
4B

Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Literacy Performance Assessment Pilot Study-Participant Waiver Requests

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the Literacy Performance Assessment pilot study. This item recommends that the Commission approve the selection criteria for participation; approve the requested waiver for selected institutions that meet proposed criteria; discuss and determine if participants may waive both the TPA and RICA requirements; and adopt a minimum performance level for successful completion of the revised CalTPA Cycle 2 for use during the 2024 pilot.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends the Commission:

- (1) Adopt proposed criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the Literacy Performance Assessment pilot study.
- (2) Approve waiver requests from selected institutions to waive the RICA and CalTPA Cycle 2 requirements for their candidates who successfully complete the Literacy Performance Assessment and meet the performance level set by the Commission.
- (3) Approve waiver requests from selected Education Specialist low incidence institutions to waive the RICA requirement for their candidates who successfully complete the Literacy Performance Assessment and meet the performance level set by the Commission.
- (4) Adopt a compensatory scoring model and require candidates who participate in the pilot to pass the Literacy Performance Assessment with an expected average performance level of 2 across all rubrics.

Presenters: Amy Reising, Chief Deputy Director, Executive Office, Heather Kennedy, Consultant, Professional Services Division

Literacy Performance Assessment Pilot Study-Participant Waiver Requests

Introduction

This agenda item presents criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the Literacy Performance Assessment (LPA) pilot study proposed for spring of 2024. The pilot will include Multiple Subject (MS), Education Specialist Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) and Extensive Support Needs (ESN), and potentially PK-3 Early Childhood Education (ECE) Specialist teacher preparation programs. The Literacy Performance Assessment is intended to replace the currently adopted Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) as called for in [Senate Bill 488 \(Chap. 678, Stats. 2021\)](#), commonly referred to as SB 488, and to measure priority elements appropriate for new teachers of the newly adopted [Literacy Teaching Performance Expectations \(TPE\) Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction](#) for all students.

SB 488 added section 44320.3 to the Education Code, requiring the Commission to ensure that by July 1, 2025, an approved Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) for preliminary multiple subject and education specialist candidates assess all candidates for competence in instruction in literacy. As designed, and for candidates participating in the pilot, the current Literacy Performance Assessment would replace Cycle 2: Assessment Driven Instruction in the California Teaching Performance Assessment (CalTPA) such that candidates from preparation programs using the CalTPA would meet both the RICA and TPA requirements for earning a credential. Sponsors of the edTPA and Fresno Assessment of Student Teachers (FAST) are also expected to embed a literacy performance assessment in their models, subject to approval by the Commission. Until such time as these other model sponsors have expanded their models to include a literacy performance assessment component, the LPA will also be available for edTPA and FAST candidates to meet the literacy instruction assessment requirement.

Twenty-nine institutions have expressed interest in participating in the pilot study and are requesting that the Commission waive the RICA requirement as well as the existing, approved Cycle 2 of the CalTPA for candidates who successfully complete and meet a minimum passing standard for the Literacy Performance Assessment.

To participate in this pilot and meet both the TPA and reading instruction competence assessment requirements (combined TPA and RICA), CalTPA candidates would complete the current *Cycle 1: Learning About Students and Planning Instruction* of the CalTPA with a focus on math content and complete the revised *Cycle 2: Assessment-Driven Literacy Instruction* which measures TPE Domains 1-6, as well as competency in literacy instruction as defined in the newly adopted literacy TPEs for each program type (MS, MMSN, ESN, and PK-3), as directed by SB 488. This combination of Cycle 1 and the revised Cycle 2, if approved, would replace the requirement of the current CalTPA and RICA examination.

This item recommends that the Commission approve the selection criteria for participation in the pilot of the LPA; approve the requested waiver for selected institutions and candidates that meet proposed criteria including coursework that aligns with the new sets of TPE Domain 7 (MS, MMSN, ESN, and PK-3) and SB 488; and adopt an expected performance level for successful completion of the revised LPA, administered and scored during the 2024 pilot study.

Background for TPA Requirement

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

Commencing July 1, 2008, for a program of professional preparation to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 44259, the program shall include a teaching performance assessment that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and that is congruent with state content and performance standards for pupils adopted pursuant to subdivision (a) of section 60605.

Currently there are three Commission-approved TPA models: CalTPA, edTPA, and FAST for Multiple Subject and Single Subject candidates. [CalTPA](#) and [edTPA](#) also offer approved TPAs for Education Specialist MMSN and ESN candidates (FAST will be on the October 2023 agenda for approval for these two credential types). Completion of a Commission-approved TPA is only one of multiple measures that an approved preliminary preparation program is required to use in determining a recommendation for a Multiple or Single Subject, Education Specialist (MMSN and ESN), or PK-3 Specialist credential.

The Commission's model, the CalTPA, has been approved for use in California since 2008, and *Cycle 2: Assessment-Driven Instruction* is currently being revised to meet the requirements of SB 488 and retitled, *Cycle 2: Assessment-Driven Literacy Instruction*. New literacy assessment tasks and scoring rubrics have been developed to assess both the current TPEs (Domains 1 through 6) and the newly adopted TPE Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for all Students. They are being finalized in preparation for a pilot study in spring 2024. A list of institutions seeking inclusion in the literacy CalTPA pilot will be presented to the Commission at the October 2023 meeting.

This cycle will be available as a standalone reading instruction assessment for both edTPA and FAST candidates until such time as these models have been adapted to include a literacy performance assessment.

Per SB 488, Single Subject candidates do not need to take the new Literacy Performance Assessment, as they have never been required to pass a reading instruction assessment;

therefore, for all adopted performance assessment models, the Single Subject teaching performance assessment will continue to be administered as developed.

Background on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment Requirement and Literacy Instruction

Following the passage of SB 488, Education Code [§44259](#) and [§44283](#) were amended and [§44283.2](#) was added to require the Commission to complete a series of actions related to preparation for literacy instruction. These sections of statute require that the study of effective means of teaching literacy and evidence-based means of teaching foundational reading skills be included as a minimum requirement for Multiple Subject, Single Subject in English, and Education Specialist teaching credentials. It further requires that Commission standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) align with the [English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve \(ELA/ELD Framework\)](#) adopted by the State Board of Education and incorporate the [California Dyslexia Guidelines](#). The Commission committed to apply these same requirements to the PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction credential, which was retooled after SB 488 was passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor.

Current law requires individuals seeking to obtain a teaching credential in California to fulfill several requirements. For those seeking a Multiple Subject (elementary) or an Education Specialist (special education) credential, candidates must pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) to obtain a preliminary teaching credential. Established in 1996, the RICA was one part of a broader set of policies known collectively as the California Reading Initiative (CRI). The Commission implemented the RICA requirement in 1998 for Multiple Subject credential candidates and in 2000 for Education Specialist credential candidates.

Since the enactment of the California Reading Initiative statute over 25 years ago, the State Board of Education adopted a significantly updated *K-12 English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework*. These updates impact candidate preparation for teaching reading and developing literacy, including for students identified as English learners, as well as assessment of candidate competency in these areas. Additionally, the *California Dyslexia Guidelines* were published to address teaching reading to students with dyslexia. To meet the needs of all California students, SB 488 required the Commission to update its program standards and Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) for teacher preparation with respect to reading and literacy instruction, as well as corresponding candidate assessments.

During the 2022-23 academic year, the Commission consulted broadly with experts, preparation program personnel, and members of the public to update the program standards and literacy TPEs. The Commission adopted new standards for most teaching credentials in October 2022 and for the low incidence Education Specialist areas of Early Childhood Special Education, Visual Impairments, and Deaf and Hard of Hearing in February 2023. See [Agenda Item 2A](#) presented to the Commission at the June 2023 meeting.

Multiple Subject, Education Specialist, and PK-3 candidates must successfully complete TPE-aligned coursework and clinical practice, as well as meet the passing standard for a performance assessment, which beginning in Fall 2025, must include literacy. The teaching performance assessment provides the opportunity to measure priority TPEs that beginning teachers must be able to demonstrate prior to being recommended for a preliminary credential. All of TPE Domain 7 will be introduced, practiced, and assessed within the curriculum at the local level in the candidate's teacher preparation program. Additionally, priority TPE Domain 7 elements and/or portions of elements will be assessed on the Literacy Performance Assessment. For a chart of potential TPEs to be measured by the Literacy Performance Assessment see [Appendix C](#).

To meet the requirements of SB 488, staff, a literacy design team ([Appendix A](#)), and the Commission's technical contractor Evaluation Systems Group of Pearson (ES) have been working to develop a performance assessment that incorporates the requirements of SB 488 and measures priority TPE Domain 7 elements that are appropriate for beginning teachers to demonstrate.

This agenda item is organized into three parts:

- Part 1 presents an overview of current plans for the pilot study of the literacy performance assessment (LPA) and proposes participation criteria for the selection of institutions that offer Multiple Subject, Education Specialist (MMSN and ESN), and PK-3 Specialist teacher preparation programs. This part of the item also presents a request from institutions for a Commission waiver of the requirement that candidates pass RICA and instead take and pass a literacy performance assessment. In addition to meeting the RICA requirement, selected candidates who are using the CalTPA model will be able to take the LPA in place of the currently approved Cycle 2.
- Part 2 discusses the Commission's waiver authority and provides an overview of the LPA, including information about how the LPA addresses the Commission's Performance Assessment Design Standards (PADS) and measures elements of TPE Domain 7 for each credential type (MS, MMSN, ESN, and PK-3).
- Part 3 proposes a performance level that would establish a minimum passing score for candidates who complete the LPA administered during the 2024 pilot (January – April 2024).

Part 1: Criteria for the Selection of Institutions to Participate in the Cycle 2 Pilot Study

The pilot study of the LPA will provide an opportunity to collect data about the teaching performance of 170-240 candidates across a sample of institutions and program types that reflect the diversity of program sizes, candidates served, institutional affiliations, pathways, and service areas in California. The pilot will seek to include candidates at institutions using all three models: the CalTPA, edTPA, and FAST. The Pilot Plan for the LPA identifies the following credential types and target number of responses needed for the pilot study. In addition, the table presents sample targets for low incidence programs - Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DHH), Visual Impairments (VI), and Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) - who currently are not

required to pass a TPA but are required to pass RICA. Participation in this pilot would potentially allow these low incidence candidates to meet the RICA requirement if they meet the passing standard for the LPA.

Table 1: LPA Pilot Study Sample

Credential Type	Consequential for Candidate	January to April 2024	Potential Waiver	Pilot Minimum	Pilot Maximum	# to Score
Multiple Subject	Yes	Pilot	RICA & CalTPA C2	30	40*	All
MMSN	Yes	Pilot	RICA & CalTPA C2	50	75	All
ESN	Yes	Pilot	RICA & CalTPA C2	30	40	All
PK3*	Yes	Pilot	RICA & CalTPA C2	30	40	All
DHH	No**	Pilot	RICA	10	15	All
VI	No	Pilot	RICA	10	15	All
ECSE	No	Pilot	RICA	10	15	All
			TOTAL	170	240	

*If no PK-3 Specialist programs are approved in time to participate in the pilot, ES will recruit an additional 35 MS candidates who are teaching in grades TK-3.

**Low incidence education specialist programs are not required to pass a TPA until July 2025.

To ensure a diverse sample, staff recommends the Commission adopt the following criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the pilot study of the Literacy Performance Assessment:

Participation Criteria

1. The institution is in good standing with the Commission, and its preliminary Multiple Subject, Education Specialist (MMSN and ESN) and PK-3 teacher preparation programs meet all standards.
2. The preliminary Multiple Subject, Education Specialist (MMSN and ESN) and PK-3 teacher preparation program is reviewed by literacy experts and determined to be teaching TPE Domain 7 content. See [Appendix C](#) for LPA TPEs.
3. The preliminary Education Specialist low incidence (DHH, VI, and ECSE) teacher preparation program is reviewed by literacy experts and determined to be teaching TPE Domain 7 content. See [Appendix C](#) for LPA TPEs.
4. The institution agrees to fully participate in the pilot study, which requires:
 - a. Working with Evaluation Systems (ES) and Commission staff to select a diverse group of candidates by December 2023 to pilot the LPA;

- b. Providing the expected level of support for pilot participants defined in program standard 5 with an additional focus on TPE Domain 7 elements measured by the LPA;
 - c. Ensuring that all pilot participants have a fair and equitable opportunity to complete the LPA - and submit scoreable evidence to ES by April 2024; and
 - d. Providing pilot participants who do not meet the expected performance level on the LPA with remedial support and the opportunity to take and pass the RICA. Additionally, these candidates would be required to take and pass the institution's currently approved TPA (CalTPA, edTPA, or FAST).
5. The institution contributes to an appropriately diverse pool of pilot participants that includes different types of programs (MS, MMSN, ESN, DHH, VI, ECSE, and PK-3) and program pathways (Intern, Residency, 5th year, four-year integrated undergraduate program), candidates, geographic regions, and demographics.

Institutions Requesting the Waiver

Evaluation Systems and Commission staff will recruit programs to participate in the LPA pilot, which is scheduled for spring 2024, across the seven types of credential programs. Institutions with approved Multiple Subject, Education Specialist (MMSN, ESN, VI, DHH, and ECSE), and PK-3 preparation programs will need to request a waiver of the RICA requirement for their candidates who complete the pilot and achieve passing status as determined by the Commission on the LPA. CalTPA candidates will need a waiver for the C2 Instructional Cycle. Low incidence Education Specialist programs [will be required to pass an approved TPA fall of 2025](#).

An item will be prepared for the October 2023 meeting with a list of institutions seeking a RICA and/or CalTPA Cycle 2 waiver for the literacy performance assessment. If requests come in after the October 2023 Commission meeting, their waiver requests will be placed on the December 2023 Consent Calendar. Commission staff will work with ES and identified institutions to draw a sample of candidates from all three types of TPA models (CalTPA, edTPA, and FAST) that is diverse and broadly representative of the larger population of teacher candidates.

Selected Institutions will need to submit the following waiver request to the Commission prior to the October 2023 meeting for approval:

“Our institution requests that the Commission waive the reading instruction assessment requirement and CalTPA Cycle 2 (if applicable) requirement for any of our identified teaching credential candidates who complete and achieve a passing score as determined by the Commission on the pilot of the LPA.”

Low incidence programs will need to submit the following waiver request to the Commission prior to the October 2023 meeting for approval:

“Our institution requests that the Commission waive the reading instruction assessment requirement for any of our identified teaching credential candidates who complete and achieve a passing score as determined by the Commission on the pilot of the LPA.”

Part 2: Commission Authority to Issue a Waiver

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

§44225 The commission shall do all of the following:

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

The underlined section of statute sets criteria for the issuance of a waiver that requires equivalence or comparability of requirement to be established. The process of the development of the LPA involves multiple steps, including design of tasks and rubrics to measure the priority elements of TPE Domain 7; a pilot study where the proposed tasks and rubrics are completed; revision of tasks and rubrics based on the pilot findings; a field test of the revised cycle; a standard setting study; and finally, review and approval by the Commission for use in California. The proposed LPA has not completed the Commission's review process yet, as it is still under development. The LPA is expected to be presented to the Commission for review and final approval at its June 2025 Commission meeting and be fully implemented starting July 1, 2025.

Documentation of progress toward meeting the [Performance Assessment Design Standards](#) (PADS) was conducted by ES and reviewed by Commission staff. The review indicates that the LPA, completed in collaboration with the Literacy Design Team, satisfies these standards adopted by the Commission. On this basis, the LPA can be considered to represent professional preparation equivalent and therefore comparable to the current RICA requirements for a Multiple Subject, Education Specialist, and PK-3 Teaching Credential.

Under these conditions, the Commission has the authority to provide waivers to candidates that meet the expected performance level on the LPA rather than on the current RICA. The Commission has previously allowed a waiver for the TPA under similar circumstances for the initial pilot of the edTPA during 2012-13 and for the [redeveloped CalTPA in 2017](#).

Detailed information about the current structure of the LPA and summary information about how it addresses key provisions of the Commission's adopted PADS are presented below to illustrate how the completion of the LPA can be considered comparable to completion of the RICA, as well as for the currently approved Cycle 2 for the CalTPA for programs that use this model. [Appendix B](#) provides more detailed information based on the ES analysis and Commission staff documentation of progress toward meeting the PADS.

[Appendix C](#) provides a map of the TPEs measured in the LPA including the new TPE Domain 7 priority elements. All programs selected for the pilot will be reviewed by literacy experts and

determined to be teaching all elements of each of the 7 TPE Domains. The LPA will provide a measure of competency on the priority TPE elements deemed appropriate for beginning teachers by the Literacy Design Team and the required reading instruction pedagogy as described in SB 488 that are aligned to the ELA and ELD standards and framework and the Dyslexia Guidelines. The current version of RICA is not fully aligned to the recently adopted TPE Domain 7 or to the ELA/ELD Framework.

Structure of the Literacy Performance Assessment

The CalTPA Literacy Design Team (LDT) has been meeting since March 2023 to develop the Literacy Performance Assessment to address the PADS and measure priority elements of TPE Domain 7. The LDT brings a wealth of experience implementing performance assessments in a variety of teacher preparation programs, and members are literacy experts with knowledge and experience in supporting students with dyslexia. The California Department of Education is participating in the work and has assigned two liaisons, its Statewide Literacy Co-Directors, to attend meetings. The LDT's knowledge and experience have led to the development of a next generation reading instruction competence assessment as well as a third-generation CalTPA Cycle 2 that benefits from lessons learned from over two decades of implementation. The draft LPA is intended by the LDT to measure priority elements of the newly adopted literacy TPE Domain 7, incorporate the requirements of SB 488, and align with the ELA and ELD Framework and the *California Dyslexia Guidelines*. Members of the LDT are listed in [Appendix A](#).

The LPA reflects a task-based structure that requires candidates to (a) plan a segment of instruction and assessment; (b) teach and video record their practice; (c) assess student learning; (d) reflect on the effectiveness of the planning, instruction, and assessment data; and (e) apply what they have learned from the cycle of instruction and assessment by identifying what they would alter and then reteach or extend learning (and video record) to meet or exceed the set ELA/ELD learning goals.

Candidates enrolled in programs using the CalTPA will be required to pass both of the CalTPA's Instructional Cycles (the current Cycle 1 focused on mathematics instruction and the revised Cycle 2 focused on literacy instruction) in order to be recommended for a preliminary Multiple Subject, Education Specialist (MMSN and ESN), or PK-3 teaching credential. Multiple Subject and Education Specialist Pilot participants will complete Cycle 1 focused on math during early field placement, submit it for scoring, and receive assessment results including a pass or no pass status, a scaled score, and analytic feedback about specific TPEs prior to submitting their response to the revised Cycle 2. Preparation programs participating in the pilot will be expected to provide targeted support for their candidates to improve teaching practice based on their assessment results from Cycle 1. Candidates will engage in Cycle 2 later in their program and will be provided support by their faculty and supervising teacher(s). If a candidate does not meet the passing scores on the revised Cycle 2 that embeds the LPA, they will need to take and pass the currently approved Cycle 2 (also with a focus on literacy) and meet the appropriate Commission-approved passing standard score. In addition, they will need to take and pass the RICA assessment.

Candidates enrolled in programs that use the edTPA or FAST will continue to be required to pass their TPA model. Completing and passing the pilot LPA would provide a waiver for the reading instruction competence assessment requirement.

How the Literacy Performance Assessment Addresses the Performance Assessment Design Standards (PADS)

Passage of a Commission-approved TPA and LPA provides assurance to the Commission and the public that each candidate demonstrates the ability to teach the state-adopted content standards to California's public school students. There are many expectations a proposed assessment must satisfy before it is recommended to the Commission for approval. Specific key essential requirements from the Education Code and the PADS are identified below with a staff analysis of the degree to which the LPA currently addresses each of these essential aspects. (See [Appendix B](#) for a full, up to date response to each of the PADS elements).

- Assess each candidate on the CSTP
The Education Code specifies that the TPA must assess each candidate on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). The Commission has developed more specific indicators of the level of teaching that needs to be demonstrated through the *Teaching Performance Expectations* (TPEs) and the newly revised and adopted TPE Domain 7, Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students, which reflect the CSTP as exemplified at the level of a beginning teacher. [Appendix C](#) provides information indicating which TPEs are being assessed in the LPA and this mapping will be updated after the pilot and used to guide further development.
- Assess each candidate's ability to teach the state-adopted academic content standards to California students
The TPA must assess each candidate's ability to teach the state-adopted content standards. The LPA requires candidates to plan their instruction and assessment based on the ELA and ELD state adopted student academic content standards and frameworks, including using the *California Dyslexia Guidelines* as a foundational document. TPE Domain 7 requires candidates to demonstrate ELA and ELD specific pedagogy, including foundational reading skills (print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics, and word recognition) and crosscutting themes (meaning making, language development, effective expression, and content knowledge), and the scoring rubrics require a focus on these key sets of knowledge and skills. In addition, there is an explicit requirement within the LPA to address the effective teaching of students with identified reading needs, including dyslexia. Assessors of the LPA must hold at the least the appropriate California credential, have recent experience teaching reading, and comprehensive reading expertise. Exact criteria for assessor selection are under discussion by the LDT and will be used for the spring 2024 pilot study.
- Validity and Reliability in Scoring
As the tasks and scoring rubrics are completed and made ready for the pilot study, ES, the LDT, and Commission staff will develop comprehensive training for assessors to

ensure understanding of the requirements for literacy instruction as provided in SB 488, including foundational reading skills, crosscutting themes, and the *California Dyslexia Guidelines*. As candidate materials are submitted for scoring, selected assessors will participate in the training, which will include calibration exercises to support reliability in scoring. ES and Commission staff will monitor implementation, program support, and scoring activities to support the validity and reliability of the LPA. Feedback from the pilot will be reviewed and used by the LDT, ES, and Commission staff to revise the training and procedures for scoring, as needed, for use in the 2025 field test. Members of the LDT, ES, and Commission staff have significant experience with performance assessment and scoring performance assessments, including experience with the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), edTPA, PACT, CalTPA, CalAPA, and RICA.

- Formative assessment information for program use in candidate preparation and program improvement.
Consistent with the Commission’s PADS, formative, aggregate pilot data will be provided to participating programs.

Comparison of the draft Literacy Performance Assessment with the Current RICA Video Performance Assessment

Candidates currently have the option to take either a written or video performance assessment to fulfil the current RICA requirement. The table below provides an overview of the **current** RICA video performance assessment requirements.

Evidence to be Submitted	RICA Video Requirements
<p>Setting 1: Whole-Class Instruction Video and Template</p>	<p>Instructional Setting: This lesson must be delivered to an entire class of no fewer than 5 students.</p> <p>Domains: Domain 1 (Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment) and Domain 4 (Vocabulary, Academic Language, and Background Knowledge)</p> <p>Description: Video and template should demonstrate your ability to: (a) plan, organize, and manage reading instruction based on ongoing assessment, as described in Domain 1, and (b) plan and deliver to a whole class an effective lesson that develops the students' vocabulary, academic language, and background knowledge.</p> <p>The central instructional objective of the lesson must be derived from Competency 11 of Domain 4. You must demonstrate knowledge and skills in this competency.</p>

Evidence to be Submitted	RICA Video Requirements
<p>Setting 2: Small-Group Instruction Video and Template</p>	<p>Instructional Setting: This lesson must be delivered to a group of at least 3 but no more than 12 students.</p> <p>Domains: Domain 1 (Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment) and Domain 2 (Word Analysis)</p> <p>Description: Video and template should demonstrate your ability to: (a) plan, organize, and manage reading instruction based on ongoing assessment, as described in Domain 1, and (b) plan and deliver to a small group of students an effective lesson that develops the students' word analysis.</p> <p>The central instructional objective of the lesson must be derived from Competency 6 or 7 of Domain 2. You must demonstrate knowledge and skills in one of these competencies.</p>
<p>Setting 3: Individual Instruction Video and Template</p>	<p>Instructional Setting: This lesson must be delivered to an individual student.</p> <p>Domains: Domain 1 (Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment) and Domain 5 (Comprehension)</p> <p>Description: Video and template should demonstrate your ability to: (a) plan, organize, and manage reading instruction based on ongoing assessment, as described in Domain 1, and (b) plan and deliver to an individual student an effective lesson that develops the student's comprehension.</p> <p>The central instructional objective of the lesson must be derived from Competency 13, 14, or 15 of Domain 5. You must demonstrate knowledge and skills in one of these competencies.</p>

Current RICA Competencies are available [here](#). It should be noted that these competencies are not fully aligned to the currently adopted ELA/ELD Framework.

The following chart describes the specific steps and expected evidence proposed for the DRAFT LPA:

Cycle Step	What You Need to Do	Evidence to Be Submitted
Step 1: Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide contextual information, including assets and learning needs for all students. • Develop a plan for a series of 3 to 5 literacy lessons and complete the Learning Segment Template. At least one lesson must include foundational reading skills. Describe your assessments and explain how they are aligned to and measure the standard(s)-based ELA and ELD goals. • Provide a description or blank copy of the assessments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part A: Written Narrative: Contextual and Small Group Information • Part B: Learning Segment Template • Part C: Written Narrative: Assessment Descriptions • Part D: Description or Blank Copy of Assessments
Step 2: Teach and Assess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct the instruction and assessment activities in your learning segment (3 to 5 lessons). • Video record your learning segment lessons. Select 3 clips that include effective literacy instruction and pedagogy. Provide annotations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part E: 3 Annotated Video Clips • Part F: Written Narrative: Analysis of Assessments
Step 3: Reflect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Score the summative assessment responses using a rubric. Select student responses and provide rubric-based feedback. • Analyze student results from assessments used throughout the learning segment. • Reflect on students' literacy assessment data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part G: Students Responses and Feedback • Part H: Written Narrative: Analysis of Assessment Results and Reflection
Step 4: Apply	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze the evidence you observed of student learning and describe what was most and least effective. • Plan follow-up instructional activity based on your analysis of assessments. Your follow-up activity will be either a re-teaching or extension. • Describe how you decided on your instructional approach and how that change was informed by your analysis of the assessment results from Steps 2 and 3. • Video record one follow-up activity and select 1 video clip that demonstrates how you adjusted or built on your instruction based on your analysis of the assessment results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part K: Written Narrative: Next Steps for Learning and Re-Teaching or Extension Activity Description Part L: 1 Annotated Video Clip of Follow-Up Activity

The proposed pilot version of the LPA is comparable to the requirements asked of candidates in the video version of the current RICA performance assessment.

The following table provides a comparison between the two assessments and their requirements.

Table 2: Comparison of Requirements: Draft Literacy Performance Assessment and Current Video RICA Performance Assessment

Components of Proposed Pilot Version of Literacy Performance Assessment	Components of Current Video RICA Performance Assessment	Description
Contextual Information About Students, including previous assessments and/or screenings	Assessment and Planning Student Information	Assessment methods used to determine the lesson(s) Student background information
Learning Segment Description (three to five lessons and assessments)	Lesson Plan (whole group, small group, or individual)	Explanation of learning activities and assessments
Assessment Descriptions	N/A	Description of assessments with rubrics
Video Clips (3)	Video Clips (3)	Video recording of candidate’s instruction
Video annotations	N/A	Explanation of what is occurring in the video and why
Analysis of Assessments	N/A	Analysis of assessments
Analysis of Summative Assessment Results and Reflection	Reflection	Using assessment data to plan future instruction and reflecting on effectiveness
Next Steps for Learning and Re-Teaching or Extension Activity and video clip	N/A	Implement extension or reteach activity with students based on assessment results

In addition to the differences in the requirements of the two assessments, the rubrics associated with each assessment are very different. The RICA rubrics are holistic in nature, while the LPA relies on analytic rubrics directly aligned to the recently adopted TPE Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students, which aligns to the current ELA/ELD Framework and the expectations of SB 488. See [Appendix D](#) for the RICA video performance assessment holistic rubric and current CalTPA Cycle 2 analytic rubrics.

With these comparable features and the addition of the Assessment Descriptions, Analysis of Assessments, specific video annotations, and Next Steps for Learning and Re-Teaching or

Extension Activity and video clip, candidates will demonstrate an equivalent and therefore comparable, if not more comprehensive, body of evidence than what is asked for in the current video RICA performance assessment. Given the specificity and alignment of the LPA draft analytic rubrics to SB 488 and the more comprehensive set of evidence required of candidates to demonstrate both foundational reading skills and the additional crosscutting themes of the ELA/ELD Framework, staff submit that the draft LPA is at least equivalent to the current RICA video performance assessment and therefore meets the statutory provision for the Commission to waive the current requirement for candidates who take and pass the pilot version of the LPA. Staff further recommends that pilot participants who are taking the CalTPA to meet their TPA requirement receive a TPA waiver that recognizes a passing score on the LPA as a replacement for Cycle 2 of the CalTPA.

In summary, successful completion of an approved teacher preparation program and a TPA that either includes or is taken in addition to the LPA are comparable to completion of a program and passage of a fully approved TPA and assessment of reading instruction competence. Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission utilize its authority to grant waivers to candidates upon request of the institution of higher education enrolling them in preparation if their institution meets the criteria and is selected to participate in the pilot study. Granting of this waiver will allow candidates who successfully complete the LPA to meet the current RICA requirement, and if they are participating in and complete both cycles of the CalTPA model, to also meet the TPA requirement for a credential. For the low incidence Education Specialist candidates, they would be allowed to waive the RICA requirement.

Part 3: Proposed Performance Level to Pass the Revised CalTPA Cycle 2

Developers of TPA models typically conduct a standard setting study in order to establish the requirements for successful completion of the assessment. ES will conduct a standard setting study following the field test period, which will conclude in April 2025. The purpose of the pilot study is to engage participants to collect additional validity evidence about the design of the literacy performance assessment, specifically the tasks and rubrics, and use these data to refine the LPA for use in a full-scale field test.

Commission staff recommend that the Commission establish an initial performance level for use in the scoring of candidates who complete the LPA during the pilot. The expected performance level should take into account that participating preparation programs have been reviewed by literacy experts and have met the expectations of TPE Domain.

Commission staff recommend a minimum performance of 14 points for the proposed draft rubrics (8). This recommended score represents a passing score of 2 points per rubric with the rough equivalent of a standard error of measurement (SEM) of -2.0 applied. The application of a -2.0 SEM has been a consistent Commission practice for new and revised assessments.

Candidates who do not meet the Commission's expected minimum performance level will be supported in taking the RICA and/or the institution's existing approved TPA, as appropriate.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Commission:

1. Adopt the proposed criteria for the selection of institutions to participate in the Literacy Performance Assessment pilot study listed on page 7-8 of this item.
2. Approve waiver requests from selected institutions to waive the requirement for the assessment of reading instruction competence requirement for their candidates who successfully complete the LPA and meet the pilot expected performance level set by the Commission. CalTPA candidates who pilot and meet the expected passing standard on the LPA may also use this score to meet the CalTPA Cycle 2 requirement. Candidates enrolled in programs using the edTPA or FAST TPA models who take and pass the LPA will meet the reading instruction competence assessment requirement. To meet the TPA requirement, these candidates will need to take and pass the TPA used by their institution. When the edTPA and FAST model sponsors have revised their models to include a literacy performance assessment that meets the requirements of SB 488 and they have been approved by the Commission, then their candidates who pass the TPA will meet both the TPA and reading instructional competence requirements. *Note: a final list of institutions requesting a waiver on behalf of their candidates participating in the pilot study will be provided as an agenda item at the October 2023 Commission meeting.*
3. Approve waiver requests from selected institutions to waive the requirement for the reading instruction competence assessment requirement for their low incidence Education Specialist candidates (DHH, ECSE, and VI) who successfully complete the LPA and meet the pilot expected performance level set by the Commission. (TPA is not required for these candidates until July 1, 2025).
4. Require candidates to pass the LPA with a minimum score of 14 across the 8 proposed rubrics. Candidates who do not pass the LPA would need to take and pass the current RICA and the current TPA model adopted by their program.

Next Steps

If the Commission adopts proposed criteria, approves the waiver requests from institutions participating in the pilot study of the Literacy Performance Assessment, approves that candidates participating can seek a waiver for both the RICA and the CalTPA Cycle 2 requirements (as appropriate), approves that low-incidence candidates participating can seek a waiver for the RICA requirement, and adopts the proposed performance level, then staff and ES will work with the institutions to select candidates for the pilot, conduct an orientation with participating programs and candidates in fall 2023, and initiate the pilot of *the Literacy Performance* in January-April, 2024. The final list of candidates participating in the Pilot will be provided to the Commission for approval at a future meeting.

Appendix A
Literacy Performance Assessment Design Team

Multiple Subject/Single Subject	
Amy K Conley	Literacy Lecturer, California Polytechnic University Humboldt, Literacy Consultant, Humboldt County Office of Education
Miyuki Manzanedo ⁺	Teacher, Marguerite Montgomery Elementary, Davis Joint Unified School District
Marissa Luna Lopez	Coordinator, Multiple Subject and Education Specialist Intern Credentialing, Merced County Office of Education
Michelle Soltis ⁺	Teacher, San Diego Unified School District, Miramar Ranch Elementary
Molly Sutherland ^{**}	Teacher, San Juan Unified School District, Lichen School
Tawna Turner ⁺	Literacy Teacher, Aspire Alexander Twilight College Prep Academy
Education Specialist	
Lauren Collins [*]	Associate Professor, San Diego State University
Cathy Creasia	Director of Accreditation and Credentialing, University of Southern California Rossier School of Education
Laura Rhinehart [*]	Assistant Researcher, Center for Dyslexia, Diverse Learners, and Social Justice at University of California, Los Angeles
Priya Tjerandsen ^{**}	Teacher and Head Learning Specialist, North Bridge Academy
PK-3 Early Childhood Education	
Oona Fontanella-Nothom	Assistant Professor, Early Childhood Studies, California State University, Los Angeles
Sandra Frisby	Associate Director, Faculty Early Childhood Development, Fresno Pacific University
Isabella Gutierrez	Director of Child Development Centers, West Hills Community College District
Cindy Li ⁺	Core Faculty, School of Human Development and Education, Pacific Oaks College
EL/Bilingual	
George Ellis	Regional Director, California Reading and Literature Project, University of California, Berkeley
Martha Hernandez	Executive Director, Californians Together
Annie Song ⁺	Teacher, Alhambra Unified School District, Instructor, Los Angeles County Office of Education
Pamela Spycher	Senior Research Associate, WestEd
Education Specialist- Low Incidence	
Janelle Green	Principal, Early Childhood, California School for the Deaf, Riverside
Cheryl Kamei Hannan	Professor, California State University, Los Angeles
Nicoli Ueda ^{**}	Teacher, Teacher Advisor, Induction Credentialing and Added Authorization Programs, Los Angeles Unified School District
Liaisons	
Nancy Brynelson	Statewide Literacy Co-Director, California Department of Education
Bonnie Garcia	Statewide Literacy Co-Director, California Department of Education

*Indicates dyslexia expertise and +indicates classroom teachers with recent experience in teaching reading in the early elementary grades

Appendix B

Revised CalTPA as aligned to the California Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards (Adopted June 2023)

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
Assessment Design Standard 1: Assessment Designed for Validity and Fairness	
<p>The sponsor* of a teaching performance assessment seeking approval for use in California (model sponsor) designs a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) in which complex pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring scales are linked to and assess California’s Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The model sponsor clearly describes the uses for which the assessment has been validated (i.e., to serve as a determination of a candidate’s status with respect to the TPEs and to provide an indication of preparation program quality and effectiveness), anticipates its potential misuses, and identifies appropriate uses consistent with the assessment’s validation process. The model sponsor maximizes the fairness of the assessment design for all groups of candidates in the program. A passing standard is recommended by the model sponsor based on a standard setting study where educators have made a professional judgment about an appropriate performance standard for beginning teachers to meet prior to licensure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the recommendation of the Commission’s TPA Literacy Design Team, a subject-specific instructional cycle based on the pedagogical sequence of plan, teach/assess, reflect, and apply that directly addresses the TPEs including TPE Domain 7 • Multiple, 5-point rubrics supporting the assessment of the TPEs including TPE Domain 7 • Analytic performance information provided to candidates, EPPs, and the CTC • Formal review by the Commission’s Bias Review Committee of all assessment materials • 2024 pilot and 2025 field test with a diverse representation of educator preparation programs (EPPs) and candidates • Standard Setting will be conducted in spring 2025
<p>1(a) The Teaching Performance Assessment includes complex pedagogical assessment tasks to prompt aspects of candidate performance that measure the TPEs. Each task is substantively related to two or more major domains of the TPEs. For use in judging candidate-generated responses to each pedagogical task, the assessment also includes multi-level scoring rubrics that are clearly related to the TPEs that the task measures. Each task and its associated</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A literacy focused instructional cycle based on the pedagogical sequence of plan, teach/assess, reflect, and apply that directly addresses the TPEs including TPE Domain 7 • Instruction Cycle 2—Assessment-Driven Literacy Instruction: TPEs 1.5, 1.8, 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 3.6, 3.8, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, 5.8, 6.1, 6.3, 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9, 7.10, 7.11

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
<p>rubrics measure two or more TPEs. Collectively, the tasks and rubrics in the assessment address key aspects of all major domains of the TPEs. The sponsor of the performance assessment documents the relationships between TPEs, tasks, and rubrics.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each 5-point rubric indicates the TPEs addressed
<p>1(b) 1. The multiple subject general education TPA model sponsor must include in its performance assessment 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 literacy in a manner aligned to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code sec. 44259; the Commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs); and the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the State Board as well as the content areas authorized by the credential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An instructional cycle completed within the context of the candidate’s student teaching assignment focused on literacy (C1 will be focused on Mathematics)
<p>C1(b) 2. The single subject general education TPA model sponsor must include in its performance assessment 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional cycles completed within the context of the candidate’s subject-specific student teaching assignment • Content Expert Panel reviews of Cycle 2 content and rubrics before and after the pilot (16 single subject panels)
<p>1(b) 3. The education specialist TPA model sponsor must include in its performance assessment 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. It must also assess the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An instructional cycle completed within the context of the candidate’s student teaching assignment focused on literacy and IEPs (C1 will be focused on Mathematics) • Content Expert Panel reviews of Cycle 2 content and rubrics before and after the pilot (MMSN, ESN, DHH, VI, and ECSE)

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
<p>candidate’s ability to effectively teach literacy in a manner aligned to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code section 44259; the Commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs); and the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the State Board, as well the content areas authorized by the credential.</p>	
<p>1(b) 4. The PK-3 TPA model sponsor must include a focus on developmentally appropriate pedagogy within the design of the TPA tasks and scoring scales to assess the candidate’s ability to effectively teach literacy in a manner aligned to the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (4) of subdivision (b) of Education Code section 44259; the Commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness and current Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs); and the current English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework adopted by the State Board, as well as the content areas authorized by the credential.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developmentally appropriate instructional cycles completed within the context of the candidate’s PK-3 student teaching assignment (C1 in Mathematics and C2 in Literacy)
<p>1(c) Consistent with the language of the TPEs, the model sponsor defines scoring rubrics so candidates for credentials can earn acceptable scores on the Teaching Performance Assessment with the use of different literacy and content-specific pedagogical practices that support implementation of the state-adopted content standards, curriculum frameworks, and Preschool Learning Foundations. The model</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developmentally appropriate pedagogy for inclusion in rubrics identified by the Literacy Design Team • Assessment (cycle, rubrics) and system (e.g., submission and scoring platforms) structured to allow for a variety of response options • Assessor Qualifications stipulate that expertise in foundational reading, and

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
<p>sponsor takes steps to plan and anticipate the appropriate scoring of candidates who use a wide range of pedagogical practices that are educationally effective and builds scoring protocols to take these variations into account.</p>	<p>cross-cutting themes of the ELD/ELA Standards, and the California Preschool Learning Foundations to be evaluated is required by one or more of the following ways (draft for pilot):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current (or retired within 3 years) California education professional in one or more of the following capacities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ University/program educator providing instruction to TK-12 teacher candidates within a CTC-accredited teacher preparation program ▪ Field supervisor ▪ Mentor or master teacher ▪ PK-12 teacher ▪ PK-12 administrator • Have expertise in one or more of the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hold a valid California Clear Multiple Subject, Education Specialist, or PK3 Teaching Credential, or added authorization, in literacy ▪ Have university teaching experience in literacy ▪ Hold a degree or graduate certificate in literacy ▪ Reading or literacy researcher with relevant recent teaching experience ▪ National Board-Certified Teacher (NBCT) ▪ Reading literacy or reading leadership specialist credential/authorization • Adhere to confidentiality requirements • Reside in the state of California

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle and program specific assessor training (literacy as per SB 488), calibration, and scoring designed to address a variety of response options including training on implicit bias
<p>1(d) 1. For Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and PK-3 candidates, the model sponsor must include within the design of the TPA candidate tasks a focus on addressing the teaching of English learners, all underserved education groups or groups that need to be served differently, and students with disabilities in the general education classroom to adequately assess the candidate’s ability to effectively teach all students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Learning Segment that requires classroom context and student characteristics, including numbers of English learners and students with IEPs, 504 Plans, or identified for GATE; description of English language proficiency levels; description of social-emotional learning strengths and needs; and description of funds of knowledge¹, learning and behavioral characteristics, disabilities, dyslexia, intellectual or academic advancement, ethnicity, race, socioeconomic status, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, language, religion, and/or geographic origin, as well as students whose first language is English, English learners, and reclassified English learners.
<p>1(d) 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each step of Instructional Cycle 2 is related to a whole class and a small group of students which may include: a student with identified special need with an IEP/504 Plan or GATE identified, an English learner with an IEP, and a student from an underserved education group or a group that needs to be served differently
<p>1(e) For Multiple Subject, PK-3, and Education Specialist candidates, the model sponsor must include assessments of the candidate’s ability to demonstrate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple Subject, Ends’, and PK-3 candidates will address literacy in a series of three to five lessons and assessments based on the ELA/ELD Standards, and the

¹ Funds of knowledge are defined as "The historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being" (Moll et al., 2001).

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
<p>pedagogical competence related to teaching current, state-adopted core content areas of at least Literacy and Mathematics. Programs use local program performance assessments for History/Social Science and Science if not already included as part of the TPA.</p>	<p>California Preschool Learning Foundations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mathematics content will be addressed in Cycle 1
<p>1(f) The model sponsor must include a teaching performance within the TPA during the required clinical experience, including a video of the candidate’s teaching performance with candidate commentary describing the lesson plan and rationale for teaching decisions shown and evidence of the effect of that teaching on student learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During Cycle 2 evidence is required at each step (plan, teach/assess, reflect, and apply) to describe and explain the instructional decisions made and their effectiveness on student learning • Instruction Cycle 2: a minimum of six annotated video clips
<p>1(g) The TPA model sponsor must provide materials appropriate for use by programs in helping faculty become familiar with the design of the TPA model, the candidate tasks, and the scoring rubrics so that faculty can effectively assist candidates to prepare for the assessment. The TPA model sponsor must also provide candidate materials to assist candidates in understanding the nature of the assessment, the specific assessment tasks, the scoring rubrics, submission processes and scoring processes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face-to-face and online presentations and workshops for EPPs and other stakeholders • Websites: Pilot/field test and operational program sites • CalTPA pilot assessment guides for EPPs and candidates • CalTPA field test assessment guides for EPPs and candidates • CalTPA Program guides for EPPs and candidates
<p>1(h) The model sponsor develops scoring rubrics and assessor training procedures that focus primarily on teaching performance and that minimize the effects of candidate factors that are not clearly related to pedagogical competence, which may include any actual or perceived characteristic protected by AB 537, which includes sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, ethnic group identification, race, ancestry, national origin, religion, color, or mental or physical disability or any other bias that is not likely to affect job</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bias prevention addressed in training, calibration, and ongoing scoring during pilot, field test, and operation administration • Candidate personal information is protected via encrypted file transmissions • Performance scoring data monitored on an ongoing basis for issues of potential bias • Assessors are required to recuse themselves from the evaluation of

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
effectiveness and/or student learning, such as appearance, hairstyles and/or hair texture, demeanor, speech patterns and accents, or personal attire.	submissions by candidates for whom they are faculty supervisors
<p>1(i) 1. The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor’s clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for Multiple Subject, PK-3, and Education Specialist candidates, preparation programs, public schools, and public school students within the authorization of the credential. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the literacy and content-specific pedagogical competence of candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended uses and anticipated, possible misuses reflect the results of the TPE validation study • Validity evidence in support of the program collected at all stages of development and into operational administration
<p>1(i) 2. The model sponsor provides a clear statement acknowledging the intended uses of the assessment. The statement demonstrates the model sponsor’s clear understanding of the implications of the assessment for single subject candidates, preparation programs, public schools, and public school students within the authorization of the credential. The statement includes appropriate cautions about additional or alternative uses for which the assessment is not valid. All elements of assessment design and development are consistent with the intended uses of the assessment for determining the content-specific pedagogical competence of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intended uses and anticipated, possible misuses reflect the results of the TPE validation study • Validity evidence in support of the program collected at all stages of development and into operational administration

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
<p>candidates for Preliminary Teaching Credentials in California and as information useful for determining program quality and effectiveness.</p>	
<p>1(j) The model sponsor completes content review and editing procedures to ensure that literacy and content-specific pedagogical assessment tasks and directions to candidates are culturally and linguistically responsive, sustaining, fair and appropriate for candidates from diverse backgrounds.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal review by the Commission’s Bias Review Committee of all assessment materials • Elimination of potential bias responsibility of all review teams and program personnel • Results of pilot and field test target potential equity issues and are used to revise the assessment to eliminate potential equity issues
<p>1(k) The model sponsor completes initial and periodic basic psychometric analyses to identify pedagogical assessment tasks and/or scoring rubrics that results in differential effects in relation to candidates’ race, ethnicity, language, gender or disability. When group pass rate differences are found, the model sponsor investigates the potential sources of differential performance and seeks to eliminate construct-irrelevant sources of variance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistical analyses and review of the psychometric qualities of the cycle and rubrics during the pilot, field test, and on an ongoing basis through operational administration, including specifically for subgroup performance differences • Results of statistical analyses and psychometric reviews used to identify and eliminate issues of potential bias
<p>1(l) In designing assessment administration procedures, the model sponsor includes administrative accommodations that preserve assessment validity while addressing issues of access for candidates with disabilities or learning needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (PL 101-336), candidates request accommodations during registration, and alternative arrangements are provided on a case-by-case basis to address the individual need(s) while maintaining the validity of the assessment results.
<p>1(m) In the course of determining a passing standard, the model sponsor secures and reflects on the considered judgments of teachers, supervisors of teachers, support providers of new teachers, and other preparers of teachers regarding necessary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empanel a diverse group of California educators for a legally defensible Standard-Setting study to be conducted in Spring 2025 • Viability of passing standards analyzed throughout ongoing operational

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
<p>and acceptable levels of proficiency on the part of entry-level teachers. The model sponsor periodically reviews the reasonableness of the scoring scales and established passing standard, when and as directed by the Commission.</p>	<p>administration</p>
<p>1(n) To preserve the validity and fairness of the assessment over time, the model sponsor may need to develop and field test new literacy and content-specific pedagogical assessment tasks and multi-level scoring rubrics to replace or strengthen prior ones. Initially and periodically, the model sponsor analyzes the assessment tasks and scoring rubrics to ensure that they yield important evidence that represents candidate knowledge and skill related to the TPEs and serve as a basis for determining entry-level pedagogical competence to teach the curriculum and student population of California’s public schools. The model sponsor documents the basis and results of each analysis, and modifies the tasks and rubrics as needed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistical analyses and review of the psychometric qualities of the cycle and rubrics on an ongoing basis through operational administration • Results of statistical analyses and psychometric reviews used to identify potential revisions to assessment, as determined with Commission’s TPA Program Director
<p>1(o) The model sponsor must make all TPA materials available to the Commission upon request for review and approval, including materials that are proprietary to the model sponsor. The Commission will maintain the confidentiality of all materials designated as proprietary by the model sponsor.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the case of the CalTPA, the CTC is the model sponsor and has access to all program-related materials at all times.
<p>1(p) For concurrent bilingual candidates, no candidate can be required to translate student work or provide English transcriptions for the video component(s) of the TPA if in a language other than English. Model sponsors must ensure candidates may demonstrate their knowledge and skills teaching literacy in the language of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per the current approved CalTPA policy

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per the current approved CalTPA policy
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the recommendation of the Commission’s TPA Literacy Design Team, multiple forms of evidence are required across the pedagogical sequence of plan, teach/assess, reflect, and apply • Validity evidence in support of the program collected at all stages of development and into operational administration • Centralized, statewide scoring based on standardized scoring materials and procedures and a pool of qualified literacy assessors from across the state who meet CTC requirements for training, calibration, and ongoing operational scoring • Local scoring option available to EPPs based on same standards as used with centralized, statewide scoring
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 qualifications for a Preliminary Teaching Credential as one part of the requirements for the credential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple forms of evidence required across steps • Instruction Cycle 2: written lesson plan context, lesson/assessment sequence template, annotated video-recorded instruction (minimum of 6 clips), copies of assessment and rubrics, three scored

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
	<p>student work samples with feedback, written analysis of assessment, written reflective summary, video-recorded follow-up activity, written explanation of follow-up activity</p>
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pilot of cycle and rubrics scheduled for Jan – April 2024 • Field test of entire assessment (cycle, rubrics) and program infrastructure (registration, submission, scoring, score reporting) scheduled for Spring 2025
<p>2(c) The Teaching Performance Assessment system includes a comprehensive process to select and train California educators as assessors who score candidate responses to the pedagogical assessment tasks. An assessor training program demonstrates convincingly that prospective and continuing assessors gain a deep understanding of implicit bias as it relates to scoring, the TPEs, the pedagogical assessment tasks and the multi-level scoring rubrics. The training program includes task-based scoring trials in which an assessment trainer evaluates and certifies each assessor’s scoring accuracy and calibration in relation to the scoring rubrics associated with the task. The model sponsor for multiple subject, PK-3, and education specialist TPAs establish selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited to appropriate literacy and pedagogical expertise in the content areas and TPE domains assessed within the TPA. The model sponsor for the single subject TPA establishes selection criteria for assessors of candidate responses to the TPA. The selection criteria include but are not limited</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessor application, screening, and selection based on CTC-approved qualifications • Online and in-person professional development for faculty, program coordinators, and assessors during pilot, field test, and operational administration • Summative assessment based on actual cycle and rubrics passed by each assessor and trainer, confirming knowledge and understanding of the TPEs, cycle, and rubrics prior to operational scoring • Complete implicit bias training • Complete training for literacy instruction per SB 488

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
<p>to appropriate pedagogical expertise in the content areas and TPE domains assessed within the TPA. The model sponsor selects assessors who meet the established selection criteria and uses only assessors who successfully calibrate during the required TPA model assessor training sequence. When new pedagogical tasks and scoring rubrics are incorporated into the assessment, the model sponsor provides additional training to the assessors, as needed.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ongoing “read-behinds” by scoring leads • Ongoing, timely monitoring of assigned scores, with prompt feedback to assessors based on scoring performance statistics • Full complement of online reliability, frequency distribution, and production reports at the assessment and individual assessor level
<p>2(e) The model sponsor provides a consistent scoring process for all programs using that model, including programs using a local scoring option provided by the model sponsor. The scoring process conducted by the model sponsor to assure the reliability and validity of candidate outcomes on the assessment may include, for example, regular auditing, selective back reading, and double scoring of candidate responses near the cut score by the qualified, calibrated scorers trained by the model sponsor. All approved models must include a local scoring option in which the assessors of candidate responses are California program faculty and/or other individuals identified by the program who meet the model sponsor’s assessor selection criteria. These local California assessors are</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTC-approved assessor and trainer qualifications • Real-time monitoring of inter-rater reliability and scoring processes during pilot, field test, and operational administration • Scorer and trainer summative assessment before scoring and embedded calibration scoring • Automatic and real-time assessor performance statistics • Same standards and processes for centralized, statewide scoring and local scoring • Routine auditing of scoring processes

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
<p>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.</p>	
<p>2(f) The model sponsor's assessment design includes a clear and easy to implement appeal procedure for candidates who do not pass the assessment, including an equitable process for rescoring of evidence already submitted by an appellant candidate in the program, if the program is using centralized scoring provided by the model sponsor. If the program is implementing a local scoring option, the program must provide an appeal process as described above for candidates who do not pass the assessment. Model sponsors must document that all candidate appeals granted a second scoring are scored</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeal process, providing an opportunity for candidates to formally address any concerns or objections arising from established program policies or the implementation of those policies • Rescore based on appeal conducted by assessor unfamiliar with submission

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
by a new assessor unfamiliar with the candidate or the candidate’s response.	
<p>2(g) The model sponsor conducting scoring for the program provides results on the TPA to the individual candidate based on performance relative to TPE domains and/or to the specific scoring rubrics within a maximum of three weeks following candidate submission of completed TPA responses. The model sponsor provides results to programs based on both individual and aggregated data relating to candidate performance relative to the rubrics and/or domains of the TPEs. The model sponsor also follows the timelines established with programs using a local scoring option for providing scoring results.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate score reports designed with Commission’s TPA Literacy Design Team • Results reports to candidates, EPPs, and the Commission within three weeks of the submission deadlines
<p>2(h) The model sponsor provides program level aggregate results to the Commission, in a manner, format and time frame specified by the Commission, as one means of assessing program quality. It is expected that these results will be used within the Commission’s ongoing accreditation system.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program-level, aggregate results to the Commission (format determined with the Commission’s TPA Program Director)
Assessment Design Standard 3: TPA Model Sponsor Support Responsibilities	
<p>The sponsor of the performance assessment provides technical support to teacher preparation programs using that model concerning fidelity of implementation of the model as designed. The model sponsor is responsible for conducting and/or moderating scoring for all programs, as applicable, within a national scorer approach and/or the local scoring option. The model sponsor has ongoing responsibilities to interact with the Commission, to provide candidate and program outcomes data as requested and specified by the Commission,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance to EPPs as defined with Commission’s TPA Literacy Design Team • Centralized, statewide scoring and local scoring managed by the CalTPA program • All program data available to the CTC

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
and to maintain the currency of the model overtime.	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance defined with Commission’s TPA Literacy Design Team, including online guides for candidates and EPPs
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results reports to EPPs within three weeks of the submission deadlines • Centralized, statewide scoring and local scoring managed by the CalTPA program
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual report parameters determined in collaboration with the Commission’s TPA Program Director
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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of and actions taken to maintain currency of assessment determined with Commission’s TPA Program Director

Performance Assessment Design Standard	How Addressed by the LPA
frameworks, as well as Commission adopted teacher preparation standards and TPEs.	
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retake policies determined in collaboration with Commission’s TPA Literacy Design Team and Program Director

* 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.

Appendix C
Literacy Performance Assessment
Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) Map

Teaching Performance Expectations Assessed on LPA

TPE 1: Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning	Addressed in LPA
1. Apply knowledge of students, including their prior experiences, interests, and social-emotional learning needs, as well as their funds of knowledge and cultural, language, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to engage them in learning.	Yes
2. Maintain ongoing communication with students and families, including the use of technology to communicate with and support students and families, and to communicate achievement expectations and student progress.	No
3. Connect subject matter to real-life contexts and provide active learning experiences to engage student interest, support student motivation, and allow students to extend their learning.	No
4. Use a variety of developmentally and ability-appropriate instructional strategies, resources, and assistive technology, including principles of Universal Design of Learning (UDL) and Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) to support access to the curriculum for a wide range of learners within the general education classroom and environment.	Yes
5. Promote students' critical and creative thinking and analysis through activities that provide opportunities for inquiry, problem solving, responding to and framing meaningful questions, and reflection.	Yes
6. Provide a supportive learning environment for students' first and/or second language acquisition by using research-based instructional approaches, including focused English Language Development, Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), scaffolding across content areas, and structured English immersion, and demonstrate an understanding of the difference among students whose only instructional need is to acquire Standard English proficiency, students who may have an identified disability affecting their ability to acquire Standard English proficiency, and students who may have both a need to acquire Standard English proficiency and an identified disability.	No
7. Provide students with opportunities to access the curriculum by incorporating the visual and performing arts, as appropriate to the content and context of learning.	No
8. Monitor student learning and adjust instruction while teaching so that students continue to be actively engaged in learning.	Yes
TPE 2: Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning	Addressed in LPA
1. Promote students' social-emotional growth, development, and individual responsibility using positive interventions and supports, restorative justice, and conflict resolution practices to foster a caring	No

community where each student is treated fairly and respectfully by adults and peers.	
2. Create learning environments (i.e., traditional, blended, and online) that promote productive student learning, encourage positive interactions among students, reflect diversity and multiple perspectives, and are culturally responsive.	No
3. Establish, maintain, and monitor inclusive learning environments that are physically, mentally, intellectually, and emotionally healthy and safe to enable all students to learn, and recognize and appropriately address instances of intolerance and harassment among students, such as bullying, racism, and sexism.	No
4. Know how to access resources to support students, including those who have experienced trauma, homelessness, foster care, incarceration, and/or are medically fragile.	No
5. Maintain high expectations for learning with appropriate support for the full range of students in the classroom.	No
6. Establish and maintain clear expectations for positive classroom behavior and for student-to-student and student-to-teacher interactions by communicating classroom routines, procedures, and norms to students and families.	No
TPE 3: Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning	Addressed in LPA
1. Demonstrate knowledge of subject matter, including the adopted California State Standards and curriculum frameworks.	Yes
2. Use knowledge about students and learning goals to organize the curriculum to facilitate student understanding of subject matter and make accommodations and/or modifications as needed to promote student access to the curriculum.	Yes
3. Plan, design, implement, and monitor instruction consistent with current subject-specific pedagogy in the content area(s) of instruction, and design and implement disciplinary and cross-disciplinary learning sequences, including integrating the visual and performing arts as applicable to the discipline.	Yes
4. Individually and through consultation and collaboration with other educators and members of the larger school community, plan for effective subject matter instruction and use multiple means of representing, expressing, and engaging students to demonstrate their knowledge.	No
5. Adapt subject matter curriculum, organization, and planning to support the acquisition and use of academic language within learning activities to promote the subject matter knowledge of all students, including the full range of English learners, Standard English learners, students with disabilities, and students with other learning needs in the least restrictive environment.	Yes

6. Use and adapt resources, standards-aligned instructional materials, and a range of technology, including assistive technology, to facilitate students' equitable access to the curriculum.	Yes
7. Model and develop digital literacy by using technology to engage students and support their learning, and promote digital citizenship, including respecting copyright law, understanding fair use guidelines and the use of Creative Commons license, and maintaining Internet security.	No
8. Demonstrate knowledge of effective teaching strategies aligned with the internationally recognized educational technology standards.	Yes
TPE 4: Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students	Addressed in LPA
1. Locate and apply information about students' current academic status, content- and standards-related learning needs and goals, assessment data, language proficiency status, and cultural background for both short-term and long-term instructional planning purposes.	No
2. Understand and apply knowledge of the range and characteristics of typical and atypical child development from birth through adolescence to help inform instructional planning and learning experiences for all students.	No
3. Design and implement instruction and assessment that reflects the interconnectedness of academic content areas and related student skills development in literacy, mathematics, science, and other disciplines across the curriculum, as applicable to the subject area of instruction.	Yes
4. Plan, design, implement and monitor instruction, making effective use of instructional time to maximize learning opportunities and provide access to the curriculum for all students by removing barriers and providing access through instructional strategies that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appropriate use of instructional technology, including assistive technology; • applying principles of UDL and MTSS; • use of developmentally, linguistically, and culturally appropriate learning activities, instructional materials, and resources for all students, including the full range of English learners; • appropriate modifications for students with disabilities in the general education classroom; • opportunities for students to support each other in learning; and • use of community resources and services as applicable. 	Yes
5. Promote student success by providing opportunities for students to understand and advocate for strategies that meet their individual learning needs and assist students with specific learning needs to successfully participate in transition plans (e.g., IEP, IFSP, ITP, and 504 plans).	No
6. Access resources for planning and instruction, including the expertise of community and school colleagues through in-person or virtual collaboration, co-teaching, coaching, and/or networking.	No

7. Plan instruction that promotes a range of communication strategies and activity modes between teacher and student and among students that encourage student participation in learning.	Yes
8. Use digital tools and learning technologies across learning environments as appropriate to create new content and provide personalized and integrated technology-rich lessons to engage students in learning, promote digital literacy, and offer students multiple means to demonstrate their learning.	Yes
TPE 5: Assessing Student Learning	Addressed in LPA
1. Apply knowledge of the purposes, characteristics, and appropriate uses of different types of assessments (e.g., diagnostic, informal, formal, progress-monitoring, formative, summative, and performance) to design and administer classroom assessments, including use of scoring rubrics.	Yes
2. Collect and analyze assessment data from multiple measures and sources to plan and modify instruction and document students' learning over time.	Yes
3. Involve all students in self-assessment and reflection on their learning goals and progress and provide students with opportunities to revise or reframe their work based on assessment feedback.	Yes
4. Use technology as appropriate to support assessment administration, conduct data analysis, and communicate learning outcomes to students and families.	No
5. Use assessment information in a timely manner to assist students and families in understanding student progress in meeting learning goals.	Yes
6. Work with specialists to interpret assessment results from formative and summative assessments to distinguish between students whose first language is English, English learners, Standard English learners, and students with language or other disabilities.	No
7. Interpret English learners' assessment data to identify their level of academic proficiency in English as well as in their primary language, as applicable, and use this information in planning instruction.	No
8. Use assessment data, including information from students' IEP, IFSP, ITP, and 504 plans, to establish learning goals and to plan, differentiate, make accommodations and/or modify instruction.	Yes
TPE 6: Developing as a Professional Educator	Addressed in LPA
1. Reflect on their own teaching practice and level of subject matter and pedagogical knowledge to plan and implement instruction that can improve student learning.	Yes
2. Recognize their own values and implicit and explicit biases, the ways in which these values and implicit and explicit biases may positively and negatively affect teaching and learning, and work to mitigate any negative impact on the teaching and learning of students. They exhibit positive dispositions of caring, support, acceptance, and fairness toward all students and families, as well as toward their colleagues.	No

<p>3. Establish professional learning goals and make progress to improve their practice by routinely engaging in communication and inquiry with colleagues.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>4. Demonstrate how and when to involve other adults and to communicate effectively with peers and colleagues, families, and members of the larger school community to support teacher and student learning.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>5. Demonstrate professional responsibility for all aspects of student learning and classroom management, including responsibility for the learning outcomes of all students, along with appropriate concerns and policies regarding the privacy, health, and safety of students and families. Beginning teachers conduct themselves with integrity and model ethical conduct for themselves and others.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6. Understand and enact professional roles and responsibilities as mandated reporters and comply with all laws concerning professional responsibilities, professional conduct, and moral fitness, including the responsible use of social media and other digital platforms and tools.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>7. Critically analyze how the context, structure, and history of public education in California affects and influences state, district, and school governance as well as state and local education finance.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>TPE Domain 7: Effective Literacy Instruction for All Students</p>	<p>Addressed in LPA</p>
<p>1. Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction (and integrated content and literacy instruction) grounded in an understanding of applicable literacy-related academic standards and the themes of the California English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework (Foundational Skills, Meaning Making, Language Development, Effective Expression, and Content Knowledge) and their integration.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>2. Plan and implement evidence-based literacy instruction (and integrated content and literacy instruction) grounded in an understanding of Universal Design for Learning; California’s Multi-Tiered System of Support (Tier 1–Best first instruction, Tier 2–Targeted, supplemental instruction, and Tier 3–Referrals for intensive intervention); and the California Dyslexia Guidelines, including the definition and characteristics of dyslexia and structured literacy (i.e., instruction for students at risk for and with dyslexia that is comprehensive, systematic, explicit, cumulative, and multimodal and that includes phonology, orthography, phonics, morphology, syntax, and semantics).</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>3. Incorporate asset-based pedagogies, inclusive approaches, and culturally and linguistically affirming and sustaining practices in literacy instruction (and in integrated content and literacy instruction), recognizing and incorporating the diversity of students’ cultures, languages, dialects, and home communities. Promote students’ literacy development in languages other than English in multilingual (dual language and bilingual education) programs.</p>	<p>No</p>

<p>4. Provide literacy instruction (and integrated content and literacy instruction) for all students that is active, motivating, and engaging; responsive to students’ age, language and literacy development, and literacy goals; reflective of family engagement, social and emotional learning, and trauma-informed practices; and based on students’ assessed learning strengths and needs, analysis of instructional materials and tasks, and identified academic standards.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>
<p>5. Foundational Skills. Multiple Subject Candidates: Develop students’ skills in print concepts, including letters of the alphabet; phonological awareness, including phonemic awareness; phonics, spelling, and word recognition, including letter-sound, spelling-sound, and sound-symbol correspondences; decoding and encoding; morphological awareness; and text reading fluency, including accuracy, prosody (expression), and rate (as an indicator of automaticity), through instruction that is structured and organized as well as direct, systematic, and explicit and that includes practice in connected, decodable text. Multiple Subject and Single Subject English Candidates: Provide instruction in text reading fluency that emphasizes spelling and syllable patterns, semantics, morphology, and syntax. Multiple Subject and Single Subject Candidates: Advance students’ progress in the elements of foundational skills, language, and cognitive skills that support them as they read and write increasingly complex disciplinary texts with comprehension and effective expression.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Partial and based on Candidate choice</p>
<p>6. Meaning Making. Engage students in meaning making by building on prior knowledge and using complex literary and informational texts (print, digital, and oral), questioning, and discussion to develop students’ literal and inferential comprehension, including the higher-order cognitive skills of reasoning, perspective taking, and critical reading, writing, listening, and speaking across the disciplines. Engage students in reading, listening, speaking, writing, and viewing closely to draw evidence from texts, ask and answer questions, and support analysis, reflection, and research.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Partial and based on Candidate Choice</p>
<p>7. Language Development. Promote students’ oral and written language development by attending to vocabulary knowledge and use, grammatical structures (e.g., syntax), and discourse-level understandings as students read, listen, speak, and write with comprehension and effective expression. Create environments that foster students’ oral and written language development, including discipline-specific academic language. Enhance language development by engaging students in the creation of diverse print, oral, digital, and multimedia texts. Conduct instruction that leverages students’ existing linguistic repertoires, including home languages and dialects, and that accepts and encourages translanguaging.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Partial and based on Candidate Choice</p>
<p>8. Effective Expression. Develop students’ effective expression as they write, discuss, present, and use language conventions. Engage students in a range of frequent formal and informal collaborative discussions, including extended conversations, and writing for varied purposes, audiences, and contexts. Teach students to plan, develop, provide</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Partial and based on Candidate Choice</p>

<p>feedback to peers, revise using peer and teacher feedback, edit, and produce their own writing and oral presentations in various genres, drawing on the modes of opinion/argumentation, information, and narration. Develop students' use of keyboarding, technology, and multimedia, as appropriate, and fluency in spelling, handwriting, and other language conventions to support writing and presentations. Teach young children letter formation/printing and related language conventions, such as capitalization and punctuation, in conjunction with applicable decoding skills.</p>	
<p>9. Content Knowledge. Promote students' content knowledge by engaging students in literacy instruction, in all pertinent content areas, that integrates reading, writing, listening, and speaking in discipline-specific ways, including through printed and digital texts and multimedia, discussions, experimentation, hands-on explorations, and wide and independent reading. Teach students to navigate increasingly complex literary and informational texts relevant to the discipline, research questions of interest, and convey knowledge in a variety of ways. Promote digital literacy and the use of educational technology, including the ability to find, evaluate, use, share, analyze, create, and communicate digital resources safely and responsibly, and foster digital citizenship.</p>	<p>Partial and based on Candidate Choice</p>
<p>10. Multiple Subject and Single Subject English Candidates: Monitor students' progress in literacy development using formative assessment practices, ongoing progress monitoring, and diagnostic techniques that inform instructional decision making. Understand how to use screening to determine students' literacy profiles and identify potential reading and writing difficulties, including students' risk for dyslexia and other literacy-related disabilities. Understand how to appropriately assess and interpret results for English learner students. If indicated, collaborate with families and guardians as well as with teachers, specialists, other professionals, and administrators from the school or district to facilitate comprehensive assessment for disabilities in English and as appropriate in the home language; plan and provide supplemental instruction in inclusive settings; and initiate referrals for students who need more intensive support.</p>	<p>Partial</p>
<p>11. Multiple Subject and Single Subject Candidates: Provide instruction in English language development (ELD) for students identified as English learner students based on an understanding of comprehensive ELD, which includes both integrated and designated ELD and is part of Tier 1 instruction. Understand how integrated and designated ELD are related and how designated ELD is taught in connection with (rather than isolated from) content areas and topics. Use ELA/literacy standards (or other content standards) and ELD standards in tandem to plan instruction that attends to students' literacy profiles, levels of English language proficiency, and prior educational experiences. Provide ELD instruction that builds on students' cultural and linguistic assets and develops students' abilities to use English purposefully, interact in meaningful ways, and understand how English works across the disciplines.</p>	<p>Partial based on Classroom Context</p>

Appendix D

RICA and CalTPA Rubrics

Current RICA [VIDEO ASSESSMENT SCORING SCALE](#)

4	<p>The "4" submission reflects a thorough understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission completely fulfills the purpose of the assessment by responding fully to the given task.</p> <p>The submission provides evidence of a lesson that is based on one or more appropriate instructional objectives, is appropriate in relation to the assessed needs of the students and the instructional setting, and demonstrates an accurate and effective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission provides strong supporting information, explanations, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p>
3	<p>The "3" submission reflects an adequate understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission generally fulfills the purpose of the assessment by responding adequately to the given task.</p> <p>The submission provides evidence of a lesson that is based on one or more generally appropriate instructional objectives, is generally appropriate in relation to the assessed needs of the students and the instructional setting, and demonstrates a generally accurate and reasonably effective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission provides adequate supporting information, explanations, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains</p>
2	<p>The "2" submission reflects a limited understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission partially fulfills the purpose of the assessment by responding in a limited way to the given task.</p> <p>The submission provides evidence of a lesson that is based on one or more partially appropriate instructional objectives, is partially appropriate in relation to the assessed needs of the students and the instructional setting, and demonstrates a limited and generally ineffective application, which may include significant</p>

	<p>inaccuracies, of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission provides limited supporting information, explanations, and rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p>
1	<p>The "1" submission reflects little or no understanding of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission fails to fulfill the purpose of the assessment by responding inadequately to the given task.</p> <p>The submission provides evidence of a lesson that is based on one or more inappropriate instructional objectives, is inappropriate in relation to the assessed needs of the students and the instructional setting, and demonstrates a largely inaccurate and/or ineffective application of the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p> <p>The submission provides little or no supporting information, explanations, or rationales based on the relevant content and pedagogical knowledge from the specified RICA domains.</p>
RNM	Requirements Not Met (i.e., the requirements listed in the RICA Video Performance Assessment Guide were not met).
B	The first 10 minutes of the video are blank.

Rubric 2.2 — Step 1: Plan

Essential Question: How does the candidate plan a learning segment in which assessments and rubrics, instructional strategies, and lessons align and build on one another to provide a progression of learning that develops the students’ concepts and skills to achieve the standards-based learning goal(s)?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate uses assessments and/or rubrics, instructional strategies, and lessons in the learning segment that are misaligned in ways that will hinder student access to learning goal(s).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate presents inaccuracies in lesson content.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate’s sequence of lessons does not provide a progression of learning.</p>	<p>Candidate uses assessments and rubrics, instructional strategies, and learning activities in the learning segment that are partially aligned in ways that could limit student access to learning goal(s).</p> <p>Candidate’s sequence of lessons does not clearly provide a progression of learning and/or it is not apparent how the learning segment will affect the development of students’ age and/or developmentally appropriate higher-order thinking skills (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, transfer) and/or academic language.</p>	<p>Candidate uses assessments, rubrics, instructional strategies, and learning activities in each lesson of the learning segment that are clearly aligned with one another to support the students to meet the standards-based learning goal(s).*</p> <p>Candidate’s sequence of lessons provides a progression of learning that will develop the students’ age and/or developmentally appropriate higher-order thinking skills (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, transfer) and academic language.</p> <p>Candidate’s planned learning</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate’s learning segment plan builds in opportunities that provide multiple access points (different ways to learn content visually, through writing or reading, listening, acting out, verbalizing) to learning content and multiple modes of expression (different ways for the students to show what they know, e.g., through writing, speaking, drawing, performing, digital modes) to demonstrate learning of content.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate’s planned assessments, rubrics, and learning activities are clearly based on evidence-based practices.</p>

	Candidate’s learning activities are not likely to support students’ engagement with the content.	activities are appropriate and likely to support the students’ engagement with the content throughout the learning segment.		
--	--	---	--	--

*You must use California Content Standards and/or Curriculum Frameworks and California English Language Development Standards (CA ELD Standards), if appropriate.

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Element 1; TPE 3, Elements 2, 5; TPE 5, Elements 1, 3
--

Rubric 2.5 — Step 2: Teach and Assess

Essential Question: How does the candidate use informal assessment to monitor and support the students’ deep learning of content (age **and/or** developmentally appropriate higher-order thinking skills) and adjust instruction to meet the needs of learners?

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate does not use informal assessment to monitor student understanding of lesson content.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not adjust their instruction based on informal assessment results.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>There are inaccuracies in presented content.</p>	<p>Candidate’s attempts to use informal assessment lead to an incomplete understanding of students’ content knowledge.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidates’ in-the-moment adjustments focus on the students’ lower-order thinking skills (memorize, duplicate, repeat, define), resulting in a limited view of the students’ deep learning of content.</p>	<p>Candidate uses informal assessment to monitor and support students’ age and/or developmentally appropriate higher-order thinking (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, interpretation, transfer) to meet the learning goal(s).</p> <p>Based on the monitoring of informal assessment results, the candidate responds in the</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate provides adaptations (accommodations and/or modifications) during informal assessments for specific students to meet their unique learning needs and makes targeted adjustments to their instruction.</p> <p>Candidate provides the students multiple ways to demonstrate their learning (e.g., verbal, written, drawing,</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate purposefully uses informal assessments to advance or deepen learning.</p> <p>Candidate administers assessments in a transparent way (e.g., candidate reviews learning goal[s] with students so that they are aware of exactly what they are expected to know and be able to demonstrate).</p>

	<p>OR</p> <p>Candidate makes inadequate and/or inappropriate adjustments to their instruction.</p>	<p>moment by adjusting their instruction to meet the learning needs of students.</p>	<p>diagramming, performing) through a range of informal assessments.</p>	<p>Candidate and students engage in positive dialogue around assessment results that celebrates student progress and supports growth (e.g., candidate notes progress of learning first, then reviews what students have not yet demonstrated).</p>
--	--	--	--	--

TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Elements 1, 8; TPE 3, Element 3; TPE 4, Elements 3, 4; TPE 5, Elements 1, 2