

---

# 6E

## Information

### *Professional Services Committee*

## **Impact of SB 5 and Related Information on Undergraduate and Blended Teacher Preparation**

---

**Executive Summary:** This item discusses the implications of SB 5 for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject teacher preparation programs. In addition, this item provides information on the requirements related to undergraduate and blended teacher preparation in California.

**Policy Question:** In what ways could the Commission most effectively work with the field to support the implementation of the principles contained in the SB 5 legislation?

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenter:** Katie Croy, Consultant, and Teri Clark, Director, Professional Services Division

#### **Strategic Plan Goal:**

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

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

February 2014

---

---

# Impact of SB 5 and Related Information on Undergraduate and Blended Teacher Preparation

---

---

## Introduction

This agenda item discusses the implications of SB 5 (Chap. 171, Stats. 2013) for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject teacher preparation. In Part 2, this item provides information on the requirements related to undergraduate and blended teacher preparation in California.

## Part 1: Senate Bill 5 (Padilla; Chap. 171, Stats. 2013)

Passage of SB 5 amended current law by changing the time limit for post-baccalaureate teaching credential programs from one year to two years. Under the Ryan Act of 1970, which made California the only state in the nation to require postgraduate teacher education as the primary route to preparation, programs were limited to one year or the equivalent of 1/5 of a 5 year program. As described more fully in Part 2 of this agenda item, the Act made it very difficult to use the undergraduate years for teacher education purposes or to integrate the learning of subject matter and pedagogy for teachers, while also putting a limit on the time allowed for coursework and clinical preparation in the field.

While there have been efforts to work around these restrictions, they have been cumbersome, and more integrated models have not been widely adopted in the teacher education community. Consequently, most California teachers receive a preparation that generally allows for less field-based training, less connection between content and pedagogical preparation, and less in-depth training for the teaching of high-needs students than teachers in most other states. As described below, there are a number of ways to leverage better preparation and more effective teaching that rely on greater flexibility for programs in how they organize their work and on stronger outcomes-based measures. In this context, there are at least four opportunities enabled by the passage of SB 5 that comport with the Commission's strategic plan and priorities:

- *Promoting innovation in teacher preparation:* While the demands on teacher education have grown,<sup>1</sup> the one year cap prevented California programs from adopting successful innovations that have enabled greater program effectiveness and efficiency in other parts of the country. Over the years the one year cap was in place, it restricted options at both the undergraduate and the graduate level. Due to the substantial array of requirements that have been added to preparation through legislation or state policy in the last decade, institutions have not had the flexibility to incorporate highly effective and well researched preparation strategies like residencies, co-teaching models, blended undergraduate/graduate models or in-depth clinical experiences.
- *Increasing flexibility in program design,* including models that use time more efficiently at the undergraduate level, those that bridge the undergraduate and graduate levels, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Since 1970, requirements have increased for teachers to master a greater range of subject matter teaching techniques, teach literacy at all grade levels and in all subjects, meet the needs of English language learners and special education students, address student health and mental health needs, and infuse technology in the classroom, among other areas.

those that operate at the graduate level. The two year limit enacted by SB 5 maintains the principle of a cap, but is not expected to trigger a widespread move to two-year graduate level programs. More likely is that it will enable some programs to add an additional summer or semester to better cover emerging content (e.g., teaching Common Core standards, meeting the needs of English learners or special education students) and will open up a range of options that better use the undergraduate years and integrate undergraduate with graduate study (allowing more training overall in less total time).

- *Extending the cap to two years* allows some institutions to continue offering candidates a streamlined, fast-paced route into teaching, while other institutions may choose to offer more intensive preparation and clinical experiences. These and other options will allow candidates to select the most appropriate program for their needs and will better serve local districts, who can choose to hire individuals who have more of the specialized training they feel will allow them to be successful in the classroom with California's diverse learners in an era of rapid educational change.
- *More effective training* will increase the overall efficiency of the California system, since it is significantly less costly to prepare teachers before they enter the workforce than it is to offer a comparable quality of mentored professional development later. There are also high costs for teacher attrition and teacher ineffectiveness which are influenced by the adequacy of pre-service training. Underprepared teachers are less effective and leave the field in their first years at twice the rate of well-prepared teachers, costing districts significant wasted resources.<sup>2</sup> (National studies find that districts spend about \$20,000 to replace a teacher who leaves and that teacher attrition has significant negative effects on student achievement.)<sup>3</sup> Enabling stronger training that better prepares teachers to be effective from day one in the classroom is more cost-effective than the alternatives.

The opportunity presented by the passage of SB 5 is not to needlessly add time or requirements to the teaching credential but to allow programs and candidates to organize the learning process more efficiently and effectively without artificial restrictions.

Part 2 of this item provides background on statutory requirements and CTC interpretations of statute that have had an impact on the ways in which teacher preparation programs are currently structured. SB 5 introduces a small but highly significant change in these requirements of law, allowing sponsors of programs and the Commission to explore appropriate innovations that increase the quality and effectiveness of teacher preparation.

---

<sup>2</sup> Ingersoll study of attrition; NCTAF study of attrition costs.

<sup>3</sup> Ronfeldt, Loeb, and Wyckoff study of attrition.

**Part 2: Background on Integrated and Blended Programs of Teacher Preparation**

Historically, the structure and requirements for preliminary teacher preparation in California have been significantly different from other states in several key ways. The table below provides a comparative look at California and other states’ requirements for teacher preparation.

<b>Credential Requirement</b>	<b>California</b>	<b>Other States</b>
Subject matter preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undergraduate level</li> <li>• Typically completed prior to teacher preparation (must be completed prior to student teaching)</li> <li>• Typically separate from teacher preparation curriculum</li> <li>• Guided by explicit Subject Matter Requirements adopted by the Commission consistent with K-12 student academic content standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undergraduate level</li> <li>• Integrated/simultaneous with teacher preparation curriculum</li> </ul>
Professional preparation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graduate level (other than for blended/integrated)</li> <li>• Primary focus on professional teaching knowledge</li> <li>• Lesser focus on subject-specific pedagogical knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undergraduate level, integrates both professional teaching knowledge and subject-specific pedagogical knowledge</li> <li>• May be Graduate level</li> </ul>
Allowable majors for prospective teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must be Arts and Sciences, undergraduate Education major not allowed</li> <li>• Typically, focus is solely on subject matter content and there is no integration of teaching methodology with subject matter content except in integrated/blended programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typically undergraduate Education major</li> <li>• Typically undergraduate work blends teaching methodology with subject matter content</li> </ul>
Relationship between subject matter faculty and education faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Typically no relationship unless specifically cultivated by a particular institution or program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitates an integrated approach with both subject matter and education faculty</li> </ul>
Time frame for teacher preparation (prior to SB 5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific time limit on obtaining a baccalaureate</li> <li>• One-year limit on teacher preparation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific time limit – typically a four-year undergraduate experience leading to a degree and credential</li> </ul>

Unlike other states, California prohibits a prospective teacher from completing an undergraduate major in Education. In states where an undergraduate Education major may be earned, the candidate completes the requirements for a college degree at the same time as completing the pedagogical preparation to be a teacher. A benefit of an Education major is that the School or

College of Education may have up to four years to work with the candidate and can carefully integrate the content and pedagogical preparation. A challenge within this approach is to make sure that the candidate has a fully robust preparation in both the actual content to be taught to K-12 students in alignment with the state's adopted student academic content standards and the pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities required to be an effective teacher in that content area.

California, however, has focused its policy on assuring that candidates have a robust preparation in terms of the content that they will be responsible for teaching to K-12 students. This is a primary rationale for why California requires candidates to complete a bachelor's degree in an arts and science area, which has led to the separation, quite often, of subject matter preparation from teacher preparation. This policy, however, has several perhaps unintended consequences, including:

- Promoting an artificial divide between Arts and Sciences faculty and faculty in the School/College of Education, both of which are working with the same credential candidates but mostly or entirely in isolation (see further discussion below on this topic).
- Increased pressure on teacher preparation programs to address subject-specific pedagogical knowledge in a sufficiently robust manner to ensure that candidates can teach their subjects well, an aspect of preparation that competes with other important aspects of preparation, like student teaching, in what has been a one-year preparation experience.
- Preparation of future teachers who learn their subject matter in isolation from considerations about how the subject matter content would appropriately be taught to K-12 students.
- With the advent of the Common Core Standards, candidates need multiple, continuous opportunities to develop cross-disciplinary understandings that enable them to apply what they know to complex problem solving. The current, siloed structure of preparation does not support this level and type of knowledge and skill development for future teachers.

Most Commission-approved teacher preparation programs are post-baccalaureate programs wherein the individual first completes his/her undergraduate degree then applies to a postgraduate credential program. Within this preparation paradigm, there is often no relationship between what happens in an undergraduate subject matter preparation experience and what subsequently happens in a teacher preparation program where candidates are expected to learn the pedagogically-appropriate methods of teaching that content to K-12 students, nor is there any logical connection or incentive for collaboration between the two different faculties.

One way that California has attempted to design an approach that would bridge this artificial divide is the blended/integrated program delivery option. California's Education Code, §44259.1 (Appendix A), provides an option for Commission-approved institutions to offer programs where the subject matter content preparation is integrated with the pedagogical preparation. The requirement is that the Commission not "...compromise or reduce its standards of subject matter preparation...or its standards of profession preparation..." for these integrated programs. The

Education Code specifically requires the California State University (CSU) system to develop these concurrent programs and requires the CSU to work with the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to ensure that lower division coursework completed at a community college is articulated with the corresponding coursework at a CSU campus and that the articulated coursework be accepted as equivalent to the coursework completed by candidates who complete an integrated program at a CSU campus.

As it turns out, however, a blended or integrated teacher preparation program is not an easy type of program to design or to operate. Initially, at the time that the SB 2042 teacher preparation program standards were written and implemented, there was federal funding available to promote the development of blended/integrated programs. A number of institutions stepped up to this challenge. What they found, however, was a number of structural issues that made developing and implementing this type of program complex and difficult. Among these were:

- To meet the statutory expectation that the agency not reduce its standards for these programs, the Commission required that the institution have a Commission-approved subject matter program in each content area along with a Commission-approved teacher preparation program (this requirement meant a significant amount of work for a program to write responses to both sets of program standards simultaneously and to comply with both sets of program standards once approved). This requirement alone was sufficiently daunting that some programs never completed the dual program approval process.
- The requirement that Arts and Sciences faculty work collaboratively with Education faculty in a manner that would provide integrated subject matter and pedagogical subject matter preparation to candidates simultaneously with general teacher preparation over a four to five year period of time. This type of collaborative approach, involving many faculty members from different departments, does not happen overnight. It takes cultivation and practice, and sometimes the effort involved was too challenging to ensure a seamless program experience for candidates. Not surprisingly, in many cases the Arts and Sciences faculty had concerns that including preparation to be a teacher within the undergraduate courses leading towards the four year degree would mean that the candidate would not have sufficient room in his or her class schedule for some of the courses required for the major.
- Prior to the passage of SB 2210 in 2004 and SB 1209 in 2006, an individual was required to have completed a minimum of 30 units after earning a bachelor's degree as one of the requirements for the Clear Teaching Credential. Institutions that offered teacher preparation in a blended or integrated model found that the individuals had to take additional courses to meet the requirement of 30 units after earning a bachelor's degree. This requirement is no longer in place so it would not be an impediment for a blended or integrated program now or in the future.
- Issues outside of the program that nonetheless affected candidate choices. For example, school districts typically offer salary schedule incentives for units beyond the bachelor's degree. Candidates who completed blended/integrated undergraduate programs were not likely to have these units, and so would see participation in a blended/integrated program as detrimental to their future potential earnings as compared to a candidate who

completed a graduate level traditional teacher preparation program and began teaching with as many as perhaps 30 or more graduate level units to their credit.

The Commission has not kept track of which institutions offer an integrated delivery model as part of the preliminary teacher preparation program. No certification is required to be held by an individual participating in an integrated program, unlike an intern who must hold an intern credential. The individual who completes the teacher preparation program through an integrated delivery model earns a Preliminary Teaching Credential as do all other candidates who complete the preparation program through a student teaching or intern delivery model. Since no distinct credential is required during the program nor awarded at the completion of the program, the Commission has not monitored where these programs are offered or how many candidates complete teacher preparation in this manner.

Although the definition of an integrated program in the Education Code is when one institution operates both a Commission-approved subject matter program, which waives the requirement that the individual pass a content examination, and a Commission-approved preliminary teacher preparation program, institutions offer a variety of what they call blended programs that may or may not meet the strict definition of “integrated” as specified in statute. The following are some examples of how institutions blend teacher preparation:

- Blending general education, usually Multiple Subject, teacher preparation with preparation as an Education Specialist teacher. The candidate earns both a Preliminary Multiple Subject teaching credential as well as an Education Specialist teaching credential, usually in Mild/Moderate.
- Blending general education teacher preparation closely with undergraduate content courses but the content courses are not part of a Commission-approved subject matter program. The rationale for these blended programs is that the candidate has a better understanding of how to teach a specific content area if pedagogical preparation is integrated with and learned alongside the content courses. These candidates must still pass the content examination to satisfy the subject matter requirement and earn a Preliminary teaching credential at the conclusion of the program.
- Blending Multiple and Single Subject teacher preparation so the candidate completes the preparation program at the institution and earns both a Multiple Subject and Single Subject credential.
- Blending preparation for a Preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject or Education Specialist teaching credential with preparation to teach bilingually. At the completion of the blended programs the individual would be eligible for both a Multiple or Single Subject teaching credential as well as a Bilingual Authorization.

In order to gather more updated and comprehensive information about the range of program options currently being implemented across the state, a survey of all Commission-approved general education and special education preliminary programs could be conducted to gather baseline information about what the programs are currently doing, ask if the institutions are considering offering additional programs in a blended or integrated delivery model and if there is

assistance required that the Commission could provide. If such a survey were to be conducted, staff could then report back to the Commission at a later date with information on the range and variety of blended programs operating in California. If the Commission would like information on which institutions offer preliminary preparation through a blended or integrated delivery model, this survey could allow this information to be posted and available on the Commission's web page.

### **Next Steps**

This item has been presented for information and Commission discussion. If so directed by the Commission, staff could organize discussions with the field and/or move forward in another manner to support the effective implementation of SB 5 and explore more fully the ways in which teacher preparation can maximize the integration of the undergraduate and post-graduate experience.

## **Appendix A**

### **Integrated Programs**

44259.1

(a) (1) An integrated program of professional preparation shall enable candidates for teaching credentials to engage in professional preparation, concurrently with subject matter preparation, while completing baccalaureate degrees at regionally accredited postsecondary institutions. An integrated program shall provide opportunities for candidates to complete intensive field experiences in public elementary and secondary schools early in the undergraduate sequence. The development and implementation of an integrated program shall be based on intensive collaboration among subject matter departments and education units within postsecondary institutions and local public elementary and secondary school districts.

(2) The commission shall encourage postsecondary institutions to offer integrated programs of professional preparation that follow the guidelines developed pursuant to this section. In approving integrated programs, the commission shall not compromise or reduce its standards of subject matter preparation pursuant to Article 6 (commencing with Section 44310) or its standards of professional preparation pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 44259.

(b)(1) Commencing with the 2005–06 school year, an integrated program offered by the California State University shall be designed to concurrently lead to a preliminary multiple subject or single subject teaching credential, and a baccalaureate degree. Recommendation for each shall be contingent upon satisfactory completion of the requirements for each.

(2) By July 1, 2004, the Chancellor of the California State University, in consultation with California State University faculty members, shall develop a framework defining appropriate balance for an integrated program of general education, subject matter preparation, and professional education courses, for both lower division and upper division students, including an appropriate range of units to be taken in professional education courses. In developing the framework, the Chancellor of the California State University and California State University faculty members shall consult with the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges on matters related to the effective and efficient use of, and appropriate role for, lower division coursework in an integrated program.

(c)(1) By January 1, 2005, the Chancellor of the California State University and the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges shall collaboratively ensure that both of the following occur:

(A) Lower division coursework completed by a community college student transferring to a California State University integrated program is articulated with the corresponding coursework of the California State University.

(B) The articulated community college lower division coursework is accepted as the equivalent to the coursework offered to students who enter that integrated program as freshman students.

(2) Commencing with the 2005–06 school year, each campus of the California State University shall invite the community colleges in its region that send significant numbers of transfer students to that campus to enter into articulation agreements. These articulation agreements shall be based on a fully transferable education curriculum that is developed pursuant to the framework developed under paragraph (2) of subdivision (b). Approval of one or more of the articulation agreements will enable the coursework of a community college student to be accepted as the equivalent to the coursework offered to students who enter that integrated program as freshman students.

(d) A postbaccalaureate program of professional preparation shall enable candidates for teaching credentials to commence and complete professional preparation after they have completed baccalaureate degrees at regionally accredited institutions. The development and implementation of a postbaccalaureate program of professional preparation shall be based on intensive collaboration among the postsecondary institution and local public elementary and secondary school districts.

## **Appendix B**

### **Multiple and Single Subject Preliminary Preparation**

44259.

(a) Except as provided in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b), each program of professional preparation for multiple or single subject teaching credentials shall not include more than two years of full-time study of professional preparation.

(b) The minimum requirements for the preliminary multiple or single subject teaching credential are all of the following:

(1) A baccalaureate degree or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of postsecondary education. Except as provided in subdivision (c) of Section 44227, the baccalaureate degree shall not be in professional education. The commission shall encourage accredited institutions to offer undergraduate minors in education and special education to students who intend to become teachers.

(2) Passage of the state basic skills proficiency test that is developed and administered by the commission pursuant to Section 44252.5.

(3) Satisfactory completion of a program of professional preparation that has been accredited by the Committee on Accreditation on the basis of standards of program quality and effectiveness that have been adopted by the commission. In accordance with the commission's assessment and performance standards, each program shall include a teaching performance assessment as set forth in Section 44320.2 that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The commission shall ensure that each candidate recommended for a credential or certificate has demonstrated satisfactory ability to assist pupils to meet or exceed academic content and performance standards for pupils adopted by the state board pursuant to Section 60605. Programs that meet this requirement for professional preparation shall include any of the following:

(A) Integrated programs of subject matter preparation and professional preparation pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44259.1.

(B) Postbaccalaureate programs of professional preparation, pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 44259.1.

(C) Internship programs of professional preparation, pursuant to Section 44321, Article 7.5 (commencing with Section 44325), Article 11 (commencing with Section 44380), and Article 3 (commencing with Section 44450) of Chapter 3.

(4) Study of alternative methods of developing English language skills, including the study of reading as described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), among all pupils, including those for whom English is a second language, in accordance with the commission's standards of program quality and effectiveness. The study of reading shall meet the following requirements:

(A) Commencing January 1, 1997, 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.
- (ii) A strong literature, language, and comprehension component with a balance of oral and written language.
- (iii) Ongoing diagnostic techniques that inform teaching and assessment.
- (iv) Early intervention techniques.
- (v) Guided practice in a clinical setting.

(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). A program for the multiple subjects credential also shall include the study of integrated methods of teaching language arts.

(5) Completion of a subject matter program that has been approved by the commission on the basis of standards of program quality and effectiveness pursuant to Article 6 (commencing with Section 44310) or passage of a subject matter examination pursuant to Article 5 (commencing with Section 44280). The commission shall ensure that subject matter standards and examinations are aligned with the academic content and performance standards for pupils adopted by the state board pursuant to Section 60605.

(6) Demonstration of knowledge of the principles and provisions of the Constitution of the United States pursuant to Section 44335.

(7) Commencing January 1, 2000, demonstration, in accordance with the commission’s standards of program quality and effectiveness, of basic competency in the use of computers in the classroom as determined by one of the following:

(A) Successful completion of a commission-approved program or course.

(B) Successful passage of an assessment that is developed, approved, and administered by the commission.