

PART 1. GENERAL INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY ALL PROGRAMS

1.1. Institution Name:

California State University, Los Angeles

1.2. Dean or Director of Teacher Education Name and contact information:

Marcos Pizarro, Dean
mpizarr7@calstatela.edu
Ph: 323-343-4300

1.3. Primary contact(s) for questions and subsequent follow up communications from the Commission regarding the literacy certification process, including contact name, title, email, and phone number. Institutions may list up to 2 individuals. Note: The institution's Dean or Director of Teacher Education will receive all formal communication as well as the named individual(s).

Mitch Fryling, Associate Dean
mitchell.fryling2@calstatela.edu
Ph: 323-343-4303

Jamie Marsh
Associate Professor of Literacy Education
jmarsh4@calstatela.edu

1.4. Credential program type addressed in this document. (i.e., Preliminary Multiple Subject, Education Specialist: Mild Moderate Support Needs).

Preliminary Multiple Subject

1.5. List of all pathways offered by the institution for this credential (e.g. student teaching traditional, intern, residency).

Multiple Subject Student Teaching Traditional
Multiple Subject Intern
Multiple Subject ITEP

1.6. Affirmation by the Dean or Director of Teacher Education of the following statements:

I have read the materials being submitted and authorize their submission for the purposes of certification pursuant to SB 488 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2021).

I understand that what is included in this submission process represents *selected* aspects of the new literacy standard adopted by the Commission. I understand that the information submitted represents the information specifically required for literacy certification as indicated in Education Code section 44259(B) (4)(A) and (B).

I understand that all Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject, Education Specialist, and PK-3 ECE Specialist Instruction Credential programs must be fully aligned with all of the applicable literacy instruction standards and TPEs, not just those required for certification, by July 1, 2024. I further attest that the program and all associated pathways represented in this submission have undergone a full review by our faculty and staff and are, or will be, fully aligned to the new literacy instruction standard by July 1, 2024.

I understand that beginning July 1, 2025, all Preliminary Multiple Subject, Education Specialist, and PK-3 ECE Specialist Instruction credential candidates will be required to take and pass a Commission-approved Literacy Performance Assessment that is embedded in the program pursuant to Education Code 44320.3 and is based on the literacy instruction standard and TPE Domain 7.

PART 2. OVERVIEW OF REQUIRED COURSES FOR LITERACY INSTRUCTION AND PROCESS FOR PROGRAM REVISIONS

Submission Requirements for Part 2

2.1. Provide a table listing all required courses for each pathway offered for this credential type where literacy instruction is the primary coursework focus. Institutions may also list other required courses where literacy instruction is not the primary focus but in which some of the content in Standard 7 and TPE 7 is covered. (Note: Not all of Standard 7 and TPE 7 will be reviewed during the literacy certification process, but this information will be helpful to understand the design of the program with respect to literacy instruction.)

Pathway	List of all required courses where the primary focus is literacy instruction	List of any other required courses where literacy standard 7 and TPE 7 are covered but are not the primary focus of the course
Multiple Subject Student Teaching <i>Traditional</i> Program	EDCI 4010 English Language Development EDEL 4150 Curriculum and Teaching of Reading and Language Arts EDEL 4160 Curriculum and Teaching of Writing/Language Arts	EDCI 4000 Transformative Teaching in Diverse Urban Classrooms EDSP 4000 Foundations of Special Education EDEL 4020 Introduction to Instructional Design, Assessment, and Classroom Management EDEL 4170 Curriculum and Teaching of Elementary Mathematics

		<p>EDEL 4180 Curriculum and Teaching of Elementary Science</p> <p>EDEL 4190 Curriculum and Transformative Teaching of Social Science</p> <p>EDEL 4881: Reflection, Synthesis and Assessment of Directed Teaching</p>
Multiple Subject Student Teaching <i>ITEP</i> Program	<p>EDCI 4010 English Language Development</p> <p>EDEL 4150 Curriculum and Teaching of Reading and Language Arts</p> <p>EDEL 4160 Curriculum and Teaching of Writing/Language Arts</p>	<p>EDCI 4000 Transformative Teaching in Diverse Urban Classrooms</p> <p>EDSP 4000 Foundations of Special Education</p> <p>EDEL 4020 Introduction to Instructional Design, Assessment, and Classroom Management</p> <p>EDEL 4170 Curriculum and Teaching of Elementary Mathematics</p> <p>EDEL 4180 Curriculum and Teaching of Elementary Science</p> <p>EDEL 4190 Curriculum and Transformative Teaching of Social Science</p> <p>EDEL 4881: Reflection, Synthesis and Assessment of Directed Teaching</p>
Multiple Subject <i>Intern</i> Pathway	<p>EDEL 4160 Curriculum and Teaching of Writing/Language Arts</p>	<p>EDCI 4000 Transformative Teaching in Diverse Urban Classrooms</p> <p>EDSP 4000 Foundations of Special Education</p> <p>EDEL 4020 Introduction to Instructional Design, Assessment, and Classroom Management</p>

		<p>EDEL 4170 Curriculum and Teaching of Elementary Mathematics</p> <p>EDEL 4180 Curriculum and Teaching of Elementary Science</p> <p>EDEL 4190 Curriculum and Transformative Teaching of Social Science</p> <p>EDEL 4881: Reflection, Synthesis and Assessment of Directed Teaching</p>
--	--	---

2.2. Briefly describe the process (i.e., committee established, specific faculty review committee work, academic senate approval, etc.) used to review the program to ensure alignment with the new literacy instruction standards and teaching performance expectations. If this process differed by pathway, please describe the process for each pathway. Note who was involved in this effort. Institutions may respond with a table indicating each pathway. The following table provides an example of how this information could be provided.

Pathway	Process used for internal program review to ensure alignment with new literacy standards and TPEs.	Identify staff who engaged in this process and titles (program director, faculty, site-based personnel, etc.)
Multiple Subject Student Teaching Traditional Program	For all of the pathways listed in the first column of this table, the following process was used to review the program to ensure alignment with the new literacy instruction Standard 7 and teaching performance expectations (TPEs). Dr. Jamie Marsh served as the designated literacy representative for the College of Education on the CSU's CAR/W Faculty Council (CAR/W Co-Director Tanya Flushman) throughout the 2022-23 and 2023-24 academic years. In this role, Dr. Marsh participated in all CAR/W Faculty Council meetings (10/14/22, 2/3/23, 4/28/23, 10/6/23, 2/9/24, 4/26/24) where agenda items included Senate Bill 488 Certification, the New Literacy Program Standard 7 and TPEs, and related	Dr. Joan Fingon, Professor Emerita & Multiple Subject Program Coordinator Dr. Jamie Marsh, Associate Professor, New Literacy Standard 7 + TPEs Coordinator, CSU CAR/W Rep
Multiple Subject Intern Pathway		Dr. Anna Chee, Professor, Emerita, Literacy Dr. Kimberly Persiani, Professor
Multiple Subject ITEP		Dr. Socorro Orozco,

	<p>CTC Updates for Teacher Preparation Programs. In addition, Dr. Marsh participated in the CAR/W TPE and Program Standard Alignment Committee (1/25/23, 2/15/23, 10/18/23, 10/30/23, 11/29/23) and contributed to the SB488 Certification Work Group (3/1/24, 3/22/24).</p> <p>Dr. Marsh shared regular updates related to SB488 and the New Literacy Program Standard 7 and 7 TPEs with the following faculty identified to help coordinate this work. In the Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I), this included: Dr. Joan Fingon (MS Program Coordinator, 2023-Present), Dr. Rebecca Joseph (SS Program Coordinator), and Dr. Sharon Ulanoff (C&I Chair). In the Department of Special Education and Counseling, this included: Dr. Anna Osipova, Dr. Cheryl Kamei-Hannan, Dr. Holly Menzies, Dr. Jilly Chang (Chair) and Brenda Naimy.</p> <p>In Spring 2023, with the charge of CAR/W and support Interim Dean Mitch Fryling, the MS and SS programs formed a <i>transition plan</i>, which included the development of literacy TPE work groups for the 2023-24 academic year, for the purpose of supporting MS and SS tenure-track faculty and lecturers to engage in the implementation work needed to make necessary changes to the MS and SS programs to adhere to the new required literacy standard.</p> <p>This <i>transition plan</i> included the following tasks and timeline for the 2023-24:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend state or regional meetings, workshops, trainings, webinars, office hours, etc. to receive technical assistance on the updated literacy program standard and TPE (Ongoing - Aug 2023-May 2024) • Share the CAR/W Literacy Program Standard 7 Alignment Document with Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist faculty and develop work group plan for completion in Spring 2024 (Aug 2023-Oct 2024) • Review and discuss the revised Literacy Standard 7 and 7 TPEs and 	<p>Assistant Professor, Math</p> <p>Dr. Verónica González, Assistant Professor, Bilingual</p> <p>Dr. Lili Zhou, Assistant Professor, Math</p> <p>Dr. Brian Gibbs, Assistant Professor, Social Studies</p> <p>Dr. Paula Arvedson, Professor Emerita, Math/Science</p> <p>Dr. Lia Kami-Stein, Professor, ELD</p> <p>Dr. Paolo Magcalas, Assistant Professor, ULRN</p> <p>Sara Ozuna, ULRN Program Coordinator</p> <p>Abril Trasvina, Lecturer & Staff</p> <p>Dr. Erica Hamilton, Lecturer</p> <p>Vanessa Solomon, Lecturer</p> <p>Aimee Cunningham, Lecturer</p> <p>Aleeta Powers, Lecturer</p> <p>Charlene Fried, Lecturer</p> <p>Melissa West, Lecturer</p> <p>Dr. Iraiz Ynigo, Lecturer</p> <p>Dr. Kellie Albrecht, Lecturer</p> <p>Dr. Layla Al-Aloom, Lecturer</p>
--	---	---

	<p>current recommended readings and resources to support implementation in our courses to be embedded throughout the program (Jan-Mar 2024)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyze the current program course matrix, and syllabi to identify the courses and assignments/activities where the revised literacy TPE elements will be embedded (Jan-Mar 2024) • Collaborate with faculty who teach these courses to revise assignments/activities to align with the literacy TPE elements and update syllabi/signature assignments (Jan-Apr 2024) • Develop matrix to indicate courses where the literacy TPE elements will be Introduced (I), Practiced (P), and Assessed for proficiency (A) – link IPAs in this matrix to updated course syllabi (Jan-Apr 2024) • Revise program and fieldwork handbooks, websites, other materials (May-June 2024) • Orient and train University supervisors and mentor teachers on these updates (May-Sept 2024) <p>A PADLET was developed and shared across the COE faculty as a place to curate and support the sharing of important updates, documents, and resources to support the implementation work. This included links to CTC Resources, Program Standards, COE Alignment Tools, and Faculty Resources to support professional learning and syllabi/course alignment and implementation of the new literacy program standard 7 and TPEs.</p> <p>Faculty in each program contributed to shared resources, including those disseminated by CAR/W, the CDE and CTC, the UCSF Dyslexia Center, CA Dyslexia Guidelines, e-Learning Modules from the UC/CSU Collaborative for Neurodiversity and Learning, among others.</p> <p>Dr. Marsh presented the COE’s transition to the New Literacy Program Standard 7 & 7 TPE’s, which included updates related to</p>	<p>Dr. Holly Menzies, Professor Emerita, Special Education</p> <p>Dr. Elina Saeki, Professor & Chair of Special Education & Counseling</p> <p>Dr. Anna Osipova, Associate Professor, Special Education</p> <p>Brenda Naimy, Lecturer, Special Education</p>
--	---	---

SB488 and provided a PowerPoint of this information to share with faculty. The following group meetings and dates during the 2023-24 academic year include:

- MS Program Committee Meetings (11/29/23, 2/28/24, 3/27/24, 4/24/24),
- SS Program Committee Meetings (11/2/23, 2/8/24)
- Integrated Elementary Teaching Emphasis (ITEP) (10/24/23, 4/24/24),
- SPED Faculty Meetings (11/9/23, 2/7/24).

In Fall 2023, Dr. Marsh collaborated with Dr. Joan Fingon, MS Program Coordinator, and Dr. Rebecca Joseph, SS Program Coordinator (and with consultation from Interim Dean Mitch Fryling and Interim Associate Dean A. Dee Williams) to schedule a series of small faculty-led Literacy TPE Work Groups for each impacted course during the Spring 2024 semester. Impacted courses and faculty were identified in MS and SS program meetings and by MS and SS Program Coordinators.

MS Work Group Meeting Dates and consultation during the Spring 2024 semester included:

1. 2/14: EDCI 4000- Part 1 (Dr. Erica Hamilton, Aimee Cunningham & Abril Trasvina)
2. 2/21: EDCI 4010 (Dr. Kimberly Persiani, Dr. Verónica Gonzalez & Charlene Fried)
3. 2/28: EDEL 4150 (Dr. Anna Chee, Dr. Verónica Gonzalez & Dr. Kellie Albrecht)
4. 3/6: EDEL 4170 (Dr. Socorro Orozco & Dr. Lili Zhao), EDEL 4180 & EDEL 4190 (Dr. Brian Gibbs)
5. 3/6: EDEL 4160 (Dr. Jamie Marsh & Dr. Melissa West)
6. 3/20: EDEL 4881 (Dr. Kimberly Persiani & Dr. Aleeta Powers)
7. 3/20: EDCI 4000 Part 2 update (Dr. Erica Hamilton & Abril Trasvina)

These faculty groups then reviewed and audited their course syllabi to assess what aspects of the New Literacy Program Standard 7 and TPEs are already evidenced in their

	<p>course and what aspects needed to be revised/changed/added to align and cohere to the new standard 7 and identified TPEs within the course.</p> <p>The CAR/W alignment tool was used to support this process, and in each work group faculty developed an agreed upon matrix to indicate which aspect of the standard and which literacy TPEs would be introduced, practiced, and assessed in the course, and in this process a literacy matrix was developed for the MS and SS programs.</p> <p>Within work groups, faculty collaborated on specific assignments, projects, and lectures, lessons, and modules they would implement within the course to cohere and align to the TPEs addressed in the course. Faculty were also provided with the CCTC Resource Guide on Preparing Teachers for Effective Literacy Instruction distributed from CAR/W. The Padlet contained links to the ELA/ELD Framework, Dyslexia Guidelines, and other important resources. Special Education faculty also shared the dyslexia information/modules that were available from the UC/CSU Neurodiversity link.</p> <p>Finally, within small work groups faculty identified any training, materials, or resources needed for implementation. Dr. Marsh and Dr. Fingon helped facilitate all MS faculty-led work groups and Dr. Marsh and Dr. Joseph helped facilitate all SS faculty-led work groups.</p> <p>Updates from all work groups and the new MS and SS literacy matrices were shared in the on-going MS and SS Program Committee Meetings to finalize each matrix, review program certification documents and expectations, and determine next steps and support needed.</p> <p>Dr. Marsh, Dr. Fingon, and Dr. Joseph met with Interim Dean Fryling and Interim Associate Dean Williams to share updates, approximately once a month, related to this work and to request support needed in the process.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>MS faculty submitted their newly aligned syllabi to Dr. Marsh and Dr. Fingon for review in May 2024 in preparation for the program certification submission. Feedback was provided to faculty, when needed, to further support alignment. The draft report was submitted and reviewed by C&I Chair, Dr. Sharon Ullanoff, and Interim Associate Dean A.Deer Williams, end of spring semester 2024.</p>	
--	--	--

For the remaining requirements in Part 2, please include the full language of the prompt with your response.

2.3. Describe how the program has ensured that faculty teaching the literacy instruction courses understand the requirements in SB 488, the new standards and TPEs, and the evidence base supporting them. If this response differs by pathway, please respond for each pathway.

Dr. Marsh presented and facilitated ongoing discussions on the requirements in SB 488, the new standards and TPEs, and the evidence base supporting them within MS and SS Program faculty Meetings. In addition, faculty unpacked and discussed for clarity and understanding the Literacy Program Standard 7 +TPEs and SB 488 within small faculty work groups for every impacted course in the program. For example, faculty who teach the same course came together to read, study, and discuss the new Literacy Program Standard 7 + TPEs. Dr. Marsh displayed the updated course matrix and the Standard 7 + TPEs for faculty to discuss, etc. These faculty groups then reviewed and audited their course syllabi to assess what aspects of the new literacy program standard and TPEs are already evidenced in their course and what aspects need to be revised/changed/added to align and cohere to the new standard and identified TPEs within the course. The CAR/W alignment tool was used to support this process, and in each work group faculty developed an agreed upon matrix to indicate which aspect of the standard and which each literacy TPEs would be introduced, practiced, and assessed in the course, and in this process a literacy matrix was developed for the program. Within these small work groups, faculty collaborated on specific assignments, projects, and lectures/lessons/modules they would implement within the course to cohere and align to the TPEs addressed in the course. They also identified any resources or support needed for continued professional learning. To further support faculty with syllabi alignment and implementation, a course syllabus model that was aligned with Standard 7 + TPEs was provided and discussed with all MS faculty within an MS Program Meeting mid semester as a way to assist faculty in preparing their course syllabi.

2.4. Describe how the institution/program has provided opportunities for faculty teaching these courses to engage in professional learning to ensure that they are prepared to teach new content as required by SB 488, the standards, and the performance expectations. If none has been provided to date, provide information about the implementation plan for specific professional development and learning that will take place. If these responses differ by pathway, please respond for each pathway.

There was much discussion about what expertise faculty needed particularly for those teaching the literacy courses for certain standards/TPEs and the new content required by SB 488, including the Dyslexia Guidelines, and to include input from special education faculty for other resources, particularly from Dr. Anna Osipova and Dr. Jilly Chang, members of the UC/CSU Collaborative for Neurodiversity and Learning. Within faculty work groups, faculty read and discussed SB 488 and previewed the dyslexia modules provided by this UC/CSU Collab and engaged in continued exploration of the modules and relevant readings from the Dyslexia Guidelines as they aligned and prepared their course syllabi. The plan is to [survey](#) all MS and SS faculty, university supervisors, and mentor teachers in the Fall of 2024 to identify any specific professional development and training needs related to the new Literacy Program Standard and TPEs, to be provided during the 2024-25 academic year. Faculty were also asked to complete a survey from CAR/W sent to all CSUs literacy faculty early May 2024 inquiring about faculty's skills, knowledge, and support needs related to the New Literacy Standards + TPEs.

2.5. What steps has the program taken or will take in the coming months to communicate to mentor/cooperating teachers and other PK-12 partners the new requirements of SB 488, the new literacy instruction program standards, TPEs, and upcoming performance assessment requirements? (meetings, notifications, handbook updates, etc.)

The COE disseminated a [letter](#) on September 23rd to all mentor teachers and PK-12 partners to communicate the new requirements of SB 488, the new literacy instruction program standards, TPEs, and upcoming performance assessment requirements. In addition, Dr. Rebecca Joseph, the Directed Teaching Coordinator and C&I Associate Chair, held multiple meetings with new and returning university supervisors and mentor teachers during the Spring 2024 semester, during which she shared updates related to SB 488 and the new literacy program standard, TPEs, and forthcoming literacy performance assessment (NEW Univ Supervisor Meeting Dates: 2/9/24 or 2/10/24, 4/26/24 or 4/27/24; Returning Supervisors: 2/16/24 or 2/17/24; ALL Supervisors: 4/19/24 or 4/20/24; Mentor Teacher Meeting Dates: 2/9/24, 3/18/24, 4/24/24). In addition, an orientation is scheduled for all mentor teachers and university supervisors at the start of each semester to ensure this information is communicated. [Orientation to the New Literacy Program Standard and TPEs](#) slides will be provided and updates to handbooks and clinical practice tools will be shared ([COE Handbook](#), [MS/SS Mentor/Supervisor Handbook](#), [MS/SS Teacher Candidate Handbook](#), [Observation Reports](#), and [Midterm and Final Evaluation Forms](#)). University Supervisors and Mentor Teachers will provide input related to their knowledge and confidence in implementing specific aspects of the new literacy program standard and TPEs.

2.6. In what ways did the program's process for reviewing its coursework and clinical practice requirements against the new standards and TPEs include individuals with expertise in literacy instruction for multilingual/English learner students?

While all MS and SS faculty have some expertise in various aspects of literacy instruction for multilingual/English learner students, Dr. Verónica Gonzalez and Dr. Sharon Ulanoff (Bilingual faculty) were consulted through Zoom sessions and email exchanges throughout the review

process for coursework and clinical practice requirements against the new standards and TPEs.

Further, Dr. Anna Osipova (Special Education) was consulted for her knowledge of the Dyslexia Guidelines as they related to multilingual/English learner students.

In addition, the MS faculty also assessed our fieldwork model strengths and needs and brainstormed other options to help ensure our students' more equitable access to quality early fieldwork placements, where they could observe and practice evidence-based literacy instruction with multilingual/English learner students. Clinical practice tools and rubrics were discussed at MS whole group meetings (January-March 2024).

2.7. Provide links to syllabi that demonstrate that the *English Language Arts (ELA) and Literacy Standards, English Language Development (ELD) Standards, and English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework* are required and central components for candidates in literacy instruction coursework. These links should be bookmarked to the exact place in the syllabi where this occurs. Multiple links to different sections of the same syllabus are acceptable.

[Link to EDCI 4010 Syllabus](#)

- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Other Readings](#)” to document evidence of the English Language Development (ELD) Standards, and English Language Arts/English as central components in the course
- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Culturally Relevant Integrated ELD Lesson Plan](#)” assignment to document evidence of the ELA and ELD Standards
- See comment provided under “[Designated ELD Lesson Plan](#)” assignment to document evidence of the ELD standards
- See comment provided in [Session 8](#) in the “Course Schedule” to document evidence of the ELA and ELD Standards and ELA/ELD Framework
- See comment provided in [Session 11](#) in the “Course Schedule” to document evidence of the ELA/ELD Framework
- See comments provided in [Sessions 12](#) and [13](#) in the “Course Schedule” to “Integrated ELD Lesson Plan” assignment due
- See comments provided in [Sessions 15](#) and [16](#) in the “Course Schedule” to “Designated ELD Lesson Plan” assignment due

[Link to EDEL 4150 Syllabus](#)

- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Required Texts](#)” to document evidence of the ELA and ELD Standards and the ELA/ELD Framework
- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Reflection Journal](#)” assignment description to document evidence of the ELA and ELD Standards and the ELA/ELD Framework
- See comments provided in syllabus under “[Early Reading Development Foundational Skills Lesson Plan](#)” (in [weeks 3](#) and [7](#)) and “[Case Study of a Reader](#)” assignment descriptions to

document evidence of the ELA and ELD Standards and the ELA/ELD Framework See comments provided in the Course Schedule in weeks [1](#), [2](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)

[Link to EDEL 4160 Syllabus](#)

- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Required Texts](#)” to document evidence of the ELA and ELD Standards and the ELA/ELD Framework
- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Writer’s Workshop Discussions](#)” assignment description to document evidence of the ELA and ELD Standards and the ELA/ELD Framework
- See comments provided in syllabus under “[Teaching Lab #1: Prewriting Miniesson](#)” and “[Teaching Lab #2: Revision Miniesson](#)” assignment descriptions to document evidence of the ELA standards
- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Case Study of a Writer](#)” assignment description to document evidence of the [ELA Standards](#)
- See comments provided in the Course Schedule in [weeks 2](#), [8](#), [9](#), [12](#)

PART 3. PREPARING CANDIDATES TO UNDERSTAND AND TEACH FOUNDATIONAL SKILLS, AS REQUIRED IN EDUCATION CODE SECTION 44259 (b)(4)(A)(i) and (B)

Below is the language from Education Code Section 44259 (b)(4)(A)(i) and (B).
44259 (b)(4)(A)(i) contains the following requirements:

...satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following:

(i). The study of organized, systematic, explicit skills including phonemic awareness, direct, systematic, explicit phonics, and decoding skills.

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

Submission Requirements for Part 3

Part 3 addresses candidate preparation to provide effective literacy instruction consistent with the above requirements.

If there are differences in candidate preparation for these TPEs across the pathways offered by the institution, please indicate these differences and ensure they are clearly labeled.

3.1. *Program/Coursework Coverage of TPEs* – Submission of Table 3.1 (provided in the appendices). Course coverage of Foundational Skills TPE 7.5 with links to specific content within course syllabi. (See Appendix C-F, as applicable to each credential program)

Standard 7a – Foundational Skills Instruction for Multilingual and English Learner Students

Introduced: Via ELA/ELD Framework readings, CA Dyslexia Guidelines, and course lectures on foundational skills instruction for multilingual and English learner students.

Practiced: Through lesson plans, case study analysis, and reflection activities addressing multilingual learners' literacy needs.

Assessed: In [Case Study of a Reader](#) (Sections B & C, [Early Development Foundational Skills Lesson Plan](#), and [Reflection Journal](#) entries.

3.2. *Coursework Coverage of Standard 7* – Provide a narrative with links embedded to specific location(s) in course syllabi addressing Standard 7a describing how the program prepares candidates to teach foundational skills and the coverage of the above knowledge and skills (TPE 7.5), as specified in the excerpt from the Education Code. Please be concise. Suggested length no more than 1000 words.

Standard 7a describes how the program prepares candidates to teach foundational skills, and the coverage of the above knowledge and skills (TPE 7.5) are predominantly covered in [EDEL 4150 \(Curriculum and Teaching of Reading/Language Arts\)](#). They are also introduced in [EDCI 4000 \(Transformative Teaching in Diverse Urban Classrooms\)](#). In EDEL 4150, they are further unpacked and practiced and assessed through weekly lectures and readings (for example, see [weeks 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 15](#)) in the Course Schedule in the syllabus, the [Early Reading Development Foundational Skills Lesson Plan](#) assignment, and the [Case Study of a Reader signature assignment](#), which is completed throughout the semester with instructor supervised guidance and feedback, is part of the 15 hours of required fieldwork in this course. Students are placed in an elementary classroom setting working with a case study student that the teacher candidate identified with the support of the classroom teacher.

In the [Early Reading Development Foundational Skills Lesson Plan](#), the requirements are for students to design a lesson that addresses a *foundational* reading skill. Students analyze various types of assessment data and use their analysis and interpretation of this data to decide on a *foundational reading skill* to *explicitly* teach the student. This may include helping the student develop skills in print concepts, letters of the alphabet; phonological awareness, spelling, and word recognition, and/or letter-sound, spelling-sound, and sound-symbol correspondences; decoding and encoding; morphological awareness; and text reading fluency, accuracy, prosody (expression), and rate (as an indicator of automaticity). The lesson plan must include detailed instruction that is structured, organized, as well as direct, systematic, and explicit including practice in connected, decodable text. It must reflect the student's understanding and application of the English Language Arts (ELA) and Literacy Standards, English Language Development (ELD) Standards, and English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework. A rubric is provided in the course syllabus to assess students for this lesson plan.

In the [Case Study of a Reader](#) signature assignment, the requirements are for students to

complete 15 hours of fieldwork in an elementary reading classroom that is culturally and/or linguistically diverse with students who are identified as English Learners (ELs) and/or with a students identified with [potential reading and writing difficulties, including students' at risk for dyslexia and other literacy-related disabilities](#). Within this context, they complete a case study assignment, which includes analysis and interpretation of reading data, minilesson development based on their analysis and taking into consideration foundational reading skills, providing reading instruction to the students. It also includes reflecting on their teaching, student learning, and growth as well as implications on their practice.

3.3 Clinical Practice: Ensuring Opportunities for Candidates to Practice Teaching Foundational Skills – Provide direct links to evidence demonstrating how the program provides opportunities for candidates to practice teaching students foundational reading skills. The standards require that candidates are provided opportunities to practice foundational reading skills that are appropriate for the children and/or students they are teaching in their clinical practice experience. This does not mean that candidates must practice or be observed teaching every individual foundational reading skill in their clinical practice setting (see PSA 24-08). This documentation must include all the following:

3.3a. Communication/Agreement with Districts regarding clinical practice – Direct link(s) to locations in sample MOU(s) with LEAs or other documentation provided to districts outlining opportunities that must be provided to candidates in clinical practice settings (appropriate setting, information about expectations made available to administrators and mentors at the school site, etc.). This documentation must include information for mentor/cooperating teachers about the expectations for candidates to take and pass a Commission approved literacy performance assessment that includes a focus on foundational literacy skills and the additional cross cutting themes in literacy.

We have sent out letters to both [mentor teachers](#) and our [K-12 district partners](#) outlining the recent changes to the literacy standards in our teacher education programs. These letters provide detailed information on how the updated literacy standards will impact our candidates' preparation and assessment requirements moving forward.

3.3b. Candidate Information – Direct link(s) to location(s) in candidate handbooks or materials explaining the new standards, TPEs, and performance assessment requirements demonstrating that candidates have been provided accurate and timely information about what is required during clinical practice related to foundational skills.

[Link to COE Credential Handbook](#) – see comment under “E. Professional Standards”

3.3c. Candidate Clinical Practice Opportunities – Direct link(s) to locations in clinical practice observation tools/assessments to ensure that candidates are practicing teaching these skills and are being provided formative feedback to guide improvement.

Introduced: Candidates are introduced to teaching foundational reading skills in Weeks 2–5 through lectures, Canvas modules, and readings (Fisher et al., CA ELA/ELD Framework, CA Dyslexia Guidelines). These sessions include modeling of phonemic awareness, phonics, decoding, fluency, and vocabulary instruction, with specific strategies for multilingual learners.

Practiced: During clinical practice placements, candidates implement these skills with K–3 students. Practice occurs in the Case Study of a Reader assignment, where candidates conduct reading assessments (Section B), identify strengths and needs, and plan instruction that targets foundational skills (Section C). Fieldwork observation tools, such as cooperating teacher feedback forms and candidate self-reflection notes, document these opportunities.

Assessed: Candidates are evaluated through formative feedback from mentor teachers and course

instructors. Evidence is collected in:

- [Case Study of a Reader \(Sections B & C\)](#)
- [Early Development Foundational Skills Lesson Plan](#)
- [Reflection Journals](#) (focused on instructional decision-making and student outcomes)
- [Fieldwork Observation Forms](#) (mentor teacher evaluations noting candidate effectiveness in teaching foundational skills)

Link to [MS/SS Clinical Practice Tool for TPE 7](#) (pilot)

Link to [MS/SS TPE Student Self-Assessment Checklist](#)

Link to [Directed Teaching Observation Report](#) (pilot)

Link to [Directed Teaching Midterm & Final Evaluation Form](#) (pilot)

PART 4: PROGRAM INCLUSION OF LITERATURE, LANGUAGE, COMPREHENSION

Below is the applicable language from Education Code Section 44259 (b)(4)(A)(ii):

...satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is researched based and includes all of the following:

(ii) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.

Submission Requirements for Part 4

Note: If there are differences in pathways offered, please indicate these differences and identify the relevant pathway.

4.1. *Program/Coursework Coverage of TPEs* – Submission of Table 4.1 (provided in the appendices) which includes identified TPEs related to a strong literature, language, and comprehension component for candidates along with a balance of oral and written language. These include TPEs 7.6, 7.7, and 7.8. (See Appendix C-F as applicable to each credential program).

Link to Appendix C: Preliminary Multiple Subject.

All pathways, including Intern, Residency, and ITEP, follow the same literacy courses as the Post-Baccalaureate Multiple Subjects program.

4.2. *Clinical Practice: Ensuring Opportunities for Candidates to Practice* a strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language. Provide links to evidence demonstrating how the program ensures that candidates are in clinical practice settings that allow them opportunities to practice TPEs related to oral and written language, as applicable to the credential program. This documentation must include all the following:

4.2a. *Communication/Agreement with Districts* – Direct link(s) to specific location(s) in sample MOU(s) with LEAs or other documentation provided to districts outlining opportunities that must be provided to candidates in clinical practice settings (e.g., appropriate setting, information about expectations made available to administrators and mentors at the school site) related to the TPEs related to oral and written language including 7.6, 7.7, and 7.8, as appropriate to the credential program.

We are collaborating with our team and district partners to finalize the [MOU](#) to ensure it meets all requirements. Link to our draft for your review.

4.2b. *Candidate Information* – Direct link(s) to specific locations in candidate handbooks or other materials explaining the new standards, TPEs, and performance assessment requirements demonstrating that candidates have been provided accurate and timely information about what is required during clinical practice related to the TPEs listed in 4.1.

[Link to COE Credential Handbook](#) – see comment under “E. Professional Standards”

4.2c. *Candidate Clinical Practice Opportunities* – Direct link(s) to specific location(s) in clinical practice observation tools that ensure candidates are practicing teaching these skills and are provided formative feedback to guide improvement.

Introduced:

- Introduced in [Week 1](#) during course orientation, where candidates review the Fieldwork Observation & Feedback Process as outlined in the syllabus and on Canvas.
- Candidates are given access to the Clinical Practice Observation Tool (Google Form & PDF) used by cooperating teachers and university supervisors to document observation notes and TPE-aligned feedback.
- This includes orientation on how formative feedback is embedded in observation debriefs.

Practiced:

- Candidates practice receiving and implementing feedback in mock observation sessions during [Weeks 3–5](#), where peers and the instructor use the same observation tool to model how feedback aligns to the TPEs.
- In fieldwork settings, candidates are observed a minimum of three times per term by their cooperating teacher and once by a university supervisor using the Clinical Practice Observation Tool.
- Each observation is followed by a feedback conference where the candidate and observer review performance, identify strengths, and co-develop next steps.

Assessed:

- Observation data and feedback are formally integrated into [Case Study of a Reader](#)—especially in Sections C & D, where candidates must show instructional changes made based on formative observation feedback.
- University supervisors document candidate progress toward meeting TPEs in the Clinical Practice Evaluation Form, which includes a section summarizing formative feedback from each observation cycle.

Direct Evidence Locations:

- [Appendix E](#) – Clinical Practice Observation Tool (TPE-aligned rubric and comment sections for formative feedback).
- [Appendix F](#) – Formative Feedback Log (records all observation conferences, dates, observer names, and feedback notes).
- [Syllabus](#) p. 13 – Fieldwork requirements section detailing observation frequency, tool usage, and feedback procedures.
- Canvas > Clinical Practice Module – Links to observation tools and feedback templates used in candidate fieldwork.

Link to [MS/SS Clinical Practice Tool for TPE 7](#) (pilot)

Link to [MS/SS TPE Student Self-Assessment Checklist](#)

Link to [Directed Teaching Observation Report](#) (pilot)

Link to [Directed Teaching Midterm & Final Evaluation Form](#) (pilot)

PART 5. ENSURING CANDIDATES ARE WELL PREPARED TO UNDERSTAND AND IMPLEMENT DIAGNOSTIC AND EARLY INTERVENTION TECHNIQUES

Education Code 44259 (b)(4)(A)(iii) and (iv) read as follows:

...satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is researched based and includes all of the following:

(iii) Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.

(iv) Early intervention techniques.

Submission Requirements for Part 5

Note: If there are differences in pathways offered, please indicate these differences and identify the relevant pathway.

5.1. *Program/Coursework Coverage of TPEs* – Submission of Table 5.1 (provided in the appendices) which includes specific TPEs related to diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment as well as early intervention techniques. (See Appendix C-F as applicable to each credential program).

5.2. *Clinical Practice Opportunities* for candidates to practice diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment and early intervention techniques.

5.2a. Direct link to location(s) in sample MOU(s) or other documentation provided to LEAs that include explicit reference to clinical practice settings that ensure candidates practice screening and diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment and early intervention techniques, as appropriate to the credential and as identified in the TPEs and standard.

A draft of the [MOU](#) is available for your review. Additionally, we have sent out letters to both [mentor teachers](#) and our [K-12 district partners](#) outlining the recent changes to the literacy standards in our teacher education programs. These letters provide detailed information on how the updated literacy standards will impact our candidates' preparation and assessment requirements moving forward.

5.2b. Links to specific location(s) in candidate handbooks or materials that **describe for candidates what is expected of them with respect to learning and practicing diagnostic techniques as well as early intervention techniques.**

[Link to COE Credential Handbook](#) – see comment under “E. Professional Standards”

5.2c. Links to specific location(s) in clinical practice observation tools to **ensure that candidates are being provided opportunities to practice these skills and given feedback to guide improvement.**

Link to [MS/SS Clinical Practice Tool for TPE 7](#) (pilot)

Link to [MS/SS TPE Student Self-Assessment Checklist](#)

Link to [Directed Teaching Observation Report](#) (pilot)

Link to [Directed Teaching Midterm & Final Evaluation Form](#) (pilot)

5.3 Incorporation of California Dyslexia Guidelines

5.3a. *Coursework* – Explain how the *California Dyslexia Guidelines* are incorporated into the program for all candidates. (300 words or less).

While the new literacy standard 7 and TPEs are embedded throughout the program as introduced (I), practiced (P), and/or assessed (A), the literacy methods course [EDEL 4150](#) (Curriculum and Teaching of Reading/Language Arts) addresses the CA Dyslexia Guidelines as this course contains the most relevant and aligned content and assignments. In addition, [EDEL 4160](#) (Curriculum and Teaching of Writing/Language Arts) addresses dyslexia and dysgraphia screening and assessment, effective teaching approaches, and assistive technology in writing instruction. In both courses, students complete a Case Study of a Reader ([EDEL 4150](#)) and Case Study of a Writer ([EDEL 4160](#)), signature assignments completed as part of the 15 hour fieldwork component of each course. Within each assignment, students are guided to engage in multiple

conversations with the classroom teacher to gather information about their case study student, asking questions to better understand the students' literacy profile, including the teacher's assessment of the students' strengths as well as any potential reading/literacy difficulties the student faces (i.e., risk for dyslexia, dysgraphia, and/or other literacy-related disabilities). They ask the teacher for specific examples that will provide more information about the child's reading/literacy performance and provide a written report of this as part of their ongoing case study they are working on with instructor feedback and guidance throughout the semester. Further, the CA Dyslexia Guidelines and TPE 7.2 and 7.10 are introduced in [EDSP 4000](#) (Foundations of Special Education) to help students understand the major features, characteristics, and current research related to dyslexia. Specifically, through the completion of a UC/CSU Collaborative E-Learning Module, students identify key aspects of current definitions of dyslexia, describe potential characteristics of dyslexia across school-age years, discuss new research related to neurological processes in dyslexic students, and identify strategies for consulting with families.

5.3b. Coursework – Provide direct link(s) to specific location(s) in course syllabi where the content of the *California Dyslexia Guidelines* is clearly identified.

[Link to EDSP 4000 Syllabus](#)

- See comment provided in syllabus under “Course Schedule → [Week 5](#)” to document evidence of candidates being [introduced](#) to the concepts included in the [CA Dyslexia Guidelines](#)
- *Chapters addressed:*
 - Chapter 1 ([Week 5](#))
 - Chapter 8 ([Week 5](#))
 - Chapter 10 ([Week 5](#))
 - Appendix C ([Week 5](#))

[Link to EDEL 4150 Syllabus](#)

- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Required Texts with Free Digital Access](#)” as evidence of the CA Dyslexia Guidelines as required reading in the course.
- See comments under [Student Learning Outcomes \(SLO\)](#).
- See comment under “[Reflection Journal](#)” assignments as evidence of the CA Dyslexia Guidelines as required reading and reflection in the course.
- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Case Study of a Reader](#)” signature assignment to document evidence that candidates are able to practice and be assessed on their ability to develop a literacy profile for their case study student, with the guidance and support of their mentor teacher and instructor, to better understand the teacher's assessment of the students' strengths as well as any potential reading/literacy difficulties the student faces. This would include how to use literacy profile data and screenings to determine any identified potential

reading difficulties, including students' at-risk for dyslexia and other literacy-related disabilities.

- See Modules listed in course schedule (in [weeks 4](#) and [12](#)) in syllabus for CA Dyslexia Guidelines and Introduction to Dyslexia as required assignments in the course.
- See “rubrics” of Early Foundation mini lesson plan and Case Study of a Reader as signature assignments assessing 4150 students in the course syllabus.
- *Chapters addressed:*
 - Chapter 4 ([Week 4](#))
 - Chapter 5 ([Week 4](#))
 - Chapter 6 ([Week 4](#))
 - Chapter 9 ([Week 12](#))
 - Chapter 11 ([Week 12](#))
 - Chapter 13 ([Week 12](#))
 - Appendix A ([Week 12](#))

[Link to EDEL 4160 Syllabus](#)

- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Required Texts](#)” as evidence of the CA Dyslexia Guidelines as required reading in the course.
- See comment provided in syllabus under “[Case Study of a Writer](#)” course assignment to document evidence that candidates are able to practice and be assessed on their ability to build a literacy profile for their case study student, with the guidance and support of their mentor teacher and instructor, to better understand the teacher’s assessment of the students’ strengths as well as any potential reading/literacy difficulties the student faces ([i.e., risk for dyslexia, dysgraphia, and/or other literacy-related disabilities](#)).
- See comment provided in Course Schedule in [Weeks 12](#) and [13](#) as evidence of CA Dyslexia Guidelines as required reading in the course, specifically Dyslexia and Dysgraphia - Screening & Assessment, Effective Teaching Approaches and Assistive Technology
- See comment provided in syllabus under “Course Schedule” to document when candidates work on and submit this case study assignment with a writer as part of their 15 hours fieldwork requirement.
- *Chapters addressed:*
 - Chapter 9 ([Week 12](#))
 - Chapter 11 ([Week 13](#))
 - Chapter 12 ([Week 13](#))
 - Chapter 13 ([Week 14](#))
 - Appendix A ([Week 12](#))

[Link to EDCI 4010 Syllabus](#)

- *Chapters addressed:*
 - Chapter 3 ([Week 15](#))
 - Chapter 7 ([Week 15](#))
 - [Link to EDEL 4180 Syllabus](#)
- *Chapters addressed:*
 - Chapter 2 ([Week 6](#))

-
- [Link to EDEL
4881
Syllabus](#)
- *Chapters addressed:*
 - Chapter 8 ([Week 14](#))
 - Chapter 14 ([Week 14](#))
 -

5.3c. Clinical Practice – Explain how the program provides, to the extent practicable, opportunities for candidates in clinical practice settings to observe and practice the concepts and strategies included in the California Dyslexia Guidelines. Given that not every candidate will have a child with dyslexia in their clinical practice setting, describe steps taken to provide other opportunities for these candidates to practice strategies identified in the California Dyslexia Guidelines. (See 5.3f below)

Ideally, whenever possible students will be asked to be assigned to an at-risk or child with dyslexia in their fieldwork school setting. Students will also have opportunities in class discussion and small groups to learn strategies about working with dyslexic or at risk students in various scenarios (see Week 12 in course syllabus). Students will discuss reading strategies of students with reading disabilities, dyslexia, and/or other literacy-related disabilities and create a plan of action. Students will be assessed based on these and other class and group activities.

5.3d. Communication/Agreement with Districts – Direct link(s) to sample MOU(s) or other documentation describing expectations for clinical practice settings related to providing, to the extent practicable, opportunities for candidates in clinical practice settings to observe and practice the concepts and strategies included in the California Dyslexia Guidelines.

A draft of the [MOU](#) is available for your review. Additionally, we have sent out letters to both [mentor teachers](#) and our [K-12 district partners](#) outlining the recent changes to the literacy standards in our teacher education programs. These letters provide detailed information on how the updated literacy standards will impact our candidates' preparation and assessment requirements moving forward.

5.3e. Candidate Information – Direct link(s) to location(s) in candidate handbooks or other candidate material that explains the program expectations around the California Dyslexia Guidelines.

[Link to COE Credential Handbook](#) – see comment under “E. Professional Standards”

5.3f. Provide direct links to specific evidence showing how candidates are provided opportunities to learn about and, where possible, observe how schools/teachers use the skills described in California Dyslexia Guidelines (may be combined with 5.3c above).

Link to [MS/SS Clinical Practice Tool for TPE 7](#) (pilot)

Link to [MS/SS TPE Student Self-Assessment Checklist](#)

Link to [Directed Teaching Observation Report](#) (pilot)

Link to [Directed Teaching Midterm & Final Evaluation Form](#) (pilot)

