE 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6, 5.2 | Descriptions of instructional approaches are limited or inappropriate for at least two of the following groups:<br>(a) a full range of English proficiency levels,<br>(b) students with identified disabilities under IDEA 2004,<br>(c) students with different instructional needs,<br>(d) students from underserved education groups<br><br>Missing/limited discussion of plans to coordinate with other service professionals | Descriptions of Instructional approaches are generally appropriate for at least two of the following groups:<br>(a) different levels<br>(a) a full range of English proficiency levels,<br>(b) students with identified disabilities under IDEA 2004,<br>(c) students with different instructional needs,<br>(d) students from underserved education groups<br><br>Includes general plans to coordinate, collaborate, and/or co-teach with other service providers to support student needs | Descriptions of instructional approaches are specifically aligned with the needs of at least two of the following groups:<br>(a) a full range of English proficiency levels,<br>(b) students with identified disabilities under IDEA 2004,<br>(c) students with different instructional needs,<br>(d) students from underserved education groups<br><br>Includes discussion of coordination, collaboration, and/or co-teaching with other service providers to support student needs | Description of instructional approaches are detailed and specifically aligned with the needs of all of the following groups:<br>(a) a full range of English proficiency levels,<br>(b) students with identified disabilities under IDEA 2004,<br>(c) students with different instructional needs,<br>(d) students from underserved education groups<br><br>Includes thoughtful coordination, collaboration, and/or co-teaching with other service providers to support student needs |
| Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments<br><br>TPE 2.1, 2.3, 2.6 | Expectations for, and responses to, behavior are limited or inappropriate related to at least two of the following:<br>(a) individual | Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include general examples related to at least two of the following:<br>(a) individual | Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include specific examples related to all of the following: | Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include specific examples and justification related to |

| MM TPE 1.1, 1.6, 1.7, 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6. 2.7, 2.8 | responsibility, b) individualized behavior support plans, (c) intolerance, (d) an inclusive climate. Routines are ineffective, with no or limited description of how they were communicated to students. | responsibility, b) individualized behavior support plans, (c) intolerance, (d) an inclusive climate. Routines focus on management, with a general description of how they were communicated to students. | (a) individual responsibility, b) individualized behavior support plans, (c) intolerance, (d) an inclusive climate, and focus on positive, fair and respectful treatment of students. Routines are specifically designed to facilitate learning, with a detailed description of how they were communicated to students. | (a) individual responsibility, (b) individualized behavior support plans, (c) intolerance, and (d) an inclusive environment, which reflect fair and respectful treatment specifically designed for the full range of students in the class. Routines, designed to facilitate learning, are described and justified, including a description of how they were communicated to students and families, and maintained throughout the year. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**Learning Outcomes**

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations | 2 Meets Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4 Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Learning Outcomes and Standards<br><br>TPE 3.1, 3.3<br><br>MM TPE 3.1 | Outcomes are not clearly related to content or literacy standards.<br><br>Outcomes poorly represent the content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards or address a limited range in the level of learning.<br><br>IEP goals not mentioned or not addressed. | Outcomes primarily address either content or literacy standards.<br><br>Most outcomes represent the content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards, though they primarily focus on lower levels of learning.<br><br>IEP goals addressed. | Outcomes clearly address content, specific IEP goals, and literacy standards.<br><br>Most outcomes represent the content standards and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards; address a range in the type or level of learning, including a focus on higher level learning; and address the specific IEP goals of students in the class. | Outcomes clearly integrate content, <mark>specific IEP goals</mark>, and literacy standards.<br><br>All outcomes represent the content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards, <mark>specific IEP goals</mark>, address a range in the type or level of learning, including a focus on higher level learning, and real world connections. |
| Appropriateness For Students<br><br>TPE 3.2<br><br>MM TPE 3.2, 3.3 | Description of unit and rationale provide limited justification for the appropriateness of the unit for:<br>(a) development of content knowledge or literacy skills,<br>(b) specific IEP goals<br>(c) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, or future learning,<br>(d) relevance for students at that grade level | Description of unit and rationale provide general justification for:<br>(a) development of either content knowledge or literacy skills,<br>(b) specific IEP goals<br>(c) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, or future learning,<br>(d) relevance for students at that grade level | Description of unit and rationale provide specific justification for:<br>(a) development of content knowledge, literacy skills, and specific IEP goals<br>(b) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, or future learning,<br>(c) relevance for students in that class. | Description of unit and rationale provide specific justification for:<br>(a) <mark>integration of content knowledge, literacy skills, and specific IEP goals</mark><br>(b) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, and future learning,<br>(c) relevance for students in that class, specifically referencing information from Students in Context section. |

**Assessment Plan**

| Rating → <br> Indicator ↓ | 1 <br> Does Not <br> Meet Expectations | 2 <br> Meets <br> Expectations | 3 <br> Meets Expectations <br> at a High Level | 4 <br> Exceeds <br> Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Congruence with Learning Outcomes and Content <br><br> TPE 4.3 <br><br> MM TPE 4.2 | Most methods of assessment lack congruence with learning outcomes and level of learning (e.g. DOK level). <br><br> Little or no attention to the assessment of content knowledge or literacy skills. | Most assessment methods are congruent with learning outcomes in either content or level of learning (e.g. DOK level). <br><br> Attention to assessment of content knowledge or literacy skills. | Most assessment methods are congruent with learning outcomes in content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level). <br><br> Attention to assessment of both content knowledge and literacy skills. | All assessments are clearly congruent with the learning outcomes in both content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level). <br><br> Specific attention to the assessment of integrated content knowledge and literacy skills. |
| Variety in Methods of Assessment <br><br> TPE 5.2 <br><br> MM TPE 5.1 | The assessment plan is limited or does not assess students before, during, and after instruction, or uses only one method of assessment. | The assessment plan assesses student knowledge or performance before, during, and after instruction, with some variety in the assessment methods. | The assessment plan assesses student knowledge or performance before, during, and after instruction, includes a variety of assessment methods, including assessment of higher-level thinking (e.g. complex task). | The assessment plan assesses student knowledge and performance before, during and after instruction, includes a variety of assessment methods, including those requiring an integration of knowledge, skills, and reasoning. |
| Clarity of Assessment Methods <br><br> TPE 5.1 <br><br> MM TPE 5.1 | Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are not clearly described. <br><br> Candidate demonstrates little understanding of the relationship between the format, purpose of assessments, and/or IEP goals.. | Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are given for most assessment methods. Candidate describes how the format of the assessments match the learning outcomes and the | Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are clearly described for most assessment methods. <br><br> Candidate evaluates how the format of the assessments match the learning outcomes and IEP | Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are clearly described for all assessment methods and are ==explicitly linked to learning outcomes and specific IEP goals.== <br> ==Candidate evaluates and justifies how the format of the assessments match the== |

| | | purpose of assessing. Candidate provides some justification for link between assessment methods and IEP goals. | goals and the purpose of assessing. | <mark>learning outcomes and IEP goals and the purpose of assessing</mark>. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

Design for Instruction

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations | 2 Meets Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4 Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Use of Contextual Information and Data to Inform Instruction<br><br>TPE 1.6, 3.2, 4.4, 5.8<br><br>MM TPE 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 5.2 | Lessons are in conflict with the results of the pre assessment and/or the contextual factors.<br><br>Lessons include limited or inappropriate ways to provide access to the content or to develop literacy skills. | Lessons show some attention to pre assessment results and contextual factors.<br><br>Lessons provide access to content or develop literacy skills for at least two of the following:<br>(a) identified special needs,<br>(b) different levels of English language proficiency,<br>(c) different instructional needs. | Lessons are in alignment with pre-assessment results and contextual factors.<br><br>Lessons provide access to content and develop literacy skills for at least two of the following:<br>(a) identified special needs,<br>(b) different levels of English language proficiency,<br>(c) different instructional needs. | Lessons have been designed with specific reference to pre assessment data, ==present levels of academic and functional performance and accommodations/modifications in student IEPs, and contextual factors.==<br><br>Lessons provide access to content and develop literacy skills for all of the following:<br>(a) identified special needs,<br>(b) different levels of English language proficiency,<br>(c) different instructional needs. |
| Alignment with Learning Outcomes & Standards<br><br>TPE 3.1, 3.3<br><br>MM TPE 2.1 3.1 | Lessons are minimally aligned with the unit learning outcomes or are inconsistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area.<br><br>Specific IEP goals not mentioned. | Lessons are:<br>(a) aligned with unit learning outcomes and specific IEP goals<br>(b) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area of instruction or literacy skills. | Lessons are:<br>(a) aligned with unit learning outcomes and specific IEP goals<br>(b) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area of instruction and the development of literacy skills. | Lessons are:<br>(a) ==aligned with learning outcomes and specific IEP goals,==<br>(b) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area of instruction and the development of literacy skills,<br>(c) demonstrate seamless integration of content and literacy. |
| Variety in Instruction | Limited variety in instructional methods and | A variety of instructional methods and | A variety of instructional methods and | A variety of instructional methods and engagement ==and== |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| TPE<br>1.5, 4.4, 4.7<br><br>MM TPE<br>2.8, 4.1, 4.2 | engagement and intervention strategies.<br>Limited or inappropriate use of technology. | engagement and intervention strategies.<br>Appropriate use of technology to engage students or promote access to content, though primarily used by teacher. | engagement and intervention strategies,<br>including activities that provide students opportunities for critical and creative thinking.<br>Appropriate use of technology to engage students or promote equitable access to content. | ==intervention strategies==, including activities that provide opportunities for critical and creative thinking and utilize a range of communication or activity modes.<br>Clear justification for the use of technology to engage students and promote equitable access to content. |

**Instructional Decision-Making**

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Monitoring Student Learning<br><br>TPE 1.8<br><br>MM TPE 1.4 | No or limited evidence of monitoring students during instruction.<br>IEP goals not mentioned.<br><br>Focus is on external factors (e.g. time, schedule) rather than student behavior or learning. | Evidence of monitoring students during instruction is implied or general; IEP goals generally referenced.<br>Focus is primarily on behavior or lesson structure rather than student learning. | Evidence of monitoring students during instruction is specifically described and connected to IEP goals.<br><br>Focus is on student learning and engagement. | Evidence of monitoring students during instruction is connected to ==specific individuals and IEP goals==.<br><br>Focus is on productive student learning and active engagement by all students. |
| Adjustments Based on Knowledge of Student Learning and Providing Access to Curriculum<br><br>TPE 3.2<br><br>MM TPE 2.8, 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 | Teacher treats class as "one plan fits all" with no adjustments OR information about student learning is not used, or used inappropriately, to adjust instruction. | Some adjustments of the instructional plan are made to address general student needs, with some connections to knowledge of student learning or providing access to curriculum. | Appropriate adjustments of the instructional plan are made to specifically address needs of students in this class, with some reference to IEP goals. These adjustments are informed by the knowledge of student learning related to the unit topic and providing access to curriculum, including attention to specific IEP goals and appropriate accommodations/ modifications. | Appropriate adjustments of the instructional plan are made to specifically address needs of both whole group and specific students. These adjustments are explicitly informed by the knowledge of student learning, ==with specific reference to learning outcomes, IEP goals—including accommodations/ modifications, and providing access to curriculum.== |
| Alignment Between Adjustments and Learning Outcomes | Adjustments to instruction are minimally or not aligned with learning outcomes. | Adjustments to instruction are generally aligned with learning outcomes. IEP goals, including | Adjustments to instruction are specifically aligned with learning outcomes and specific IEP goals | Adjustments to instruction are ==explicitly aligned to learning outcomes and specific IEP goals and== |

| TPE 3.2<br><br>MM TPE 3.1, 3.2, 4.4 | Limited or no reasons given for how adjustments would improve student progress. | accommodations/ modifications mentioned.<br><br>Reasons for adjustments address efforts to improve student progress. | and accommodations/ modifications. .<br><br>Reasons for the adjustments specifically address how they would improve student progress. | <mark>accommodations/ modifications</mark>.<br><br>Reasons for adjustments include how they would improve student progress for the whole class and specific students. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

# Analysis of Student Learning

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations | 2 Meets Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4 Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Analysis and Interpretation of Data<br><br>TPE 5.2<br><br>MM TPE 5.2 | Analysis and interpretation of data:<br>(a) provides limited or no evidence of the number of students meeting the learning outcomes;<br>(b) is missing, inaccurate, or unsupported by evidence;<br>(c) provides a limited description of how the data/scores reflect the learning outcomes. | Analysis and interpretation of data:<br>(a) provides some evidence of the number of students meeting at least one of the learning outcomes and/or specific IEP goals;<br>(b) is generally accurate, with some supporting evidence;<br>(c) describes how the data/scores reflect learning related to at least one of the learning outcomes and/or specific IEP goals. | Analysis and interpretation of data:<br>(a) provides clear evidence of the number of students meeting each of the two learning outcomes and specific IEP goals.;<br>(b) is generally accurate and clearly supported by evidence from data;<br>(c) describes how the data/ scores reflect learning related to each of the two learning outcomes and specific IEP goals. | Analysis and interpretation of data:<br>(a) provides clear evidence of the number of students meeting each of the two learning outcomes and ==making some or no progress toward the learning outcomes and specific IEP goals.==<br>(b) is completely accurate, clearly supported by evidence from data with specific examples to support statements;<br>(c) uses specific examples to describe ==how the data/scores reflect each of the two learning outcomes and specific IEP goals.== |
| Progress Report<br><br>TPE 5.5<br><br>MM TPE 4.6, 5.2 | Progress report for student who struggled:<br>(a) uses limited or inappropriate data or examples to describe strengths or areas for growth related to one of the unit outcomes; (b) provides no, limited, or | Progress report for student who struggled: (a) uses some data or examples to describe strengths or areas for growth related to one of the unit outcomes and/or the specific IEP goals;<br>(b) provides general | Progress report for student who struggled:<br>(a) uses appropriate data and examples to describe strengths and areas for growth related to at least one of the unit outcomes specific IEP goals;<br>(b) provides realistic suggestions for improving student | Progress report for student who struggled:<br>(a) ==uses appropriate data and examples to describe strengths and areas for growth related to both of the unit outcomes and specific IEP goals==.<br>(b) provides realistic and specific suggestions for |

| | unrealistic suggestions for improving student learning. | suggestions for improving student learning with general references to specific IEP goals. | learning through individualized supports (accommodations/ modifications, specially designed instruction, and/or support services) related to these learning outcomes and the specific IEP goals for this student. | improving student learning ==through appropriate individualized supports (accommodations/ modifications, specially designed instruction, and/or support services) related to these learning outcomes and specific IEP goals for the needs of this student.== |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**Reflection and Self-Evaluation**

| Rating →<br>Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not<br>Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets<br>Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations<br>at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds<br>Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment<br><br>TPE 6.1, 6.5<br><br>MM TPE 5.2 | Does not describe effective instructional activities for at least two of these categories: (a) a range of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special learning needs, (c) students with different learning needs.<br>Provides limited or no statements about the alignment between assessments, specific IEP goals, and learning outcomes.<br>Does not describe subject matter knowledge OR description of subject matter knowledge does not relate to this unit. | Describes effective instructional activities for at least two of these categories: (a) a range of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special learning needs, (c) students with different learning needs.<br>Identifies the alignment between assessments, specific IEP goals, and learning outcomes.<br>Describes subject matter knowledge related to this unit. | Describes effective instructional activities and provides plausible justification for at least two of these categories: (a) a range of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special learning needs, (c) students with different learning needs.<br>Identifies and justifies the alignment between assessments specific IEP goals, and learning outcomes.<br>Describes how subject matter knowledge and knowledge of appropriate accommodations and/or modifications influenced the success of the unit. | Describes effective instructional activities and provides plausible justification with supporting evidence for all of these categories: (a) a range of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special learning needs, (c) students with different learning needs.<br>==Identifies and justifies the alignment between assessments, specific IEP goals, and learning outcomes, including supporting evidence.==<br><br>Describes how subject matter knowledge and knowledge of appropriate accommodations and/or modifications influenced the success of the unit, and provides supporting evidence from the unit. |
| Implications for Future Teaching<br><br>TPE 6.1 | Provides limited or inappropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, | Provides appropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, | Provides appropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, or | Provides appropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, and assessment, connects these |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| MM TPE 5.2 | instruction, or assessment. | instruction, or assessment. | assessment and explains why these adjustments would improve student learning. | suggestions to assessment data, and explains why these adjustments would improve student learning. |
| Implications for Professional Development<br><br>TPE 6.3<br><br>MM TPE (N/A) | Professional learning goal is not related to practice.<br><br>Steps are impractical or inappropriate. | Presents a reasonable professional learning goal connected to teaching in general.<br><br>Appropriate steps described in general terms. | Presents a reasonable professional learning goal connected to the unit. Appropriate steps described in specific terms. | Presents a reasonable professional learning goal based on student learning documented in the unit. Appropriate steps described in specific terms. |

# Appendix J

## FAST: ES-ESN Site Visitation Project Scoring Rubrics

**PLANNING**

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations | 2 Meets Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4 Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Subject Specific Pedagogy**<br><br>Universal TPE 3.1, 3.3, 3.5<br><br>ESN TPE 3.1, 3.2, 3.4 | The lesson plan includes content and related activities or strategies inconsistent with current subject specific pedagogy and standards, with limited support for acquisition or use of academic language. Little/no documentation of alignment with IEP goals is provided | The lesson plan includes content and related activities or strategies:<br><br>(a) consistent with current subject specific pedagogy and standards,<br><br>(b) that support the acquisition or use of academic language,<br><br>c) that generally align with students' IEP goals. | The lesson plan includes content and related activities and strategies:<br><br>(a) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and standards,<br><br>(b) that provide multiple opportunities for students to acquire and use academic language.<br><br>c) with some evidence of a plan to monitor students' access to content that aligns with students' IEP goals. | The lesson plan includes content and related activities and strategies ==adapted for specific needs of students:==<br><br>(a) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy and standards,<br><br>(b) that provide multiple opportunities for students to acquire and use academic language.<br><br>(c) ==with clear evidence of a plan to monitor students' access to content that aligns with the specifications articulated in students' IEPs.== |
| **Applying Knowledge of Students**<br><br>Universal TPE 3.2, 4.1, 4.2<br><br>ESN TPE 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 2.4, | Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides little or no useful information for planning.<br><br>Candidate plans activities or | Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides useful information for planning.<br><br>Based on a general knowledge of students at this | Information about students, gathered by the candidate, provides useful information for planning.<br><br>Based on knowledge of students in this class, including the | Candidate gathers relevant and detailed information on students to be used for planning.<br><br>Based on knowledge of individuals or |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 4.5, 4.7 | strategies that demonstrate little or no understanding of the connection between knowledge of students and promoting access to the content. | grade level, candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies to promote access to the content. | details of their IEPs, candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies that include accommodations or modifications to promote access to the content. | groups of students in the class, including their specialized learning and communication needs as specified in IEPs, candidate plans appropriate activities or strategies that include accommodations and/or modifications to promote access to the content specifically referencing these students. |
| **Student Engagement**<br><br>Universal TPE 1.1, 1.3, 1.5, 4.7<br><br>ESN TPE 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.8, 1.11, 4.3, 4.4, 4.8 | Candidate plans few or inappropriate methods for student engagement. | Candidate's plan for engaging students is appropriate to the developmental level (e.g. real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, varied communication strategies/supports). | Candidate's plan for engaging students Includes varied methods appropriate to students, as specified in students' IEPs (e.g. real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, varied communication strategies/supports). | Candidate's plan for engaging students includes varied methods specifically connected to the backgrounds and needs of individuals or groups of students, as specified in students' IEPs (e.g. real-life contexts, connections to students' experiences or interests, opportunities for critical or creative thinking, varied communication strategies/supports). |

**IMPLEMENTATION**

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Subject Specific Pedagogy**<br><br>TPE 3.1, 3.3, 3.5<br><br>ESN TPE 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | Candidate implements instruction inconsistent with subject-specific pedagogy or not in alignment with the identified academic content standard(s).<br><br>Instruction fails to or inadequately Supports students' acquisition of academic language and/or their specific IEP goals. | Candidate effectively implements instruction consistent with subject-specific pedagogy to teach the identified academic content standard(s).<br><br>Instruction supports the acquisition or use of academic language appropriate for students at this grade level and the development of students' specific IEP goals | Candidate effectively implements and monitors instruction consistent with subject-specific pedagogy and addressing students' specific learning, as documented in their IEPs, to teach the identified academic content standard(s).<br><br>Incorporates effective instructional strategies and materials to support the acquisition and use of academic language for students in this class. | Candidate effectively implements and monitors instruction consistent with subject-specific pedagogy that clearly matches the level and content of the identified academic content standard(s) ==and the specific learning needs of the students, as specified in their IEP==<br><br>Demonstrates effective integration of instructional strategies and materials to support the acquisition and use of academic language for specific needs of individuals or groups of students in this class. |
| **Applying Knowledge of Students**<br><br>TPE 1.1, 3.2<br><br>ESN TPE 1.4, 2.8, 2.9, | Candidate demonstrates little or no awareness of the learning needs, backgrounds, and interests of students at this grade level. | Candidate uses knowledge of the learning needs, communicative needs, backgrounds, or interests of students at this | Candidate uses knowledge of the learning needs, communicative needs, backgrounds, and/or interests of the students in this class to increase | Candidate adjusts instruction in response to the specific learning needs, ==communicative needs, backgrounds,== |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.11, 2.13, 3.3, 3.4 | | developmental level to provide access to the content for all students. | access to the content for all students. | <mark>interests, and experiences of individuals or groups of students in the class in order to provide all students equitable access to the content and experiences.</mark> |
| **Student Engagement**<br><br>TPE 1.3, 1.5, 1.8, 2.2, 2.6<br><br>ESN TPE 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 1.11, 2.5, 2.8, 2.10, 4.3, 4.4, 4.8 | Candidate uses inadequate techniques to promote and monitor participation by students in the learning activities.<br><br>Candidate inadequately expresses or reinforces expectations for behavior.<br><br>The candidate models few or no positive interactions. | Candidate uses primarily management techniques to promote and monitor participation by students in the learning activities.<br><br>Candidate expresses and reinforces expectations for social or academic behavior.<br><br>Candidate models generally positive interactions. | Candidate uses both management and instructional techniques with strategies (e.g. universal design, differentiated instruction, scaffolding, accommodations and/or modifications, real life contexts, opportunities for critical or creative thinking) addressed in student IEPs to promote and monitor active participation by students in the learning activities.<br><br>Candidate expresses and reinforces expectations for social and academic behavior.<br><br>Candidate models interactions that create a positive learning environment of respect for diversity | Candidate is able to use primarily instructional techniques, strategies and individualized supports (<mark>e.g. universal design, differentiated instruction, scaffolding, accommodations and/or modifications, real life contexts, opportunities for critical or creative thinking) addressed in student IEPs to ensure and monitor active and equitable participation by students in the learning activities.</mark><br><br>Candidate expresses and reinforces expectations for social and academic behavior <mark>as well as supports students with developing positive communication</mark> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | and multiple perspectives. | <mark>skills and systems to promote positive behavior.</mark><br><br>Both the candidate and the students consistently model interactions that create a positive learning environment of mutual respect for diversity and multiple perspectives. |

| Rating →<br>Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Subject Specific Pedagogy**<br><br>TPE 6.1<br><br>ESN 1.9, 2.12, 3.3, 5.1 | Candidate's description of strengths and weaknesses of lesson is unrealistic or inadequate.<br><br>Provides inadequate justification for how the activity or strategy in the selected video clip represents subject specific pedagogy.<br><br>Demonstrates little awareness of the relationship between content knowledge and skill development and planning or teaching. | Candidate realistically describes strengths and weaknesses of lesson.<br><br>Provides general justification for how the activity or strategy in the selected video clip represents subject- specific and skill-specific pedagogy.<br><br>Demonstrates a realistic understanding of the relationship between content knowledge and skill development and planning or teaching. | Candidate realistically evaluates, with evidence, strengths and weaknesses of lesson.<br><br>Provides specific justification for how the activity or strategy in the selected video clip represents subject- specific and skill-specific pedagogy.<br><br>Demonstrates a realistic understanding of the relationship between content knowledge and skill development and effective planning and teaching. | Candidate realistically justifies, with ==evidence of student learning,== strengths, and weaknesses of lesson.<br><br>Provides specific justification, using a variety of sources, for how the activity or strategy represents ==subject-specific and skill-specific pedagogy.==<br><br>Demonstrates a realistic understanding of the relationship ==between content knowledge and skill development and effective planning and teaching,== with relevant evidence. |
| **Applying Knowledge of Students**<br><br>TPE 3.2<br><br>ESN TPE 3.4 | Candidate's description of the effectiveness of the lesson to promote access to the content for the focus student are unrealistic or inadequate.<br><br>Provides unrealistic or inappropriate sug gestions to improve access to | Candidate realistically descri bes how the lesson promotes access to the content for the focus student, using evidence of participation.<br><br>Provides appropriate suggestions to improve access to content for | Candidate realistically evaluates the effectiveness of the lesson to promote access to the content for the focus student, using evidence of student learning.<br><br>Provides specific and appropriate suggestions to improve access | Candidate realistically evaluates and justifies the effectiveness of the lesson to promote access to the content for the focus student, citing specific evidence of student learning.<br><br>Provides specific and appropriate suggestions to improve access to content and justifies why the suggestions |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | content for students, in general. | students, in general. | to content for the focus student. | will be effective for the focus student. |
| **Student Engagement**<br><br>TPE 2.2<br><br>ESN TPE 2.5, 2.8, 2.9 | Candidate provides few or inappropriate examples of interactions from the lesson.<br><br>Shows little awareness of the effectiveness of engaging students through interactions to promote productive student learning, multiple perspectives, or equitable participation. | Candidate provides general examples of interactions from the lesson.<br><br>Realistically describes how these interactions promote productive student learning, multiple perspectives, or equitable participation. | Candidate provides specific examples of interactions from the lesson.<br><br>Realistically evaluates the effectiveness of these specific interactions to engage students in learning, and promote multiple perspectives or equitable participation. | Candidate provides specific examples of interactions from the lesson.<br><br>Candidate realistically evaluates and justifies the effectiveness of these specific interactions to engage students in learning, and provides clear evidence of how these interactions promoted multiple perspectives, learning related to the specific content, and equitable participation. |

# Teaching Sample Project Scoring Rubrics

## Students in Context

| Rating →<br>Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not<br>Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets<br>Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations<br>at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds<br>Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Implications for Instruction<br><br>TPE<br>1.6, 4.1, 5.8<br><br>ESN TPE<br>1.7, 1.8, 3.1, 3.2, 4.5, 4.7<br>5.3 | Descriptions of instructional approaches are limited or inappropriate for at least two of the following groups:<br>(a) a full range of English proficiency levels,<br>(b) students with identified disabilities under IDEA 2004,<br>(c) students with different instructional needs,<br>(d) students from underserved education groups<br><br>Missing/limited discussion of plans to coordinate with other service professionals | Descriptions of Instructional approaches are generally appropriate for at least two of the following groups:<br>(a) different levels<br>(a) a full range of English proficiency levels,<br>(b) students with identified disabilities under IDEA 2004,<br>(c) students with different instructional needs,<br>(d) students from underserved education groups<br><br>Includes general plans to coordinate, collaborate, and/or co-teach with other service providers to support student needs | Descriptions of instructional approaches are specifically aligned with the needs of at least two of the following groups:<br>(a) a full range of English proficiency levels,<br>(b) students with identified disabilities under IDEA 2004,<br>(c) students with different instructional needs,<br>(d) students from underserved education groups<br><br>Includes discussion of coordination, collaboration, and/or co-teaching with other service providers to support student needs | Description of instructional approaches are detailed and specifically aligned with the needs of all of the following groups:<br>(a) a full range of English proficiency levels,<br>(b) students with identified disabilities under IDEA 2004,<br>(c) students with different instructional needs,<br>(d) students from underserved education groups<br><br>Includes thoughtful coordination, collaboration, and/or co-teaching with other service providers to support student needs |
| Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments | (1) Expectations for, and responses to, behavior are limited or inappropriate | Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include general examples | Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include specific examples related | Expectations for, and responses to, behavior include specific examples |

| TPE 2.1, 2.3, 2.6 ESN TPE 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13 | related to at least two of the following: | (1) related to at least two of the following: | to all of the following: | and justification related to |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | a) individual responsibility, b) individualized behavior support plans, (c) intolerance, (d) an inclusive climate. | a) individual responsibility, b) individualized behavior support plans, (c) intolerance, (d) an inclusive climate. | (a) individual responsibility, b) individualized behavior support plans, (c) intolerance, (d) an inclusive climate, and focus on positive, fair and respectful treatment of students. Routines are specifically designed to facilitate learning, with a detailed description of how they were communicated to students. | (a) individual responsibility, (b) individualized behavior support plans, (c) intolerance, and (d) an inclusive environment, which reflect fair and respectful treatment specifically designed for the full range of students in the class. |
| | Routines are ineffective, with no or limited description of how they were communicated to students. | Routines focus on management, with a general description of how they were communicated to students. | | Routines, designed to facilitate learning, are described and justified, including a description of how they were communicated to students and families, and maintained throughout the year. |

**Learning Outcomes**

| Rating →<br>Indicator ↓ | 1<br>**Does Not<br>Meet Expectations** | 2<br>**Meets<br>Expectations** | 3<br>**Meets Expectations<br>at a High Level** | 4<br>**Exceeds<br>Expectations** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Learning Outcomes and Standards<br><br>TPE 3.1, 3.3<br><br>ESN TPE 1.6, 1.9, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 | Outcomes are not clearly related to content or literacy standards.<br><br>Outcomes poorly represent the content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards or address a limited range in the level of learning.<br><br>IEP goals not mentioned or not addressed. | Outcomes primarily address either content or literacy standards.<br><br>Most outcomes represent the content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards, though they primarily focus on lower levels of learning.<br><br>IEP goals addressed. | Outcomes clearly address content, specific IEP goals, and literacy standards.<br><br>Most outcomes represent the content standards and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards; address a range in the type or level of learning, including a focus on higher level learning; and address the specific IEP goals of students in the class. | Outcomes clearly integrate content, ==specific IEP goals,== and literacy standards.<br><br>All outcomes represent the content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) reflected in the content standards, ==specific IEP goals,== address a range in the type or level of learning, including a focus on higher level learning, and real world connections. |
| Appropriateness for Students<br><br>TPE 3.2<br><br>ESN TPE 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 5.1, 5.3 | Description of unit and rationale provide limited justification for the appropriateness of the unit for:<br>(a) development of content knowledge or literacy skills,<br>(b) specific IEP goal<br>(c) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, or future learning, | Description of unit and rationale provide general justification for:<br>(a) development of either content knowledge or literacy skills,<br>(b) specific IEP ©ls<br>(c) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, or future learning,<br>(d) relevance for students at that grade level | Description of unit and rationale provide specific justification for:<br>(a) development of content knowledge, literacy skills, and specific IEP goals<br>(b) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, or future learning,<br>(c) relevance for students in that class. | Description of unit and rationale provide specific justification for:<br>==(a) integration of content knowledge, literacy skills, and specific IEP goals==<br>(b) past experiences, pre-requisite knowledge, and future learning,<br>(c) relevance for students in that class, specifically |

| | (d) relevance for students at that grade level | | EPC 2E-74 | | referencing information from Students in Context section. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

**Assessment Plan**

| Rating →<br>Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not<br>Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets<br>Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations<br>at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds<br>Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Congruence with Learning Outcomes and Content<br><br>TPE 4.3<br><br>ESN TPE 4.4 | Most methods of assessment lack congruence with learning outcomes and level of learning (e.g. DOK level). Little or not attention to students' specific IEP goals.<br>Little or no attention to the assessment of content knowledge or literacy skills. | Most assessment methods are congruent with learning outcomes in either content or level of learning (e.g. DOK level). Some attention to students' specific IEP goals.<br>Attention to assessment of content knowledge or literacy skills. | Most assessment methods are congruent with learning outcomes in content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) and expectations specified in students' IEPs.<br>Attention to assessment of both content knowledge and literacy skills. | All assessments are clearly congruent with the learning outcomes in both content and level of learning (e.g. DOK level) ==and align with expectations specified in students' IEPs.==<br>Specific attention to the assessment of integrated content knowledge and literacy skills. |
| Variety in Methods of Assessment<br><br>TPE 5.2<br><br>ESN TPE 5.1, 5.2, 5.7 | The assessment plan is limited or does not assess students before, during, and after instruction, or uses only one method of assessment. | The assessment plan assesses student knowledge or performance before, during, and after instruction, with some variety in the assessment methods. | The assessment plan assesses student knowledge or performance before, during, and after instruction, includes a variety of assessment methods, including assessment of higher level thinking (e.g. complex task). | The assessment plan assesses student knowledge and performance before, during and after instruction, includes a variety of assessment methods, including those requiring an integration of knowledge, skills, and reasoning. |
| Clarity of Assessment Methods<br><br>TPE 5.1<br><br>ESN TPE 5.1, 5.2 | Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are not clearly described.<br>Candidate demonstrates little understanding of | Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are given for most assessment methods.<br>Candidate describes how the | Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are clearly described for most assessment methods.<br><br>Candidate evaluates how the | Prompts, directions, scoring procedures, and criteria for meeting learning outcomes are clearly described for all assessment methods ==and are explicitly linked to learning outcomes and specific IEP goals.== |

| | the relationship between the format, purpose of assessments, and/or IEP goals.. | format of the assessments match the learning outcomes and the purpose of assessing. Candidate provides some justification for link between assessment methods and IEP goals. | format of the assessments match the learning outcomes and IEP goals and the purpose of assessing. | Candidate evaluates and justifies how the format of the assessments ==match the learning outcomes and IEP goals and the purpose of assessing.== |

**Design for Instruction**

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Use of Contextual Information and Data to Inform Instruction<br><br>TPE 1.6, 3.2, 4.4, 5.8<br><br>ESN TPE 1.7, 1.8, 2.12, 2.13, 3.1, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.5, 5.3 | Lessons are in conflict with the results of the pre assessment and/or the contextual factors.<br>Lessons include limited or inappropriate ways to provide access to the content or to develop literacy skills. | Lessons show some attention to pre assessment results and contextual factors.<br>Lessons provide access to content or develop literacy skills for at least two of the following:<br>(a) identified special needs,<br>(b) different levels of English language proficiency,<br>(c) different instructional needs. | Lessons are in alignment with pre-assessment results and contextual factors.<br>Lessons provide access to content and develop literacy skills for at least two of the following:<br>(a) identified special needs,<br>(b) different levels of English language proficiency,<br>(c) different instructional needs. | Lessons have been designed with specific reference to pre assessment data, present levels of academic and functional performance and accommodations/modifications in student IEPs, and contextual factors.<br><br>Lessons provide access to content and develop literacy skills for all of the following:<br>(a) identified special needs,<br>(b) different levels of English language proficiency,<br>(c) different instructional needs. |
| Alignment with Learning Outcomes & Standards<br><br>TPE 3.1, 3.3<br><br>ESN TPE 2.5, 3.1, 4.4 | Lessons are minimally aligned with the unit learning outcomes or are inconsistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area.<br>Specific IEP goals not mentioned. | Lessons are:<br>(a) aligned with unit learning outcomes and specific IEP goals<br>(b) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area of instruction or literacy skills. | Lessons are:<br>(a) aligned with unit learning outcomes and specific IEP goals<br>(b) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area of instruction and the development of literacy skills. | Lessons are:<br>(a) aligned with learning outcomes and specific IEP goals,<br>(b) consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area of instruction and the development of literacy skills,<br>(c) demonstrate seamless integration of content and literacy. |

August 2022

| Variety in Instruction<br><br>TPE 1.5, 4.4, 4.7<br><br>ESN TPE 1.4, 1.7, 4.3, 4.4 | Limited variety in instructional methods and engagement and intervention strategies.<br><br>Limited or inappropriate use of technology. | A variety of instructional methods and engagement and intervention strategies.<br><br>Appropriate use of technology to engage students or promote access to content, though primarily used by teacher. | A variety of instructional methods and engagement and intervention strategies, including activities that provide students opportunities for critical and creative thinking.<br><br>Appropriate use of technology to engage students or promote equitable access to content. | A variety of instructional methods and engagement and intervention strategies, including activities that provide opportunities for critical and creative thinking and utilize a range of communication or activity modes.<br><br>Clear justification for the use of technology to engage students and promote equitable access to content. |
|---|---|---|---|---|

# Instructional Decision-Making

| Rating →<br>Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not<br>Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets<br>Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations<br>at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds<br>Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Monitoring Student Learning<br><br>TPE 1.8<br><br>ESN TPE 1.4 | No or limited evidence of monitoring students during instruction. IEP goals not mentioned.<br><br>Focus is on external factors (e.g. time, schedule) rather than student behavior or learning. | Evidence of monitoring students during instruction is implied or general; IEP goals generally referenced.<br><br>Focus is primarily on behavior or lesson structure rather than student learning. | Evidence of monitoring students during instruction is specifically described and connected to IEP goals.<br><br>Focus is on student learning and engagement. | Evidence of monitoring students during instruction is connected to ==specific individuals and IEP goals.==<br><br>Focus is on productive student learning and active engagement by all students. |
| Adjustments Based on Knowledge of Student Learning and Providing Access to Curriculum<br><br>TPE 3.2<br><br>ESN TPE 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.5 | Teacher treats class as "one plan fits all" with no adjustments OR information about student learning is not used, or used inappropriately, to adjust instruction. | Some adjustments of the instructional plan are made to address general student needs, with some connections to knowledge of student learning or providing access to curriculum. | Appropriate adjustments of the instructional plan are made to specifically address needs of students in this class, with some reference to IEP goals. These adjustments are informed by the knowledge of student learning related to the unit topic and providing access to curriculum, including attention to specific IEP goals and appropriate accommodations/ modifications. | Appropriate adjustments of the instructional plan are made to specifically address needs of both whole group and specific students. These adjustments are explicitly informed by the knowledge of student learning, ==with specific reference to learning outcomes, IEP goals— including accommodations/ modifications, and providing access to curriculum.== |
| Alignment Between Adjustments and Learning Outcomes | Adjustments to instruction are minimally or not aligned with learning outcomes. | Adjustments to instruction are generally aligned with learning outcomes | Adjustments to instruction are specifically aligned with learning outcomes and | Adjustments to instruction are ==explicitly aligned to learning outcomes and specific IEP== |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| TPE 3.2 <br><br> ESN TPE 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.5 | Limited or no reasons given for how adjustments would improve student progress. | . IEP goals, including accommodations/ modifications mentioned. <br><br> Reasons for adjustments address efforts to improve student progress. | specific IEP goals and accommodations/ modifications. . <br> Reasons for the adjustments specifically address how they would improve student progress. | ==goals and accommodations/ modifications.== <br> Reasons for adjustments include how they would improve student progress for the whole class and specific students. |

# Analysis of Student Learning

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1 Does Not Meet Expectations | 2 Meets Expectations | 3 Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4 Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Analysis and Interpretation of Data<br><br>TPE 5.2<br><br>ESN TPE 5.2, 5.3 | Analysis and interpretation of data:<br>(a) provides limited or no evidence of the number of students meeting the learning outcomes;<br>(b) is missing, inaccurate, or unsupported by evidence;<br>(c) provides a limited description of how the data/scores reflect the learning outcomes. | Analysis and interpretation of data:<br>(a) provides some evidence of the number of students meeting at least one of the learning outcomes and/or specific IEP goals;<br>(b) is generally accurate, with some supporting evidence;<br>(c) describes how the data/scores reflect learning related to at least one of the learning outcomes and/or specific IEP goals. | Analysis and interpretation of data:<br>(a) provides clear evidence of the number of students meeting each of the two learning outcomes and specific IEP goals.;<br>(b) is generally accurate and clearly supported by evidence from data;<br>(c) describes how the data/ scores reflect learning related to each of the two learning outcomes and specific IEP goals. | Analysis and interpretation of data:<br>(a) provides clear evidence of the number of students meeting each of the two learning ==outcomes and making some or no progress toward the learning outcomes and specific IEP goals.==<br>(b) is completely accurate, clearly supported by evidence from data with specific examples to support statements;<br>(c) uses specific examples to describe how the data/scores reflect ==each of the two learning outcomes and specific IEP goals.== |
| Progress Report<br><br>TPE 5.5<br><br>ESN TPE 4.7, 5.2, 5.3 | Progress report for student who struggled:<br>(a) uses limited or inappropriate data or examples to describe strengths or areas for growth related to one of the unit outcomes; (b) | Progress report for student who struggled: (a) uses some data or examples to describe strengths or areas for growth related to one of the unit outcomes and/or | Progress report for student who struggled:<br>(a) uses appropriate data and examples to describe strengths and areas for growth related to at least one of the unit outcomes specific IEP goals; | Progress report for student who struggled:<br>(a) uses appropriate data and examples to describe strengths and areas for growth related to ==both of the unit outcomes and specific IEP goals.== |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| provides no, limited, or unrealistic suggestions for improving student learning. | the specific IEP goals;<br>(b) provides general suggestions for improving student learning with general references to specific IEP goals. | (b) provides realistic suggestions for improving student learning through individualized supports (accommodations/ modifications) related to these learning outcomes and the specific IEP goals for this student. | (b) provides realistic and specific suggestions for improving student learning through appropriate individualized supports (accommodations/ modifications) related to these learning outcomes and specific IEP goals for the needs of this student. |

# Reflection and Self-Evaluation

| Rating → Indicator ↓ | 1<br>Does Not Meet Expectations | 2<br>Meets Expectations | 3<br>Meets Expectations at a High Level | 4<br>Exceeds Expectations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment<br><br>TPE 6.1, 6.5<br><br>ESN TPE 5.3 | Does not describe effective instructional activities for at least two of these categories: (a) a range of English proficiency, (b) students with identified special learning needs, (c) students with different learning needs.<br><br>Provides limited or no statements about the alignment between assessments, specific IEP goals, and learning outcomes.<br><br>Does not describe subject matter knowledge OR description of subject matter knowledge does not relate to this unit. | Describes effective instructional activities for at least two of these categories:<br><br>(a) a range of English proficiency,<br><br>(b) students with identified special learning needs,<br><br>(c) students with different learning needs.<br><br>Identifies the alignment between assessments, specific IEP goals, and learning outcomes.<br><br>Describes subject matter knowledge related to this unit. | Describes effective instructional activities and provides plausible justification for at least two of these categories:<br><br>(a) a range of English proficiency,<br><br>(b) students with identified special learning needs,<br><br>(c) students with different learning needs.<br><br>Identifies and justifies the alignment between assessments specific IEP goals, and learning outcomes.<br><br>Describes how subject matter knowledge and knowledge of appropriate accommodations and/or modifications influenced the success of the unit. | Describes effective instructional activities and provides plausible justification with supporting evidence for all of these categories:<br><br>(a) a range of English proficiency,<br><br>(b) students with identified special learning needs,<br><br>(c) students with different learning needs.<br><br>==Identifies and justifies the alignment between assessments, specific IEP goals, and learning outcomes, including supporting evidence.==<br><br>Describes how subject matter knowledge and knowledge of appropriate accommodations and/or modifications influenced the success of the unit, and provides supporting evidence from the unit. |

| Implications for Future Teaching<br><br>TPE 6.1<br><br>ESN TPE 5.3 | Provides limited or inappropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, or assessment. | Provides appropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, or assessment. | Provides appropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, or assessment and explains why these adjustments would improve student learning. | Provides appropriate suggestions for redesigning learning outcomes, instruction, and assessment, connects these suggestions to assessment data, and explains why these adjustments would improve student learning. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Implications for Professional Development<br><br>TPE 6.3<br><br>ESN TPE (N/A) | Professional learning goal is not related to practice.<br><br>Steps are impractical or inappropriate. | Presents a reasonable professional learning goal connected to teaching in general.<br><br>Appropriate steps described in general terms. | Presents a reasonable professional learning goal connected to the unit. Appropriate steps described in specific terms. | Presents a reasonable professional learning goal based on student learning documented in the unit. Appropriate steps described in specific terms. |