

Date of Hearing: August 3, 2020

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Patrick O'Donnell, Chair

SB 614 (Rubio) – As Amended July 27, 2020

SENATE VOTE: 38-0

SUBJECT: Teacher credentialing: reading instruction

SUMMARY: Eliminates the requirement that candidates to become elementary and special education teachers pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA), and instead requires them to either pass a program-embedded performance-based measure or a different assessment of reading instruction. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Repeals the requirement that candidates for the issuance of a multiple subject teaching credential or an education specialist teaching credential pass the RICA.
- 2) Requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) by July 1, 2022, to:
 - a) Ensure, through the accreditation process, that all approved preparation programs instruct and reliably assess candidates using a program-embedded, performance-based measure, to ensure individual competence to deliver and facilitate comprehensive and research-based reading instruction.
 - b) Adopt, modify, as necessary, and administer reading instruction assessments aligned with the state's current adopted curriculum frameworks for teacher candidates who have not been instructed and assessed, to ensure their competence to deliver comprehensive and research-based reading instruction.
 - c) Develop assessment standards, templates, and general guidance for performance-based assessment tools, instruments, and processes to be made available to preparation program sponsors to assess candidates using the program-embedded performance-based measure.
- 3) Requires, beginning on July 1, 2022, that the requirements for the issuance of the preliminary multiple subject credential and the education specialist credential include either the performance-based measure or the assessment adopted by the CTC, as described above.
- 4) Requires, beginning on July 1, 2023, that the requirements for the issuance of preliminary single subject credentials include either performance-based measure or the assessment adopted by the CTC, as described above.
- 5) Repeals the requirement that the study of reading which candidates for multiple subject, single subject, and education specialist credentials must complete be research-based and include all of the following:
 - a) the study of organized, systematic, explicit skills including phonemic awareness, direct, systematic, explicit phonics, and decoding skills. Defines "direct, systematic, explicit phonics" to mean phonemic awareness, spelling patterns, the direct instruction of

sound/symbol codes and practice in connected text, and the relationship of direct, systematic, explicit phonics;

- b) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language;
 - c) Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment;
 - d) Early intervention techniques; and
 - e) Guided practice in a clinical setting.
- 6) Requires that study of alternative methods of developing English language skills, be in accordance with the commission's and current expectations and requirements for credential candidates.
- 7) Repeals the requirement that the CTC develop, adopt, and administer a reading instruction competence assessment consisting of one or more instruments to measure an individual's knowledge, skill, and ability relative to effective reading instruction of first-time credential applicants that the CTC determines to be essential to reading instruction, and which is consistent with the state's reading curriculum framework adopted after July 1, 1996, and the Reading Program Advisory published by the State Department of Education in 1996.
- 8) Repeals the requirement that a program for the multiple subjects credential also include the study of integrated methods of teaching language arts.
- 9) Repeals the requirement that the CTC perform the following duties with respect to the reading instruction competence assessment:
- a) Develop, adopt, and administer the assessment;
 - b) Initially and periodically analyze the validity and reliability of the content of the assessment;
 - c) Establish and implement appropriate passing scores on the assessment;
 - d) Analyze possible sources of bias on the assessment;
 - e) Collect and analyze background information provided by first-time credential applicants who are not credentialed in any state who participate in the assessment;
 - f) Report and interpret individual and aggregated assessment results;
 - g) Convene a task force to advise the commission on the design, content, and administration of the assessment; and

- h) Prior to requiring successful passage of the assessment for the preliminary multiple subject teaching credential, certify that all of the teacher education programs approved by the CTC offer instruction in the knowledge, skills, and abilities required by the assessment.
- 10) Repeals an authorization for a teacher who does not hold a specialist credential to teach pupils with mild to moderate disabilities in a special day class setting to teach in such a setting if the teacher consents to the assignment and passes the RICA within one year of the beginning of the school year.
- 11) Repeals the requirement that the CTC conduct a public study session to consider the implications of incorporating the assessment of ability, skills, and knowledge related to effective reading instruction that is assessed by the RICA within the teacher performance assessment (TPA) and report on the outcome of that session to the Legislature and the Governor no later than July 1, 2007.
- 12) Repeals the requirement that the CTC convene a public study session to discuss the implications of modifying the single subject California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) to assess basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics.
- 13) Repeals the requirement that interns participating in the early completion option (ECO) pass the RICA.
- 14) Permits the subject matter requirement for multiple and single subject credentials to be met by a Commission-approved combination of an approved subject matter program and passage of a subject matter examination.
- 15) Makes findings and declarations relative to reading instruction, assessment of reading instruction performance, and the RICA.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes the minimum requirements for the preliminary multiple or single subject teaching credential and specialist teaching credential in special education for first time applicants for that credential who are not credentialed in another state, including, commencing January 1, 1997, satisfactory completion of comprehensive reading instruction that is research based and includes all of the following:
 - a) The study of organized, systematic, explicit skills including phonemic awareness, direct, systematic, explicit phonics, and decoding skills;
 - b) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language;
 - c) Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment;
 - d) Early intervention techniques; and
 - e) Guided practice in a clinical setting.

- 2) Defines “direct, systematic, explicit phonics” to mean phonemic awareness, spelling patterns, the direct instruction of sound/symbol codes and practice in connected text, and the relationship of direct, systematic, explicit phonics.
- 3) Authorizes a teacher who does not hold a specialist credential to teach pupils with mild to moderate disabilities in a special day class setting to teach in such a setting if the teacher consents to the assignment and passes the RICA within one year of the beginning of the school year. Deems passage of the assessment evidence of the teacher’s competence in reading instruction.
- 4) Requires the CTC to develop, adopt, and administer a reading instruction competence assessment consisting of one or more instruments to measure an individual’s knowledge, skill, and ability relative to effective reading instruction. Requires the assessment to measure the knowledge, skill, and ability of first-time credential applicants who are not credentialed in any state that the commission determines to be essential to reading instruction and shall be consistent with the state’s reading curriculum framework adopted after July 1, 1996, and the Reading Program Advisory published by the State Department of Education in 1996.
- 5) Requires the CTC to perform the following duties with respect to the RICA:
 - a) Develop, adopt, and administer the assessment;
 - b) Initially and periodically analyze the validity and reliability of the content of the assessment;
 - c) Establish and implement appropriate passing scores on the assessment;
 - d) Analyze possible sources of bias on the assessment;
 - e) Collect and analyze background information provided by first-time credential applicants who are not credentialed in any state who participate in the assessment;
 - f) Report and interpret individual and aggregated assessment results;
 - g) Convene a task force to advise the commission on the design, content, and administration of the assessment, with not less than one-third of the members of the task force classroom teachers with recent experience in teaching reading in the early elementary grades; and
 - h) Prior to requiring successful passage of the assessment for the preliminary multiple subject teaching credential, certify that teacher education programs offer instruction in the knowledge, skills, and abilities required by the assessment.
- 6) Establishes the requirements for issuance of the preliminary multiple subject teaching credential to include successful passage of one of the following components of the RICA:
 - a) A comprehensive examination of the knowledge and skill pertaining to effective reading instruction of the credential applicant;
 - b) An authentic assessment of teaching skills and classroom abilities of the credential applicant pertaining to the provision of effective reading instruction.

- 7) Establishes a TPA as a requirement for the issuance of preliminary multiple and single subject teaching credentials.
- 8) Establishes an “early completion option” internship for multiple subject, single subject, and education specialist (mild/moderate) intern program candidates which allows candidates to obtain a preliminary credential without completing preparation coursework, including student teaching.
- 9) Requires “early completion option” candidates in these programs to pass the reading instruction competence assessment unless the written assessment adopted by the CTC is validated as covering content equivalent to the reading assessment.
- 10) Requires the CTC to conduct a public study session to consider the implications of incorporating the assessment of ability, skills, and knowledge related to effective reading instruction that is assessed by the RICA within the teacher performance assessment.
- 11) Provides the CTC with powers and duties including the adoption and implementation of an accreditation framework setting forth the commission’s policies regarding the accreditation of educator preparation in California.

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

Need for the bill. According to the author, “SB 614 will phase out an antiquated assessment that currently serves as a barrier to teacher candidates and is a disservice to our students—particularly our high need students.

SB 614 requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, by July 1, 2020, to ensure all teacher preparation programs, through a rigorous accreditation process, instruct and assess teacher candidates to deliver comprehensive and research-based reading instruction.

Teacher preparation programs now require 600 hours of supervised practice teaching to show whether they can teach reading and literacy and other core subjects. Each video is reviewed with the professor, other teacher candidates, and provides for self-reflection.

RICA fails to align with the current English Language Arts/English Language Development frameworks and does not reflect current research and instructional best practices in reading and literacy.

Too many prospective teachers have passed every assessment but the RICA. This forces teacher candidates to spend additional resources on test preparation, additional tests, demotions, or loss of jobs without benefit to our students. Urgency is required in order to stop the drain of some of our most talented and passionate teachers to leave the profession – simply due to the outdated and misaligned RICA.”

What is the RICA? Current law requires individuals seeking to obtain a teaching credential in California to fulfill several requirements, including completion of an accredited preservice preparation program, demonstration of subject matter competency, and successful completion of an assessment of basic skills. Additionally, for those seeking a multiple subject (elementary) or an education specialist (special education) credential, candidates must pass the 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 RICA requirement was put in place by the CTC in 1998 for multiple subject credential candidates, and in 2000 for educational specialist credential candidates.

The RICA is organized into five domains:

- Domain 1: Planning, Organizing, and Managing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment
- Domain 2: Word Analysis
- Domain 3: Fluency
- Domain 4: Vocabulary, Academic Language, and Background Knowledge
- Domain 5: Comprehension

The CTC offers two test formats. The RICA Written Examination is a four hour, 70 question test taken on a computer, which includes multiple choice, constructed response, and case study essay items. The RICA Video Performance Assessment requires candidates to submit 3 videos showing instruction in whole class, small group, and individual instruction as well as an instructional context form. The vast majority of candidates take the written version of the assessment. The cost of the assessment is \$171. Unlike the state's basic skills assessment (CBEST), which allows candidates to retake portions which they fail to pass, candidates who fail the RICA must take the entire assessment over.

RICA administration suspended by Executive Order due to COVID-19 pandemic. In the spring of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic forced the closure of testing centers used to administer teacher credentialing assessments. On May 29, 2020 the Governor issued Executive Order N-66-20, which suspends a number of teacher credentialing requirements, including the RICA, for candidates who, between March 19, 2020 and August 31, 2020, were or are unable to complete the RICA due to COVID-19 related testing center closures. The executive order requires that candidates complete and pass a CTC-approved reading instruction competence assessment prior to being recommended for a clear credential, essentially giving teachers who obtain a preliminary credential five years to fulfill this requirement. As of this writing it is unclear when testing centers will resume administration of the RICA and other assessments, and whether additional action will be necessary. Candidates who choose to use the video performance assessment option may do so using online instruction.

Students' reading skills have improved since establishment of RICA, but achievement gaps persist. Over the last 20 years, California student scores on the 4th grade reading portion of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) have consistently improved, and the gap between the state and the national average has nearly closed. In 2019, California 4th graders scored 216 compared to 219 nationally, and 8th graders scored 259 compared to 262 nationally, both on a 500 point scale. Since 1998, the percent of California 4th graders scoring proficient in

reading has increased from 20 percent to 32 percent. However, both the national average and California's performance remain below the NAEP "proficient" threshold.

NAEP scores also identify significant achievement gaps which have largely persisted over the same time period. In 2019, students who were eligible for free or reduced price meals had an average score that was 31 points lower than that for students who were not eligible. This performance gap has only slightly reduced since 1998 (36 points). 8th grade scores show similar patterns, though with less improvement over time.

Why does assessment of teachers' skill at teaching reading matter? Research has established that teacher preparation and certification are by far the strongest correlates of student achievement in reading and mathematics, even when controlling for student poverty and language status. (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Ensuring that teachers are able to teach foundational reading skills is critical to their success in reading in the early grades and as a foundation for all other literacy in subsequent grades. Research indicates that early reading skills have a profound effect on later school outcomes. One frequently cited study of older data suggests that a student who can't read on grade level by 3rd grade is four times less likely to graduate by age 19 than a child who does read proficiently by that time with effects compounded significantly by poverty. (Hernández, 2011),

Teaching Performance Assessments. According to the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), during the 1990s, the Legislature became concerned with the coherence of the teacher credentialing system, as the state had added credential requirements incrementally over the years without comprehensive evaluation. At the request of the Legislature, the CTC convened a workgroup to review the state's teacher credential requirements. The workgroup concluded that existing assessments varied considerably across preparation programs and often failed to provide a good measure of teachers' preparation. At the same time, research and policy organizations such as the National Research Council and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards were supporting the development of more authentic assessments of teacher candidates. In response, the Legislature required the CTC to develop a new assessment for all general education teachers, now known as the Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA).

As of 2008, California requires all teacher candidates for a preliminary multiple and single subject teaching credentials to pass an assessment of their teaching performance as part of the requirements for earning a preliminary teaching credential. This is designed to measure the candidate's knowledge, skills and ability with relation to California's Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), including demonstrating their ability to appropriately instruct all students in the state's content standards. There are now three teaching performance assessment models available: the CalTPA-developed by the Commission, the edTPA-developed by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity (SCALE), and the Fresno Assessment of Student Teaching (FAST) developed by California State University, Fresno. A TPA for education specialists is under development.

Each of the three approved teaching performance assessment models requires a candidate to complete performance tasks relating to subject-specific pedagogy, designing and implementing instruction and student assessment, video-recording teaching, and reflecting on practice. Performance tasks must be completed within a site placement where the candidate is working with supervising teachers, master teachers, and actual students. Multiple-subject candidates must demonstrate their capacity to teach literacy and mathematics. Candidate performances are scored

by trained assessors against multiple rubrics that describe levels of performance relative to each performance task. Each model must also meet and maintain specified standards of assessment reliability, validity, and fairness to candidates. Model sponsors of approved assessments annually report on candidate performance and this data is used to inform program accreditation.

According to the LAO, the **evidence linking TPA performance and student outcomes is limited but positive**. According to an analysis of the existing literature by the LAO, two small studies evaluated an earlier version of the TPA in California and found that—controlling for other factors—students assigned to teachers who had performed better on the TPA performed somewhat better on math and reading assessments. A third study from 2017 tracked a larger sample of teachers taking a version of the TPA in Washington state and found similar results, with TPA scores having a relatively strong association with student performance in mathematics and a moderate association with performance in reading.

A report by the Center for American Progress, “Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: How Teacher Performance Assessments Can Measure and Improve Teaching,” (Darling-Hammond, 2010), notes that, compared to traditional assessments of teachers, “Performance assessments that measure what teachers actually *do* in the classroom, and which have been found to be related to later teacher effectiveness, are a much more potent tool for evaluating teachers’ competence and readiness, as well as for supporting needed changes in teacher education...Such assessments have been found to be stronger predictors of teachers’ contributions to student learning gains than traditional teacher tests.”

Candidates are not currently required to demonstrate competence in teaching foundational reading skills through the TPA. As noted above, California requires that candidates’ instructional ability be assessed in two distinct ways. For foundational reading instruction skills, the state requires that candidates pass the RICA – a standardized, generally computer-based, assessment. For all other areas of instruction, the state requires that candidates pass the TPA – a performance-based assessment. Both assessments are required to be valid and reliable, and reviewed for bias.

According to the CTC, “the treatment of literacy in TPAs is not linked specifically to foundational reading, nor does it currently reflect a comprehensive treatment of the five themes of literacy development prescribed by the ELA/ELD Framework. Rather, literacy instruction is one context in which all Multiple Subject candidates demonstrate their abilities to plan instruction, teach, assess student learning, reflect on the impact of their teaching and apply their own learning to their next cycle of instruction.”

Current English Language Arts/English Language Development curriculum framework takes integrated approach to literacy. In 2014, the State Board of Education adopted a new English Language Arts/English Language Development (ELA/ELD) Framework that reflects an integrated approach to literacy development.

According to the CTC, the framework incorporates five broad, overarching literacy themes, which, taken together, are intended to provide a comprehensive road map for helping students develop literacy across the curriculum. The five broad and interrelated themes are:

- Meaning Making
- Language Development

- Effective Expression
- Content Knowledge
- Foundational Skills

Within the new organizational structure and content of the Framework, the foundational skills of teaching reading now represent one of five integrated domains that guide literacy development across the curriculum and K-12 grade span.

Stakeholder concerns with the RICA. Some stakeholders have questioned the continued use of the RICA assessment for the purposes of determining candidate competency in the teaching of reading. According to the CTC, some stakeholders cite concerns regarding:

- Candidates who are not successful on their first attempt and have to retake the assessment multiple times;
- The predominant focus of the RICA on the foundational reading skills;
- The cost to candidates for the assessment;
- The number of credentialing assessments candidates must take; and
- The need for a standardized assessment for all candidates.

The CTC notes that, in contrast to this viewpoint, other stakeholders cite the continuing need for an external verification that multiple subject and education specialist candidates have learned how to teach reading effectively, the concern that candidates be demonstrably well-trained to work with struggling readers, the effectiveness of the RICA content specifications in driving coursework content, and the unique and critical nature of the RICA assessment in focusing specifically on the foundational reading skills.

CTC recently considered three alternatives to the RICA. In November, 2019, the CTC considered three options to replace the RICA. An analysis of these options from the agenda from that meeting is shown below:

- Replace the RICA with a new statewide external-to-program assessment for reading and literacy.
- Develop and implement a program coursework option with embedded candidate assessment(s) such as a fieldwork embedded case study approach.
- Modify the TPAs to include the teaching of reading and literacy.

Possible Options for Future Assessment and Implications

	External, Statewide Assessment	Program Embedded Coursework and Assessment	Enhanced Teaching Performance Assessment
Requires a Statute Change?	Maybe	Yes	Yes
Provides Statewide Outcomes Data	Yes	Maybe	Yes
Requires Validity and Reliability Work?	Yes	No	Yes
Reduces Candidate Testing?	No	Maybe	Maybe
Cost to Candidates?	Yes	No	Likely
Cost to Programs?	No	Yes	Likely
Cost to Develop Content Expectations?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cost to the Commission?	Yes	Yes	Yes
Impact on TPA Model Owners?	No	No	Yes
Time Frame to Full Implementation?	2 years*	2-3 years*	3-4 years*

*post-statute change

CTC recently adopted revised Teaching Performance Expectations in Literacy. In November 2019, the CTC adopted revised TPEs in literacy for multiple subject, educational specialist, and single subject English teacher candidates. These TPEs align to the 2014 California English language Arts/English Language Development Curriculum Framework and are organized into the following themes: (1) meaning making, (2) language development, (3) effective expression, (4) content knowledge, and (5) foundational skills.

These TPEs replaced a prior set, which, according to the CTC, had not been reviewed specifically with a focus on the new English Language Arts/English Language Development standards and Frameworks relating to literacy that call for the integration of cross-cutting literacy concepts across the curriculum and that reaffirm that all teachers, regardless of the content area of their credential, are teachers of literacy (including teaching both English language arts and English language development, as appropriate to their students and their credential authorization). Teacher preparation programs are expected to align their course content for reading instruction with the TPEs by the 2021-22 academic year.

Assessments used for state licensure must meet legally-defensible standards of validity and reliability. Assessments required for state licensure must meet a legally-defensible standard of validity and reliability, to ensure that the assessments measure the content they are intended to measure, in a consistent manner. Accepted standards for validity and reliability are established through the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (2014)*, published by the National Council for Measurement in Education, the American Educational Research Association, and the American Psychological Association.

The CTC has adopted sets of standards for teacher performance assessments, the California Teaching Performance Assessment Design Standards (adopted in 2015 and revised in 2019), which address validity, reliability, fairness, and sponsor support responsibilities.

Program embedded assessments serve different purposes, are not required to meet the same standard of validity and reliability. While external assessments must meet a legally-defensible standard of validity and reliability, program-embedded measures such as the one proposed by this bill do not typically need to meet these standards because they are not used for the purpose of granting or denying a license. Such assessments are generally designed by faculty for the purpose of assessing student progress and informing instruction, and may vary from course to course. They do not undergo review for validity and reliability, such as field testing or inter-rater reliability scoring.

As the CTC noted in its November, 2019 discussion of assessment options to replace the RICA, “program-level assessments relative to the TPEs are developed by faculty and embedded in coursework and clinical practice as part of the teacher preparation curriculum, and are not standardized across programs. Program-level assessments developed by faculty do not meet the reliability and validity standards that external, standardized assessments must meet.”

Research on locally-developed and scored teacher performance assessment raises concerns. One recent study (Bastian, 2016) has compared the results of locally-developed and scored teacher performance assessments with those of the official scorer of the edTPA.

In this study, the local reviewers had nine hours of TPA training facilitated by officially-calibrated faculty, including a thorough description of each TPA rubric and the criteria for each

scoring level, facilitated small group discussions to calibrate scoring, and a discussion of the official score. To control for bias, the university blinded scoring assignments within content areas and did not assign university supervisors or faculty to score the portfolios of the candidates they supervised during student teaching. To limit workload, no more than five TPA portfolios were assigned to any local evaluator.

The study found that:

- Locally-scored performance assessments only partially-aligned with construct framework (validity)
- Local scores, in comparison to official scores, were systemically higher and did not reliably identify high or low scoring candidates (reliability)

The authors concluded that while the findings suggest that teacher preparation programs (TPPs) can use these data as basis for program reforms, “Regarding other purposes for teacher candidate performance assessments, such as high-stakes teacher certification decisions, these results suggest that it may be **inappropriate for states or TPPs to base such decisions on locally-scored performance assessment portfolios**. Rather, it is advisable to employ...official scoring, if research supports its predictive validity, as a potential requirement for teacher certification.” [emphasis added]

Arguments in support. The Association of California School Administrators writes, “It is time to eliminate the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) for candidates pursuing a teaching credential. The RICA is an outdated assessment, not aligned with current reading and literacy standards, that acts as a barrier to new teachers entering the profession. RICA has become an unnecessary barrier to becoming a teacher in California and RICA pass rates reveal the disparate impact on the diverse teacher candidates California desperately needs.”

Arguments in opposition. EdVoice writes, “SB 614 would exacerbate inequality of access to a quality education by failing to guarantee that every child, particularly disadvantaged children with higher illiteracy rates, have an equitable opportunity to access a basic education, of which reading is a critical skill. It is ill-advised to eliminate the only uniform reliable and valid individual licensure-level requirement for new teachers of children in early grades to demonstrate their knowledge of teaching reading with proven science-based instructional methods.”

Recommended amendments. Staff recommends that this bill be amended as follows:

- Require that, by July 1, 2024, the CTC ensure that all approved teaching performance assessments assess candidates for multiple subject and education specialist credentials for competence in instruction in literacy, including but not limited to foundational reading skills as specified in section 44259, in a manner aligned to the CTC’s current teaching performance expectations and to the current English language arts/English language development curriculum framework adopted by the board.
- Maintain the RICA as a requirement until July 1, 2024. Make the authorizing statute inoperative as of that date and repealed as of January 1, 2025.
- Permit candidates to meet the requirement to pass the RICA through a combination of the two currently-authorized assessment models.

- Permit a candidate for a multiple subject credential or an education specialist credential who, prior or subsequent to January 1, 2021, takes and fails passage of the reading instruction competence assessment to meet the requirement by successfully completing coursework that meets the commission's standards and that addresses the content of the subtest of the assessment which the candidate did not pass.
- Authorize a holder of a preliminary multiple subject credential or a preliminary education specialist credential who was unable to take the reading instruction competence assessment pursuant to Section 44283 as it read on January 1, 2020, due to the closure of assessment centers during the COVID 19 pandemic, and who must complete this requirement in order to earn a professional clear credential, to, if the reading instruction competence assessment is no longer being administered, complete this requirement through successful completion of coursework in reading instruction that meets the CTC's standards.
- Delete proposed changes to Section 44283, including the proposed requirement that the CTC ensure that teacher preparation programs reliably assess candidates in reading instruction (this is no longer necessary given the above amendment to maintain the RICA and later assess foundational reading instruction competence in the TPA), to adopt a separate reading assessment, to provide guidance to preparation programs on performance-based assessment, as well as the requirement that all single subject credential candidates take a course and pass an assessment of primary grades reading instruction skills.
- Reinstate the requirement that ECO interns complete a reading competence assessment.
- Revise the definition of the reading instruction to mean the study of effective means of teaching literacy, including but not limited to evidence-based means of teaching foundational reading skills in print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency to all pupils, including English learners and pupils with exceptional needs, in accordance with the commission's standards of program quality and effectiveness, current teaching performance expectations, and the current English language arts/English language development curriculum framework adopted by the board.
- Changes to intent language and other clarifying and conforming changes.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Association of California School Administrators
California Association for Bilingual Education
California Association for Bilingual Teacher Education
California Association of Professors of Education Administration
California Association of School Business Officials
California Council on Teacher Education
California County Superintendents Educational Services Association
California Federation of Teachers
California Teachers Association
Californians Together
Center for Leadership, Equity, and Research
Fathers and Families of San Joaquin
Innercity Struggle

Lassen County Office of Education
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Los Angeles Unified School District
Office of The Riverside County Superintendent of Schools
Public Advocates, Inc.
Somos Mayfair
Numerous individuals

Opposition

California Business Roundtable
Consortium on Reaching Excellence in Education
Decoding Dyslexia CA
Dyslexia Training Institute
Edvoice
Great Public Schools Now
International Dyslexia Association - Los Angeles
International Dyslexia Association - Northern California
International Dyslexia Association - San Diego
International Dyslexia Association - Southern California Tri-counties
LA Comadre
Learning Rights Law Center
National Center for Learning Disabilities
National Council on Teacher Quality
Oakland NAACP
Para Los Ninos
Right to Read Project
Speak Up
UCLA Center for Dyslexia, Diverse Learners, and Social Justice
United Way of Greater Los Angeles
Numerous individuals

Analysis Prepared by: Tanya Lieberman / ED. / (916) 319-2087