

Agenda

California
Commission on
Teacher Credentialing

January 6-8, 1999
Commission Offices
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814-4213

Some of the agenda items are available for viewing on the web.

Click on the  to view the items that are available.

WEDNESDAY, January 6, 1999

Commission Office

Executive Committee (Chair Norton)

3:00 p.m.

- EXEC-1 Approval of the December 2, 1998 Executive Committee Minutes
- EXEC-2 Commission Committee Chair Appointments
- EXEC-3 Approval of Proposed Revision to Policy Manual Section 322
- EXEC-4 Consideration of Commission Meeting Dates for 1999

THURSDAY, January 7, 1999

Commission Office

1. General Session (Chair Norton)

8:00 a.m.

- GS-1 Roll Call
- GS-2 Pledge of Allegiance
- GS-3 Approval of the December 1998, Minutes
- GS-4 Approval of the January Agenda
- GS-5 Approval of the January Consent Calendar
- GS-6 Annual Calendar of Events
- GS-7 Chair's Report
- GS-8 Executive Director's Report
- GS-9 Report on Monthly State Board Meeting

2. Fiscal Planning and Policy Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Veneman)



- FPPC-1 Final Report on the Consolidation of Commission's Offices

3. Preparation Planning & Policy Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Sutro)



- PREP-1 Approval of Subject Matter Programs by Colleges and Universities



- PREP-2 A Plan for the Evaluation of the Accreditation Framework, and Accreditation Procedures



- PREP-3 Approval of Plan to Issue 1999-2000 Teaching Internship Requests for Proposals



- PREP-4 Pre-Internship Grant Program Implementation and Expansion In 1998-1999

4. Performance Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Katzman)



- PERF-1 RICA Video Performance Assessment: Scoring and Score Reporting for Candidates who Submit One or More Video Packets That Do Not Meet Requirements

**PERF-2**

The California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST): A Progress Report

5. Public Hearing**1:30 p.m.**

Proposed Amendment to Section 80049 and Addition of Section 80049.1 of Title 5 Regulations Pertaining to Requirements and Authorizations for Pupil Personnel Services Credentials

6. Appeals and Waivers Committee (Committee Chair Harvey)**A&W-1** Approval of the Minutes**A&W-2** Reconsideration of Waiver Denials**A&W-3** Waivers: Consent Calendar**A&W-4** Waivers: Conditions Calendar**A&W-5** Waivers: Denials Calendar**FRIDAY, January 8, 1999****7. Closed Session - Closed (Chair Norton)****8:00 a.m.**

(The Commission will meet in Closed Session pursuant to California Government Code Section 11126 as well as California Education Code Sections 44245 and 44248)

8. Credentials and Certificated Assignments Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Dauterive)**C&CA-1** Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Regulations Related to Examination Score Validity**C&CA-2** Proposed Amendments and Additions to Title 5 Regulations Concerning Administrative Services Credentials and Teachers Serving in Non-Instructional Assignments**9. Reconvene General Session (Chair Norton)****GS-10** Report on the Appeals and Waivers Committee**GS-11** Report of Closed Session Items**GS-12** Report of the Executive Committee**GS-13** Commissioners Reports**GS-14** Audience Presentations**GS-15** Old Business

•Quarterly Agenda for January, February & March 1999

GS-16 New Business**GS-17** Adjournment

| [Back to the Top](#) |
 | [Return to About CTC](#) |
 | [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: January 6-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-1

Committee: Fiscal Planning and Policy

Title: Update on the Consolidation of Commission's Offices

✓ Information

Prepared by: LeMardieo Morris, Analyst
Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

At the December 1998 meeting of the Fiscal Planning and Policy Committee of the Whole, Commissioners were provided with information regarding the status of the effort to consolidate and relocate the Commission's offices.

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

The activities associated with the preparation and presentation of this item are included in the baseline budget for the Fiscal and Business Services Section. Therefore, no funding augmentation is needed for this item.

SUMMARY

Staff completed the move to the 1900 Capitol Avenue facility on December 4, 1998, and has observed that the building renovations are complete with the exception of a few minor adjustments.

A FINAL PROJECT SCHEDULE is attached for you information and convenience.

	Milestones	CCTC Hours	Target Date	Actual Date	Comments
Phase 1	PRELIMINARY WORK-CCTC	240	7/1/96	3/1/96	Preparation of 4083s (Questionnaire and Needs Assessment)
T1	Project Started (Assigned to DGS)	N/A	1/8/97	1/22/97	Delay due to holiday schedule
T4	Project Schedule Complete	16	10/23/97	10/23/97	
T2	Program Completed by DGS		1/6/97	4/4/97	
T3	Form 10 Filed	80	1/7/97	7/7/97	1/7/97; 1st revision; Final revision 7/7/97
Phase 2	SITE SELECTION (Advertisement)	80	7/28/97	7/28/97	
T5	Site Search Completed	16	8/20/97	8/20/97	
Phase 3	PLANNING				
T6	Meeting with Space Planner	14	10/23/97	10/23/97	
	Conducted Initial Meeting with Staff Reps.	28	10/31/97	10/31/97	
	Review 1st Draft (Senior Staff)	10	11/12/97	11/12/97	
	Review 1st Draft (Staff Reps. and Space Planner)	28	11/14/97	11/14/97	
	Review 2nd Draft of Building Diagram (Senior Staff)	20	11/26/97	12/10/97	
	Review 2nd Draft of Building Diagram (Staff Reps)	60	12/1/97	12/10/97	
	Review Options for Comm. Mtg. Rm (Ad Hoc Committee)	8	12/5/97	12/5/97	
	Prepare 3rd Draft of Building Diagram (Space Planner)	16	12/12/97	12/11/97	
	Review 3rd Draft (Staff Reps)	14	12/15/97	12/17/97	

	Review 3rd Draft (Senior Staff)	5	12/22/97	12/17/97	
	Review Final Rough Draft (Ad Hoc Committee)	8	12/29/97	12/29/97	
	Review Final Rough Draft (Staff Reps)	14	1/5/98	1/21/98	
	Review Final Rough Draft (Senior Staff)	5	1/5/98	1/21/98	
	Plan Approval (Senior Staff)	5	1/5/98	1/21/98	
	CCTC Recommended Requirements to DGS	8	2/11/98	2/11/98	
	Preliminary Review of Recommended Requirements (DGS)	4	2/18/98	2/18/98	
	Preliminary Review of Recommended Requirements (Owner)	4	2/18/98	2/18/98	
	Plan Approval (DGS) (CCTC) (Owner)	4	3/2/98	4/6/98	
	Modular Furniture Design (CCTC) to DGS	40	4/6/98	4/6/98	
	Modular Furniture Designs to PIA		5/4/98	8/12/98	
	Modular Furniture Designs Returned to DGS		6/24/98	8/19/98	
	Modular Furniture Designs Returned to CCTC		6/26/98	8/19/98	
	Designs Including Revisions to DGS	20	5/11/98	8/21/98	Revised target date - 8/21/98
	Designs Including Revisions from DGS to PIA		7/1/98	8/24/98	
	Final Approval of PIA Drawings Via DGS	8	5/25/98	8/24/98	Revised target date - 8/24/98
	Purchase Order for Modular Furniture	2	6/8/98	8/26/98	
	Delivery of Modular Furniture		8/3/98	10/19/98	Revised target date - 10/19/98
	Installation of Modular Furniture	80	8/10/98	11/16/98	Revised target date - 11/16/98
Phase 4	NEGOTIATIONS/BID				
T7	Lease Execution		4/13/98	7/8/98	
	Approval of Exhibit "A":	32	5/26/98	7/8/98	
	Completion of Form 6	4	5/29/98	7/8/98	
Phase 5	CONSTRUCTION/NOTIFICATION				
T8	Pre-construction Meeting (Owner)		4/13/98	7/15/98	
	Construction to Begin (Owner)		5/1/98	9/8/98	
	Notice of Written Cancellation				
	1100 J Street (DGS)		5/31/98	7/9/98	90 day written notice
	1812 9th Street (DGS)		7/31/98	7/14/98	60 day written notice
Phase 6	OCCUPANCY				
T9	Phase 1 (CCTC-DPP)	320	9/1/98	12/3/98	1100 J Street - Revised target date 12/03/98
	Phase 2 (CCTC - All Other Divisions)	720	10/1/98	12/3-4/98	1812 9th Street - Revised target date 12/03/98
	Acceptance (CCTC)	8	9/1/98	12/3-4/98	1900 Capitol Avenue - Revised target date 12/03/98
T10	Project Close Out (CCTC & DGS)	8	12/14/98	1/1/99	Revised target date 1/1/99
	Totals	1,929			



[Back to the Top](#) |
[Back to January 1999 Agenda](#) |
[Back to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: January 6-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-1

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs by Colleges and Universities

✓ Action

Prepared by: Larry Birch, Ed.D., Administrator
Professional Services Division

Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs by Colleges and Universities

Professional Services Division
December 15, 1998

Executive Summary

This item contains a listing of subject matter programs recommended for approval by the appropriate review panels, according to procedures adopted by the Commission.

Fiscal Impact Summary

The Professional Services Division is responsible for reviewing proposed preparation programs, consulting with external reviewers, as needed, and communicating with institutions and local education agencies about their program proposals. The Commission budget supports the costs of these activities. No augmentation of the budget will be needed for continuation of the program review and approval activities.

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the subject matter preparation programs recommended in this item.

Background

Subject Matter Program Review Panels are responsible for the review of proposed subject matter preparation programs. This item contains a listing of subject matter programs recommended for approval since the last Commission meeting by the appropriate review panels, according to procedures adopted by the Commission.

Summary Information on Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs Awaiting Commission Approval

For the following proposed preparation programs, each institution has responded fully to the Commission's standards and preconditions for subject matter preparation for Single Subject Teaching Credentials. Each of the programs has been reviewed thoroughly by the Commission's Subject Matter Program Review Panels, and has met all applicable standards and preconditions established by the Commission and are recommended for approval by the appropriate subject matter review panel.

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the following programs of subject matter preparation for Single Subject Teaching Credentials.

Art

- California State University, Bakersfield

English

- University of Southern California

Languages Other Than English

- California State University, Chico
(Spanish)

Music

- California State University, Los Angeles
- California State University, Stanislaus
- San Jose State University

Physical Education

- Chapman University
 - Point Loma Nazarene University
 - San Diego State University
 - San Francisco State University (Dance Emphasis)
-



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to January 1999 Agenda](#) |
| [Back to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: January 6-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-2

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: A Plan for the Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework* and Accreditation Procedures

✓ Action

Prepared by: Phil Fitch, Ed.D., Consultant
Professional Services Division

A Plan for the Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework* and Accreditation Procedures

Professional Services Division

December 15, 1998

Executive Summary

The purpose of this agenda item is to request Commission approval of an evaluation plan that has been endorsed by the Committee on Accreditation. The plan calls for an independent contractor to complete a comprehensive formative and summative evaluation of the accreditation policies set forth in Sections 1 - 7 of the *Accreditation Framework* and the accreditation procedures adopted by the Commission and the COA. Upon adoption of the evaluation plan, a "Request for Proposal" (RFP) will be prepared to advise prospective applicants that the COA and CCTC are seeking proposals from public and private entities. The contractor will be required to produce a formative and summative report on (a) early and ongoing information, suggestions and recommendations regarding the *Accreditation Framework* and its early implementation, and will provide (b) comprehensive information collected over a period of time that assures that the major features of the new accreditation process have been well tested.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

How can the Commission, working jointly with the Committee on Accreditation, provide the most cost-effective and substantial review and evaluation of the policies that are provided in the *Accreditation Framework* and evaluation of the accreditation procedures that have been adopted and implemented by the COA?

Fiscal Impact Summary

In July, 1997 the Commission approved a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to provide resources for the evaluation of the Accreditation Framework. The BCP was submitted to the Department of finance as a budget augmentation starting in the 1998-99 fiscal year. The augmentation was approved by the Department of Finance and approved by the Legislature and the Governor in the Spring of 1998.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the members of the Commission review and discuss the proposed COA endorsed plan for the evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*. Staff further recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed evaluation plan.

Previous Actions by the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation

At the April 16-17, 1997 meeting of the Committee on Accreditation, an action agenda item was reviewed regarding the evaluation of both the accreditation policies provided in the *Accreditation Framework* and the accreditation procedures that have been established by the COA since its first meeting in April, 1995. The agenda item provided the COA with a scope of work for the "formative" and "summative" evaluation activities for an external contractor. The action item also included a staff recommendation to have the COA request that the Commission develop a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) to fund the adopted evaluation plan.

The COA directed staff to discuss the item and proposed action with the Executive Director, and then at the direction of the Executive Director to prepare such a BCP. Staff presented a BCP Concept Paper to the Commission at the July, 1997 meeting of the Commission. The Commission acted to have staff prepare a BCP to propose a budget augmentation to the Department of Finance starting in the 1998-99 fiscal year.

The BCP called for a budget augmentation of \$125,000 per year over a period of four years for a total of \$500,000. The Department of Finance approved the BCP and the Governor placed the budget augmentation in the Budget Bill for 1998-99, which was approved by the Legislature and signed by the Governor in August, 1998. In October 1998, staff presented the evaluation plan to the COA and it was adopted. Staff is now bringing the COA endorsed evaluation plan including an extended "scope of work" to the Commission for consideration and adoption.

Background

The *Accreditation Framework* was prepared by the Accreditation Advisory Council and the Professional Services Division of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing pursuant to Senate Bill 148 by Senator Marian Bergeson (Chapter 1455, Statutes of 1988). On May 7, 1993, the Commission adopted the *Accreditation Framework* for subsequent implementation under Senate Bill 655 (Bergeson, Chapter 426, Statutes of 1993), which became effective on January 1, 1994.

The *Framework* addresses the accreditation of colleges and universities that prepare teachers and other educators for professional state certification in California. Accreditation is an *assurance of quality* in the preparation of professional educators, and is, therefore, important to the Commission, the education profession, the general public, and the accredited institutions.

Sections 1 through 8 of *The Framework* are based on California Education Code Sections 443709 through 44374.

Section 8, *Evaluation and Modification of the Framework*, governs the evaluation and modification of the *Accreditation Framework*. The three pertinent portions of Section 8 are stated below.

- A. **Evaluation Design.** The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation are jointly responsible, in consultation with educational institutions and organizations, for (1) the design of a comprehensive evaluation of (a) accreditation policies and (b) their implementation; and (2) for the selection of an independent evaluator to conduct the evaluation.
- B. **Formative and Summative Evaluation.** The evaluation design will include formative components to produce early and ongoing information and suggestions about the *Accreditation Framework* and its implementation. The design will also include summative components. The evaluation will include an appropriate sample of institutions and accreditation options, and will be based on comprehensive information collected over a period of time that assures that the major features of the accreditation process have been well tested. It is expected that the formative and summative evaluation will be conducted over a four-year time span, beginning when the first institution is reviewed in accordance with this *Framework*.
- C. **Evaluation Report and Recommendations.** A comprehensive evaluation report and recommendations will be presented to the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation for their consideration. Among other policy issues, the evaluator will recommend whether Option 3 (General Program Standards) should serve, in addition to Option 1 (California Program Standards), as a basis for determining the comparability of standards under Options 2 or 5.

Accreditation Responsibilities of the CCTC and the COA

Responsibilities of the Commission Related to Accreditation Policies

Pertaining to the accreditation of educator preparation, the authority and responsibilities of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are found in Education Code Section 44372 (a-f) and described in the *Accreditation Framework*.

1. **Adopt and Modify the *Accreditation Framework*.** The Commission has the authority and responsibility to adopt an

Accreditation Framework, "which sets forth the policies of the Commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation in California." The Commission may modify the *Framework*. Modifications occur in public meetings after the Commission considers relevant information provided by the Committee on Accreditation, institutions, accreditation team members, the Commission's staff, and other concerned individuals. The Commission determines when a policy modification takes effect.

2. **Establish and Modify Standards for Educator Preparation.** The Commission has the authority and responsibility to establish and modify standards for educator preparation in California.
3. **Initial Accreditation of Institutions.** The Commission determines the eligibility of an institution that applies for initial accreditation and that has not previously prepared educators for state certification in California. The Commission accredits institutions that meet the criteria that have been adopted for that purpose by the Commission. Institutional accreditation by the Commission establishes the eligibility of an institution to submit specific program proposals to the Committee on Accreditation.
4. **Allocate Resources Annually for Accreditation Operations.** The Commission annually allocates resources for accreditation operations to implement this *Accreditation Framework*. Consistent with the Commission's general practice, staff assignments to accreditation operations are made by the Executive Director, in accordance with state budgets, laws, and regulations.
5. **Jointly Sponsor an External Evaluation of Accreditation Policies and Practices.** The Commission shares responsibility with the Committee on Accreditation for the design and implementation of a comprehensive evaluation of accreditation policies and the selection of an external evaluator to conduct the evaluation, pursuant to Section 8 of the *Accreditation Framework*.
6. **Review and Sponsor Legislation Related to Accreditation.** The Commission reviews legislative proposals to amend the Education Code related to the accreditation of educator preparation institutions. As the need arises, the Commission sponsors legislation related to accreditation, after considering the advice of the Commission's professional staff, the Committee on Accreditation, educational institutions, and professional organizations.

Responsibilities of the Committee on Accreditation

The responsibilities, functions, membership, and appointment of the Committee on Accreditation are set forth in Education Code Section 44373 (a-c) and described in the *Accreditation Framework*.

1. **Comparability of Standards.** The Committee determines whether standards submitted by institutions under Option 2 (National or Professional Program Standards) or Option 5 (Alternative Program Standards), taken as a whole, provide a level of program quality comparable to standards adopted by the Commission under Option 1 (California Program Standards). If the Committee determines that the proposed standards are collectively comparable in breadth and depth, when taken as a whole, to the Commission-adopted standards, the Committee on Accreditation may approve the proposed standards as Program Standards in California.
2. **Initial Accreditation of Programs.** The Committee reviews proposals for the initial accreditation of programs submitted by institutions that have been determined eligible by the Commission. New programs of educator preparation may be submitted under Options One, Two, Four, or Five in Section 3 of the *Accreditation Framework*. If the Committee determines that a program meets all applicable standards, the Committee grants initial accreditation to the program.
3. **Continuing Accreditation Decisions.** After reviewing the recommendations of accreditation teams and the responses of institutions, the Committee makes decisions about the continuing accreditation of educator preparation institutions and programs, consistent with Section 6 of the *Accreditation Framework*. Pertaining to each institution, the Committee makes one of three decisions: Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, or Denial of Accreditation.
4. **Accreditation Procedures.** The Committee recommends appropriate guidelines for self-study reports and other accreditation materials and exhibits to be prepared by the institutions. The Committee also adopts guidelines for accreditation team reports, which emphasize the use of narrative, qualitative explanations of team recommendations. The Committee may provide additional guidance to institutions, teams, and the Executive Director regarding accreditation visit procedures. The procedural guidelines of the Committee are published by the Commission as an *Accreditation Handbook*.
5. **Monitor the Accreditation System.** The Committee monitors the performance of accreditation teams and oversees other activities associated with the accreditation system.
6. **Annual Reports, Recommendations, and Responses.** The Committee presents *Annual Accreditation Reports* to the Commission. *Annual Reports* include standard information about the dimensions and results of the accreditation process. The Committee also advises the Commission about policy changes to improve the quality and integrity of the accreditation process.
7. **Meet in Public Sessions.** The Committee conducts its business and makes its decisions in meetings that are open to the public, except as provided by statute.
8. **Jointly Sponsor an External Evaluation of Accreditation Policies and Practices.** The Committee shares responsibility with the Commission for the design and implementation of a comprehensive evaluation of accreditation policies and the selection of an external evaluator to conduct the evaluation, pursuant to Section 8 of the *Framework*.

Proposed Plan for Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*

Criteria for Evaluating the Accreditation System

When the Committee on Accreditation was formed according to the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*, this policy document set forth the purposes, functions and attributes of an excellent system of professional accreditation in education. These provisions of the *Accreditation Framework* are summarized on the next page.

Four Goals, Purposes and Functions of a Professional Accreditation System (Pages 3-4 of the *Accreditation Framework*)

- Assure the public, students in the schools, and professional educators that future educators have access to excellence in professional preparation and *practica* in education, and that these components of educator preparation are oriented to the educational needs of future elementary and secondary school students. By integrating accreditation with professional certification, policymakers can ensure that educator preparation is responsive to the critical dynamic needs of elementary and secondary schools.
- Ensure that future educators have actually acquired abilities and perspectives that are essential for fulfilling specified professional responsibilities such as teaching and other services in schools. Professional accreditation contributes to such an assurance by ascertaining and verifying that each candidate's growing competence is assessed and confirmed by an accredited institution.
- Verify that each educator's specialized preparation and attainments are appropriate for the authorization(s) of the credential(s) being sought by the candidate. Assuring the appropriateness of professional preparation for future responsibilities is a function of accreditation within a broader system of professional certification.
- Contribute to broader efforts to enhance the personal stature and professional standing of teachers and other educators as members of a profession that has a strong base of specialized knowledge and a demonstrated record of accountability in the preparation and competence of each new member. A significant objective of professional accreditation is to foster needed improvements in the design, content and delivery of professional curricula and *practica*, and in the selection, guidance, supervision and assessment of candidates.

Seven Attributes of Excellence in a Professional Accreditation System (Pages 5-7 of the *Accreditation Framework*)

- *Orientation to Educational Quality.* Accreditation policies and practices should focus primarily on the *educational quality* of educator preparation programs. Accreditation standards, reviews and decisions should focus on *significant aspects* of quality, and should be designed and implemented to foster *excellence* in the professional preparation of future educators.
- *Professional Character of Accreditation.* Throughout all phases of an accreditation process, professional educators should hold themselves and their peers accountable for excellence in professional education. Accreditation policies and practices should draw primarily on the professional expertise of participants in the process. Accreditation decisions should draw primarily from consultative procedures leading to consensus judgments on the part of professional participants.
- *Breadth and Flexibility.* Accreditation standards should be drafted so the sponsors of preparation programs can meet the standards in multiple excellent ways. Without stipulating *how* the sponsors of preparation should carry out their functions, accreditation standards should describe *how well* they fulfill these functions. Accreditation should be restrictive only by precluding or minimizing the use of poor or substandard practices in professional education.
- *Intensity in Accreditation.* Accreditation reviews should be intensive in addressing issues of quality, should be comprehensive in addressing the full scope of the standards, and should yield sufficient information for reliable judgments and conclusions. Accreditation decisions should be based on reliable information that is sufficient in breadth and depth for the results to be accurate and credible.
- *Integration with the Certification System.* In policy and practice, accreditation should function consistently with the system of professional certification in education. Accreditation decisions about the sponsors of programs should parallel the kinds of decisions to be made about individual educators in the certification system. Accreditation decisions should coincide with the authorizations of credentials to serve in the public schools.
- *Contributions to Improved Preparation Programs.* Accreditation standards, reviews and decisions should contribute to improvements in the professional preparation of educators. The policies, practices and outcomes of a sponsor's programs should improve in quality as the sponsors strive to meet accreditation standards. Candidates for credentials should have access to preparation offerings that continually improve as a result of the accreditation system.
- *Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness of the Accreditation System.* The professional accreditation system should fulfill its purposes efficiently and cost-effectively. Review procedures, decision processes and reporting relationships should be streamlined and economical. Participants' roles should be clearly defined, communications should be efficient, and reviewer training should be cost-effective.

In this recommended plan for evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*, the four purposes and seven attributes (above) in the *Framework* will serve as the primary bases for (1) determining what information and evidence to collect and compile, and (2)

making inferences and reaching conclusions about the success of the *Accreditation Framework* as well as needed changes in it.

Examples of Evaluation Questions

Following are examples of evaluation questions whose answers would enable the COA and the Commission to judge the success of the *Accreditation Framework* in terms of its original purposes, goals and attributes.

- How effectively does the new accreditation system provide authentic assurances that future educators have access to excellence in professional preparation in education? How could the system be strengthened in relation to this function?
- How effective has the accreditation system been, during its initial years, in providing credible assurances that educator preparation is responsive to the critical dynamic needs of elementary and secondary schools in California? Could the standards-based process be improved in this regard?
- To what extent have the accreditation reviews provided assurances that future educators are actually acquiring abilities and perspectives that they will need to carry out their subsequent responsibilities in public schools? What changes would make the accreditation reviews more credible in this area?
- Do the accreditation policies, including policies in the *Accreditation Framework*, support the need for verification that the specialized preparation and attainments of credential candidates are appropriately related to the authorizations of the credentials they are earning? Are there additional steps that would address this need more effectively?
- Is there a consistent pattern of credible evidence that participation in the accreditation system prompts the sponsors of preparation programs to improve those programs, either before or after their accreditation reviews? In what areas of preparation is this evidence most credible, and in which areas is it least credible?
- How well has the new system of professional accreditation embraced the orientation to educational quality that was described in the *Accreditation Framework*? Could this orientation be intensified? How?
- Is the new accreditation process functioning *professionally* as much and as well as possible? Are there ways in which the professional character of the process could be enhanced? What are they, and how would they work?
- In practice, is the new accreditation system embracing the values of breadth and flexibility as these were set forth in the *Framework*? Is the process so thoroughly infused with breadth and flexibility that substandard practices are overlooked or unreported? What could be done if this is happening?
- Has the new accreditation system begun to function with the intensity, comprehensiveness and reliability that the *Framework* envisioned? Are there specific ways in which the system's performance could be improved?
- Have institutional self-studies contributed to improvements in educator preparation, or have they inhibited improvements? What should be done?
- Have accreditation team reports contributed to improvements in educator preparation, or have they inhibited improvements? What should be done?
- Has the accreditation process been as efficient and cost-effective as possible? Without compromising the system's other functions or values, how could it be made more efficient and/or cost-effective?

As the evaluation plan is carried out, the independent contractor will be required to develop specific questions that are related to the specified purposes and attributes of the new accreditation system (pages 5-7), and will be required to submit an evaluation design that addresses those questions.

Scope of Work for an External Evaluation Contractor

Sections 1 and 2 of the *Accreditation Framework* provide the following language regarding a joint responsibility of the CCTC and the COA. The CCTC and the COA are to **"jointly sponsor an external evaluation of accreditation policies and practices."** The Committee on Accreditation shares responsibility with the Commission for the design and implementation of a comprehensive evaluation of accreditation policies and the selection of an external evaluator to conduct the evaluation, pursuant to Section 8 of *The Framework*.

As stated earlier, Section 8, *Evaluation and Modification of the Accreditation Framework*, governs the provisions for a full, comprehensive evaluation the *Accreditation Framework*. Following is a recommended scope of work for the evaluation contractor.

Scope of Work -- Phase I -- Formative Evaluation (April, 1995 to December 1, 1999)

According to the *Accreditation Framework*, "the evaluation design will include formative components to produce early and ongoing information and suggestions about the *Accreditation Framework* and its implementation."

1. Complete a review and analysis of the following areas of Section 2, *Functions and Appointment of the Committee on*

Accreditation.

- Comparability of Standards
- Initial Accreditation of Programs
- Continuing Accreditation Decisions
- Monitoring the Accreditation System
- Annual Reports, Recommendations, and Responses

2. Complete a review and analysis of the following two major categories of Section 3, *Accreditation Standards*.

- **Category 1: Common Standards**
Complete a review and analysis of the utilization of the eight Common Standards for all accreditation visits completed in 1997-98 and 1998-99. The contractor will review through Spring of 1999, the use of Common Standards by institutions in preparing the Institutional Self-Study Report, the impact of Common Standard Cluster Teams on Accreditation Team Reports, and the administration and organization of the "educational units" of institutions involved in accreditation visits from Fall 1997, through Spring 1999.
- **Category 2: Program Standards**
Complete a review and analysis of the five major options for the utilization of Program Standards for accreditation visits from Fall 1997, through Spring 1999. The contractor will review the number of times each option was selected and will obtain information regarding reasons for selection of the various options for accreditation visits. The contractor will interview institutional representatives, team members, CCTC Consultant staff, and other selected professionals as to the efficacy of using and preference of one set of program standards over other options.

3. Complete a review and analysis of Section 4, *Initial Accreditation Policies*, and the establishment of procedures by the COA for the initial accreditation of programs, including the review of new programs, the use of national or other professional program standards for initial accreditation, the utilization of alternative program standards, and the approval of experimental and alternative programs.
4. Complete a review and analysis of Section 5, *Continuing Accreditation Teams of the Accreditation Framework*. The review and analysis will include the membership of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR), the training of members of the BIR, the team structure for accreditation visits, team size, configuration, and expertise. The contractor will study and report on the use of team leaders; cluster team leaders; and team assignments, including Program Cluster Teams and Common Standards Cluster Teams.
5. Complete a review and analysis of Section 6, *Continuing Accreditation Policies* and the accreditation procedures adopted by the COA to implement continuing accreditation visits from Fall 1997 through Spring 1999. The contractor will review and analyze the creation and use of the *Accreditation Handbook*, including guidelines for "Institutional Self-Study Reports," the development and use of preliminary reports, and all procedures for continuing accreditation reviews. The contractor will give particular attention to the development of "Accreditation Team Reports," team recommendations, and accreditation decisions which includes team decisions for Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations, and Denial of Accreditation.
6. Complete a review and analysis of Section 7, *National Accreditation*. The contractor will review and analyze the efficacy of the renewed Partnership with NCATE, and the implementation of merged visits with NCATE teams at selected institutions in California. The contractor will also study and report on actions of the COA to implement procedures to use national accreditation visits in lieu of COA accreditation visits for selected credential program areas.

The Scope of Work for Phase I is to be a formative evaluation of accreditation policies stated in the *Accreditation Framework*, and the work of the COA since its first meeting in April, 1995, the accreditation procedures established by the COA and the implementation of these procedures.

The contractor's report for Phase I is to be formative in nature, including initial observations and suggestions for use by the COA and the Commission. The Phase I Report will be completed by December 1, 1999, and will be used, in part, to redirect the work of the contractor for Phase II and to assist the COA in making initial decisions regarding the potential need for changes in selected accreditation procedures. The Commission may use the Phase I Report as a basis for needed changes in accreditation policy.

Scope of the Work -- Phase II -- Formative and Summative Evaluation (December, 1999 to December, 2001)

According to the *Accreditation Framework*, "The evaluation design will include formative components to produce early and ongoing information and suggestions about the *Accreditation Framework* and its implementation. The design will also include summative components. The evaluation will include an appropriate sample of institutions and accreditation options, and will be based on comprehensive information collected over a period of time that assures that the major features of the accreditation process have been well tested. It is expected that the formative and summative evaluation will be conducted over a four-year

time span, beginning when the first evaluation is reviewed in accordance with the *Accreditation Framework*."

Phase II of the evaluation called for in this RFP will be based, in part, from the findings of the period of time for the formative evaluation work completed for Phase I, 1997-99. The period of time for the comprehensive evaluation of Phase II will be from December 1, 1999, to December 1, 2001. The comprehensive evaluation will include:

- The completion of a review and analysis, for formative and summative purposes, of the *Accreditation Framework* Section 2, Section 3, Section 4, Section 5, Section 6, and Section 7 as delineated in the Work Plan for Phase I.
- The completion of a review and analysis of the accreditation procedures that were established and implemented by the COA from April, 1995, to December, 1999.
- The completion of a study of the accreditation visits conducted by the COA at all institutions from December 1999, through December of 2001.
- The completion of a study of the establishment of the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR), the training of BIR members, assignment of team members, the use of Common Standards and Program Standards cluster teams, the substance of the team reports, and the actions of the COA regarding the team reports.

The contractor will prepare a final summative evaluation report for presentation to the COA and the CCTC. A draft of the report will be presented to the CCTC staff by December, 2001 and the report will be completed and submitted to the COA and CCTC by March 1, 2002.

Required Components of the Evaluation Design

To produce findings that are accurate and conclusions and recommendations that are credible, the evaluation will need to include the following components. The approved Budget Change Proposal was based on the anticipated cost of these components.

1. Each year, the contractor will be required to collect information at ten or more postsecondary education institutions and school districts that are scheduled for accreditation reviews pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*. The contractor will collect information by interviewing key institutional personnel, including deans of education, directors of teacher education, administrators of credential programs, professors of classes, supervisors of fieldwork, and individual candidates for credentials insofar as they are participants in the accreditation process. Depending on the size of credential programs at the campus, the number of institutional interviews will vary from five to fifty. The contractor will collect further information from each institution's report to the accreditation reviewers. In most instances, the contractor will collect the information *after* the accreditation review has taken place. In other cases, the contractor will do so *during* the period when the accreditation team is *at* the college or university. The contractor will be responsible for making all prior plans and arrangements for the collection of information.
2. Each year, the contractor will be required to collect information from accreditation teams who conduct the accreditation visits on behalf of the Committee on Accreditation. The contractor will interview the leader of each accreditation team, as well as a sampling (i.e. one to ten) of the other review team members. The contractor will collect further information from the accreditation report that is written by each team of reviewers. Most of the information from the team leaders and members will relate to the conduct of on-site reviews. Additionally, however, the contractor will be required to collect information from team leaders/members pertaining to the quality of the training they received as prospective members of accreditation teams. The contractor will be responsible for making all prior plans and arrangements for the collection of team leader/member information.
3. Each year, the contractor will need to attend and observe some meetings of the Committee on Accreditation. These one and one-half day meetings occur seven or eight times per year. The contractor's confidential meeting notes and the official meeting minutes will serve as important sources of information in the evaluation study. Additionally, the contractor will need to collect further data by interviewing the twelve members of the Committee on Accreditation from time to time.
4. The contractor will be required to attend the meetings of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing that include formal reports by the Committee on Accreditation (one or two meetings per year). At these meetings, the contractor will have opportunities to observe the Committee's reports as well as the Commission's productivity in responding to the reports. Additionally, the contractor will need to interview selected members of the Commission pertaining to the implementation of the *Accreditation Framework* and their perceptions of it.
5. The contractor will need to interview selected members of the Commission's staff who (a) facilitate accreditation visits each year, and (b) report to the Committee on Accreditation.
6. To evaluate the "comparability studies" that have been completed pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, the contractor will be required to collect information from selected members of the twelve expert panels that studied the comparability of national standards for educator preparation with California standards for educator preparation.
7. To evaluate the use of national standards and national review teams at California institutions, the contractor will need to collect information from selected members of the national review teams.
8. The contractor will develop a series of interview plans or "protocols" that will include the questions to be presented to individuals in each group of participants in the accreditation system. The protocols will need to be "semi-structured" and so all interviewees have opportunities to answer the same questions, so the contractor can reach sound conclusions about the effects of the accreditation system. The interview protocols will also need to be field-tested before they are

used, and to be cross-referenced so the responses of different sources can be compared with each other.

9. In addition to collecting information from documents, face-to-face interviews and telephone interviews, the contractor will have to compile some uniform information from all participants in the evaluation study, with the use of standardized questionnaires. For this purpose, the contractor will have to develop questionnaires, which will need to be field-tested to ensure maximum feasibility and satisfactory reliability. The contractor will be responsible for encoding the questionnaire data and for compiling and analyzing it electronically.
10. The contractor will be required to collect, compile and analyze information that relates directly to the important questions that are to be resolved in the evaluation study, including the examples on pages 8-9 of this plan.

The Proposal Review Process and Selection of a Contractor

Each proposal will be evaluated to determine its responsiveness to the needs of the Commission and the COA as described in a RFP. The Commission will reserve the right to reject any or all proposals. The Commission is not required to award a contract if, in the judgment of the Commission, no acceptable proposals have been submitted.

The Proposal Review Process

The Commission will use the secondary or point-count method for evaluating proposals and awarding a contract as described in Public Contract Code Section 10377(c) and the State Contracting Manual. Proposals will be evaluated as follows:

1. Commission staff will determine the compliance of each proposal with the adapted Proposal Evaluation Criteria. Proposals that do not comply with all of these criteria will be eliminated from further consideration.
2. Each remaining proposal will be independently reviewed and rated by members of a Proposal Review Team on the basis of the adapted Proposal Evaluation Criteria. The majority of the Proposal Review Team will be Commission staff members. Reviewers may also be selected from former COA members and selected experienced accreditation team members. Following an orientation and training session that will focus on the RFP requirements and the Proposal Evaluation Criteria, Proposal Review Team members will independently read proposals and provide initial scores for each criterion. Team members will then meet to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each proposal and assign final scores. Following this discussion of the proposals, mean criterion scores for each proposal will be computed across team members. For each proposal, the mean criterion scores will then be summed to yield a total score.
3. If the Proposal Review Team determines a need to interview the sponsors of one or more of the highest scoring proposals, members of the team would conduct these interviews. Each bidder will be notified whether or not there will be any interviews and whether or not the bidder is invited. The interviews would be an opportunity for the Proposal Review Team to gain a better understanding of the invited bidders' proposals, and an opportunity for bidders to clarify aspects of their proposals for the team. On the basis of the information provided in the interviews, the Proposal Review Team would review the scores and re-compute scores as needed.
4. Each bidder will be notified whether or not their proposal received the highest total score. Commission staff will recommend to the Commission that a contract be awarded to the bidder with the highest final score. The Commission will decide whether or not to award a contract.



[Back to the Top](#) |
[Back to January 1999 Agenda](#) |
[Back to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: January 6-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-3

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Approval of Plan to Issue 1999-2000 Teaching Internship Requests for Proposals

✓ Action

Prepared by: Michael McKibbin, Ph.D., Consultant
Professional Services Division

Approval of Plan to Issue 1999-2000 Teaching Internship Request for Proposals

Professional Services Division
December 15, 1998

Executive Summary

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is responsible for issuing a Request for Proposals for Teaching Internships. This year \$11 million is available to districts and universities to help meet California's shortage of qualified teachers. This agenda provides information on the Request for Proposals process and the procedures that are proposed for the issuance of Teaching Internship Grants.

Fiscal Impact Statement

In the past five years the California Commission has distributed \$23.5 million in Teaching Internship Grants. The 1998-99 includes \$66,000 to administer \$11 million. The percentage of administrative costs for this allocation is six-tenths of one percent in 1998-99.

The funds allocated do not cover all the operating expenses of this program. The additional costs are borne by the base budget of the Professional Services Division, which was fully committed to other priority responsibilities before the grant program was established.

Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the processes and procedures described in this agenda item for the issuance of the 1999-2000 Teaching Internship Request for Proposals.

Important Note

The following report contains important information that is relevant to the Commission's policy deliberations but could not be summarized in the above spaces.

Background Information

Enabling Legislation

On October 10, 1993, Governor Wilson signed AB 1161 (Quackenbush), which enacted Chapter 1147 of the Statutes of 1993. This statute requires the Executive Director of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to award grant funds to alternative certification programs that recruit, prepare and support intern teachers in California public schools (K-12). AB 1161 defined alternative certification programs as *internship programs* in two categories. First, Education Code Section 44384

authorizes the to award of funds to *University Internship Programs* pursuant to the provisions of a 1967 statute. Second, the statute authorizes the award of funds to *District Internship Programs* pursuant to a 1983 and subsequent laws. In AB 1161, lawmakers offered legislative and fiscal support for both kinds of *teaching internship programs*. In the enabling legislation, Education Code Section 44386 stipulates that

in no event shall the grant amount awarded to any school district or county office of education exceed one thousand five hundred dollars (\$1,500) per intern per year, except that the Commission may . . . provide a larger grant per intern per year, in hardship cases.

The enabling legislation also required that program participants match the amount in the teaching internship grant.

In 1993, the State Budget also included an appropriation of \$2 million from the General Fund for teaching internship programs, beginning in the 1993-94 fiscal year. From 1993 to 1996, the annual State Budget included a continued appropriation of \$2 million from the General Fund for internships for beginning teachers. The Commission has, for five years, established policy guidelines and operational plans for the award of these funds, has overseen the grant award process, and has monitored the quality of funded internships for beginning teachers.

In February 1997, AB 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle) was passed and signed by the Governor. This bill, among other items, increased the size of teaching internship grants to \$6.5 million. The bill added to the list of areas of focus for the grants helping districts meet the needs for teachers caused by reducing class size. The Governor's Budget for fiscal year 1998-99 increased the Teaching Internship Grant Budget to \$11 million. The purpose of this Agenda Item is to seek approval of the proposed plan to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the grant funding that is available for the 1999-2000 fiscal year.

Statutory Purposes of Alternative Certification (Teaching Internship) Programs

On several occasions, California lawmakers have taken action to encourage the growth of internship programs for new teachers. In 1967, they enacted the *Teacher Education Internship Act of 1967*, which continues to be effective as Sections 44450 through 44467 of the Education Code. In 1983, lawmakers enacted the *Hughes-Hart Education Reform Act* (Senate Bill 813), and established additional internships that are governed by Code Sections 44325 through 44329, and 44830.3. Then, in 1993, the *Alternative Teacher Certification Act of 1993* (AB 1161, Quackenbush) was passed, which established funding criteria for the two kinds of internships established previously, and AB 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle) expanded the program in 1997.

Taken together, the statutes have recognized several purposes for internship programs for beginning teachers, which are summarized below.

- (1) The first purpose of internship programs for new teachers is to expand the pool of qualified teachers by attracting persons into teaching who might not otherwise enter the classroom, and who bring some of the following attributes into teaching.
 - They are changing careers after gaining experience and maturity in military services, aerospace firms, defense-related businesses and other industries.
 - They meet California's subject matter standards in the subjects in which the public schools have chronic and widespread shortages of qualified teachers.
 - They are committed to serve students in geographic areas where schools have been under-staffed, including urban, rural and isolated regions of California.
 - They cannot afford traditional program costs, and who need access to systematic training programs so they can meet professional teaching credential standards.
 - They are committed to enter the field of special education, to serve California's growing population of students with handicapping conditions.
 - They possess the linguistic and cultural skills to teach the growing numbers of limited-English-proficient pupils in K-12 schools.
 - They are members of demographic groups that are under-represented in the teaching workforce.
- (2) While addressing these critical recruitment needs, the second purpose of teaching internships is to enable K-12 schools to respond immediately to pressing needs while providing professional preparation for interns that is as extensive and systematic as traditional programs, and that links education theory with classroom practice throughout each intern's preparation.
- (3) While addressing these recruitment *and* preparation needs, the third purpose of internships is to provide effective supervision and intensive support so each new intern's learning can be targeted to her/his needs, and so beginning teachers who are interns can extend, apply, and refine what they learn about teaching in the course of their initial preparation.

Internship programs allow individuals with specialized skills, particularly in selected subject areas, and strong backgrounds, including maturity and life experience, to serve as intern teachers while pursuing their professional preparation. The

purpose of developing internships and other alternatives is to expand the pool of qualified teachers to include persons who might not otherwise be able to become teachers, including persons from military services and defense-related industries.

Internships provide mechanisms to recruit individuals from under-represented groups into the teaching force, including economically disadvantaged candidates and work-seasoned, second-career adults. They also allow schools to place in classrooms those prospective teachers who want to put their energies directly into their jobs and "learn by doing." Educational agencies have offered internships to enable non-traditional candidates to enter the profession. The grant funds provide the means to extend access to those candidates who are not reached by conventional programs and options.

Internship programs blend theory and practice and provide ways for school districts to respond immediately to pressing teacher needs. Because these programs focus on specific groups of prospective teachers, they target their preparation and support services to the particular needs of each individual. Programs are designed to identify each intern's entry-level skills, and to concentrate on what he or she needs. Internships also provide opportunities for schools and districts to become more active participants in preparing teachers, in collaboration with accredited colleges and universities.

Prior Actions by the Commission

The Commission has sponsored four "cycles" of funded internship programs since the 1993-94 fiscal year. Each cycle has encompassed two fiscal years because many internship programs are two years long. The Commission has previously taken action to affirm grant awards in the 1993-94 and 1994-95 fiscal years, a second cycle of grant awards in the 1995-96 and 1996-97 fiscal years, and a third cycle in 1997-98 and 1998-99 fiscal years. In June 1998, funds were awarded for the fourth cycle (1998-2000).

First and Second Cycles of Local Assistance Grant Awards: FY 1993-95 and 1995-97

To begin the first cycle of funding, the Commission co-sponsored Assembly Bill 1161 (Quackenbush, 1993) with the Office of the Governor. While this bill moved through the Legislature, the Commission discussed an action plan for its implementation. The Commission adopted this plan in June 1993, which enabled the staff to implement the legislation promptly. As soon as Governor Wilson signed the State Budget in 1993, the Professional Services Division began the process of distributing the allocated funds.

Based on the Action Plan approved by the Commission, the Executive Director sent an announcement of the availability of internship funds to all school districts, county offices, colleges and universities. Of these agencies and institutions, 270 asked that the detailed *Request for Proposals (RFP)* be sent to them. The staff then held Bidders' Conferences in northern and southern California. Meanwhile, the staff selected and trained a panel of professional educators to serve as program reviewers. The proposal review criteria, which were part of the Commission-adopted plan, focused on the quality of preparation, assessment *and* support services that would be delivered to interns.

In the course of 1993-94, The Executive Director issued the Request for Proposals three times. A total of 29 projects were funded utilizing the entire \$2 million. Included in the projects that were approved were programs that carried out the Executive Order of the Governor to initiate the *California Aerospace and Defense Workers Corps*. The purpose of the Corps was to attract persons who were dislocated because of cutbacks in aerospace and defense industries into teaching. This recruitment objective proved to be one of the most significant challenges in the alternative certification program, primarily because small numbers of scientists, engineers and mathematicians regard teaching as an appealing choice for their second careers.

Because the funds were subject to Proposition 98 restrictions, only school districts and county offices of education were eligible to receive grants. Many of the funded programs were initiated and led by colleges and universities, however, in partnership with districts and counties. In several other cases, postsecondary institutions were active partners in programs initiated by districts and counties. Every program that requested funds to recruit from aerospace, defense-related and military sources was funded. Every program that requested funds to fill mathematics and science teaching vacancies was funded. Programs served both urban areas and some of California's most remote areas. In addition to elementary and secondary teachers, grant recipients also included teachers in one California's greatest shortage areas, special education. All programs provided instructional, support and assessment services designed to assure that interns would be successful in very difficult teaching settings.

In 1995, based on the Commission-adopted plan, two new Requests for Proposals were distributed for a second cycle of programs. Programs that had previously received grants were invited to request "continuation grants." The sponsors of the first cohort of programs received a "Continuation RFP" for their response. Meanwhile, the Professional Services Division distributed a different RFP to all school districts, county offices, colleges and universes who had shown an interest in internships that had not participated in the first cycle.

The Executive Director received twenty-three proposals for the second cycle of funding. Nineteen proposals were from sponsors that previously participated in the first cycle of funding. Seventeen of these "continuation proposals" requested augmented budgets so they could serve larger numbers of interns. On average, the 19 continuation proposals asked for 25 percent more dollars than the original requests. Overall, the 23 proposals requested \$500,000 more than was available. Through as process of using unexpended funds from some of the continuing programs and reducing the requests of other programs, the grant awards were trimmed to \$2 million.

More than 2,600 interns were prepared in the first two cycles. These interns taught in 178 districts in 38 counties. More than 300 of these interns came to teaching after careers in the armed services or the aerospace industry. Two-thirds of the participants had a previous career before becoming a teacher.

Third Cycle of Local Assistance Grant Awards: FY 1996-98

Beginning in 1996, Governor Wilson's Class Size Reduction Initiative substantially increased the demand for K-3 teachers. To help school districts meet this demand, the Commission took a series of policy actions in August and October, 1996. In one of these actions, the Commission adopted a plan to implement Assembly Bill 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle), which proposed to add \$4.5 million to the Commission's budget to expand internship programs for beginning teachers. When the Commission took this action, AB 18 was moving rapidly toward the Governor's desk without any opposition. Unfortunately, enactment of AB 18 was delayed because of a technical error in the Legislature during the final hours of the 1996 session.

On February 6, 1997, Governor Wilson signed Assembly Bill 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle), which added \$4.5 million dollars from the General Fund to the Commission's budget specifically for the purpose of expanding internship programs for the Class Size Reduction Initiative. The augmentation legislation retained the original purposes of internships, and created two additional purposes.

- (1) Facilitate the reduction of class size in kindergarten and grades one to three.
- (2) Improve reading and mathematics instruction in the reduced classes that are taught by interns in the funded programs.

AB 18 added \$4.5 million to the Commission's budget for the fiscal year (1996-97). Accordingly, the agency is required to allocate or encumber these funds, consistent with the purposes of the program, before the fiscal year ends. To expedite the allocation of funds while increasing the effectiveness of Class Size Reduction, the Executive Director issued a new *Request for Proposals* on February 11, 1997, three working days after the Governor signed Assembly Bill 18.

To contribute to the success of Class Size Reduction, the RFP asked the sponsors of programs to include specific preparation and support in the management of classes with twenty or fewer students in the primary grades. The funding provided through this RFP was focused on helping school districts meet the need for teachers as a result of the Class Size Reduction Initiative. Another the purpose of this initiative is to improve mathematics and reading instruction. In each proposal those requesting grant funds were required to provide a description of the curriculum that would provide the skills and knowledge to teach reading and mathematics.

More than 3,600 interns successfully completed their teaching assignment in the third cycle of grant programs. The majority of the interns continue to enter teaching after a career in another profession. Forty-five percent of the interns are from groups underrepresented in the teaching force. One third of the elementary teachers are males. Twelve percent of the interns are teaching in departmentalized in secondary or middle schools; fourteen percent are serving in special education classrooms.

Fourth Cycle of Local Assistance Grant Awards: FY 1998-2000

In June 1998, the Commission received the report on the Fourth Cycle RFP. Fifty-eight teaching internship projects were funded. These 58 projects pledged to prepare more than 5,700 intern teachers. Those teachers began serving students in the fall semester. More 330 school districts are co-sponsors of those grant proposals. Districts in forty-one of California's fifty-eight counties are participating.

Funding Procedures

AB 1161 specified the criteria and procedures for implementing funding for alternative certification programs. AB 1161 requires the Executive Director of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to award grant funds to alternative certification programs that recruit, prepare and support intern teachers in California public schools (K-12). The enabling legislation stipulates that up to \$1500 per intern per year can be allocated for intern instruction, support and assessment. Participating local education agencies are required to provide similar in-kind (matching) contributions unless this would cause a hardship.

If the maximum of \$1500 per intern per year in grant funds or the requirement that this amount be matched in local funds would cause a hardship for school districts or county offices that would like to develop a program, then those agencies may provide a rationale for why the grant size per intern should be larger or why the local match should be reduced. For the purpose of the RFP, "hardship" is defined as a circumstance where the cap per intern or the local matching requirement would inhibit or curtail the agency from participating in or providing a quality preparation program for a group of interns. Hardship also means that other economic forces operating within the sponsoring agencies do not allow local resources to be dedicated to this project

Proposals are selected for funding based upon the following criteria, which are established by AB 1161, Quackenbush (Chapter 1147 of the Statutes of 1993):

- (a) Geographic distribution of grant recipients;
- (b) Demonstrated need for increasing number of certificated personnel;
- (c) The number of participants to be served by the proposed program;
- (d) The quality of the curriculum, instruction, support and assessment; and
- (e) Cost-effectiveness.

The fiscal agent and/or recipient of the funds must be a school district or county office of education. Districts and county offices are encouraged to form consortia with other education agencies and/or with businesses in the private sector. Consortia are a particularly good approach for small or geographically isolated districts that may not be able to develop a program based solely on their own human and fiscal resources. Participating agencies also are encouraged to seek co-sponsors among organizations that represent teachers in the district(s), aerospace and defense industries, educational research and development centers, and other educational organizations as well as colleges and universities.

Because funds are issued on a per capita (number of persons selected and prepared to be teachers) basis, programs that do not recruit the number of teachers that they proposed will be expected to carry over funds to subsequent years or return the funds for redistribution to programs that have exceeded the number of teachers placed in classrooms. Government Code Section 16304 authorizes projects to spend allocated funds in the fiscal year encumbered and two years after that year.

Review Process for RFP's

In each review cycle, the Executive Director has selected and invited professional educators to review and evaluate the proposals that were received. Since 1993, one hundred and fourteen responses to Requests For Proposals have been reviewed by teams of reviewers. This includes programs that are seeking programs for a second time. These programs are reviewed by evaluators including teachers and interns, district administrators, university educators, intern program coordinators, and Commission staff members.

The funding criteria that was described in the RFP and used by the evaluators examines nine areas which are listed below.

- Demonstrated Need and Rationale for the Program
- Description of Participants to be Served, and Recruitment Efforts, and Selection Processes
- Geographic Distribution of Proposals
- Quality of Curriculum in the Program, Including the Quality of Reading and Mathematics Instruction
- Quality of Instructional Staff in the Program,
- Quality of Support Provided
- Quality of Selection and Preparation of Support Providers
- Quality of Assessment of Each Intern's Performance
- Quality of Program Evaluation Plan
- Budget for the Proposed Program
- Cost-Effectiveness of the Proposed Program

Before proposals were evaluated, the Professional Services Division conducted a training session for the reviewers which included an overview of the purposes of the program, a detailed explanation and discussion of the funding criteria (as listed above), and a collective review of two proposals to assure inter-rater reliability. At the end of the training day, each member was given three or four proposals and score sheets. One week later the reviewers reconvened. For the next two days they discuss and analyze the proposals that they had read and scored individually, and they reach a consensus score for each proposal.

Programs that have previously received grants are required to resubmit a response to the Request for Proposals every two years. Eighty percent of the programs have chosen to renew their grants. Programs that are in the middle of the two year cycle are allowed to request an augmentation to their grant if they find that the demand for interns is greater than they had originally predicted. The process for requesting the augmentation is simpler than responding to a full RFP. Program Directors submit a request outlining the circumstances that have cause them to need a budget augmentation. They describe any changes that they plan on making in their original proposal, they respond to any new requirements in the RFP, and submit a new proposed budget. For example they were required to provide an explanation of their reading program in their 1997 request. These request are reviewed by the Project Officer, and, as appropriate, recommended to the Executive Director for funding.

1999 (Fifth Cycle) Request For Proposals Review Process

Staff proposes that the fifth cycle RFP follow the same format as the previous RFP's. Staff recommends that the issues that respondents need to address should be those listed above (funding criteria). Staff proposes to add one section to the RFP format previously approved by the Commission. This section would clearly distinguish Intern Programs from Pre-Intern Programs and Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs and describe eligibility requirements for each. Staff proposes that the RFP be issued by January 15, 1999. The response to the RFP would be due on April 5, 1999. The same review procedures as used in earlier years would be used to evaluate these proposals.

The Executive Director would announce grant awards on May 28, 1999. Staff estimates that approximately 7,300 interns will be prepared in grant projects in 1999-2000.



[Back to the Top](#) |
[Back to January 1999 Agenda](#) |
[Back to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: January 6-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-4

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Pre-Internship Grant Program Implementation and Expansion in 1998-99

✓ Information

Prepared by: Helen Hawley, Assistant Consultant
Professional Services Division

Pre-Internship Grant Program Implementation and Expansion In 1998-99

Professional Services Division
December 15, 1998

Executive Summary

In June, 1998, the Commission approved the funding recommendations for \$2 million from the competitive grant process for the Pre-Intern Program to eighteen statewide local programs for implementation beginning July 1, 1998. In May, Governor Wilson proposed an \$11.8 million expansion of the Pre-Intern Program in place of the previously approved \$3.8 million. The 1998 approved budget can be implemented after the Commission approves an expansion plan.

Policy Issues to be Resolved by the Commission

Should the Commission expand the Pre-Intern programs to include selected single subjects and new programs?

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal One: To promote educational excellence in California schools.

Goal Six: Work with schools of education, the Department of Education, and school districts to assure teacher quality

Fiscal Impact Statement

In the State budget for 1998-99, Governor Wilson proposed to include an \$8 million augmentation for local assistance grants in the Pre-Intern Program. This augmentation would provide adequate resources for the Commission to award local assistance grants for program expansion as indicated in this report. No further augmentation of the local assistance grant budget would be needed to carry out the recommended options.

Part One: Background Information

Part one provides background information regarding legislation, preliminary guidelines, grant selection process, and grant awards.

AB 351 (Scott) allocated \$2 million for the support of Pre-Interns in the 1998-99 school year. The distribution of these funds is based upon:

- the quality of the programs,

- the ability to serve pre-interns as a special population,
- the sponsor's history with support programs, and
- diverse circumstances of the sponsoring agencies, including geography, demography, need and size.

Twenty-eight proposals were received for funding local pre-intern programs. The widespread response to the Request for Proposals allowed for selection of many agencies which have a history of operating support programs through BTSA and Intern Programs. To obtain diversity in programs, some agencies were asked to accept fewer grant awards for their programs during the pilot year than they had requested.

The Selection Process

The advisory panel's review of the pre-internship proposals was based on a point score assigned to each of the criterion for the program:

Demonstrated Need and Rationale for the Program	20
Quality of Preparation, Support and Assistance	20
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget	10
Collaboration Between Administrators and Experienced Teachers	10
Collaboration Between District and College/University	10
Content of Preparation Program	20
Role of Personnel, Including Experienced Teachers	10
Evaluation Plan	10
Total Points	110

Each proposal was read and scored by two panel members separately. Those proposals with disparate scores of more than 15 points received a third reading. The final scores became composites of the separate reading scores. Composite scores ranged from 105.5 to 67. Any questions or concerns about the proposed programs that arose during the readings were recorded and addressed to the sponsoring agencies. These scores provided a range of proposals to fund that includes a consortium of four counties; a lower valley rural consortium; a high need, underrepresented small school district; several large urban counties and districts; and several large urban high need consortia.

The smallest program that the Commissioners approved serves 25 pre-interns; the largest serves 100 pre-interns. Most of the sponsoring agencies approved are involved in internship and/or BTSA programs, giving them previous experience with teacher support systems.

The programs which staff recommended and the Commissioners approved appear in Appendix A and B of this report.

Program Characteristics

The highest-ranking Pre-Internship Program proposals shared a number of common features that suggest a structure for the individual programs which is manageable and viable for all participants in the programs. The programs begin with a **pre-service** component in which the pre-intern receives an "early, focused and intensive" introduction to pedagogy. This early orientation is followed by **regular workshops and/or seminars** throughout the school year that target specific areas of pedagogy for more detailed instruction, usually provided by "expert" teachers at the school or district sites.

In addition, **colleges and universities collaborate with program sponsors to analyze pre-interns' subject matter levels, provide MSAT preparation and, in some cases, basic pedagogy.** Program coordinators can then set up an **Individual Induction Plan (IIP)** for each pre-intern to pursue completion of subject matter competence requirements. This is usually accomplished through MSAT preparation with targeted content knowledge. Most programs are requiring pre-interns to take the MSAT no later than the February 1999 test date. Some required that the October 1998 test be taken and used as a diagnostic tool along with transcript analysis for a pre-intern's IIP.

The programs are establishing support **training for administrators and support providers** involved in the programs, often using BTSA and Internship Program models but adapting them appropriately for pre-interns. **Collaboration** occurs between administrators and support providers as well as between pre-interns. Additionally, the programs are committed to familiarizing pre-interns early with the **California Standards for the Teaching Profession.**

Evaluation of Pre-Intern Programs

Language pertaining to the evaluation of the program was proposed by the Legislative Analyst which will require a controlled study during the pilot year between pre-interns receiving support services and emergency permit teachers without support services. The agencies which employ a comparable number of teachers on an emergency basis will be included in this evaluation.

When the advisory panel met to establish and clarify criteria for the Pre-Intern Program, they found it important to add the criteria of a formal program evaluation. As a result, each proposal addressed evaluation to include such program outcomes as retention, student success, and subject matter completion progress. The advisory panel convened in June 1998 to design the CCTC evaluation instrument which includes a comparison study of pre-interns and emergency permit teachers to determine

the effectiveness of the program as described above. Program sponsors will complete and submit the evaluation study as part of their year end report.

Program sponsors were also required in the Request for Proposal to submit a census and fiscal report on December 1, 1998, that gives a fiscal accounting of the program including the number of pre-interns being served, which staff is currently reviewing to determine continued funding. Staff monitored programs in October 1998 with the findings presented below and will do so again in March 1999.

Part Two: Implementation

Part two describes the implementation, early monitoring, development and challenges of the new programs.

Pre-Intern Program Monitoring

The Legislature and the Commission called for monitoring of the Pre-Intern Program during the first year which staff began on October 27, 1998. The nature of this early monitoring of a new ground-breaking program was advisory. The first round of monitoring revealed that all approved programs had begun implementation. Local education agencies which were identified as having previously administrated approved teacher support programs have shown the greatest progress in structuring their pre-intern programs since their infrastructures were already in place.

According to AB351, local education agencies will provide to pre-interns basic teaching skills training, peer coaching, and preparation for subject matter completion to enter an approved teacher preparation program. These services should be provided in collaboration with site administrators and colleges or universities. Monitoring revealed that some programs have created interesting and fruitful partnerships with colleges and universities in the following ways:

- The college or university, after reviewing the local pre-intern program, issues continuing education or professional development units to support providers for their participation in the program.
- The college or university provides the preservice portion of the pre-intern program as a prerequisite to their teacher preparation program, issuing units to the pre-intern for progression on their salary scale.
- The college or university approves the local agencies preservice as a prerequisite to their program, guaranteeing seats to pre-interns who complete their pre-intern program.
- The college or university provides a course in MSAT preparation.

In districts where high numbers of new teachers are employed, thus making support providers scarce, programs have designated full time release positions for support providers or recruited recently retired teachers. Many of these teachers have expressed their surprise at the intrinsic rewards of the support relationship and are eager to continue this aspect of their professional development. Some have even indicated that supporting another teacher has renewed their own enthusiasm for teaching.

DEVELOPING PROGRAM RESOURCES

The Pre-Intern Program proposes a new paradigm in teacher preparation: local education agencies in collaboration with colleges and universities preparing working untrained teachers to enter formal teacher preparation. As a new program, it requires development of resources to provide services which have not previously been rendered. The first round of monitoring indicated that the Commission needs to provide additional support to develop program resources in the following areas:

- subject matter competency evaluation
- subject matter preparation (as opposed to exam preparation)
- appropriate formative assessment to guide and train both pre-interns and their support providers

In addition any development in these areas should be designed to align with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, SB 1422, SB 2042, Internship and BTSA Programs. To assist local programs in providing services to pre-interns, Commission staff has organized two development teams to work on the challenges of subject matter preparation and formative assessment. These teams are meeting once each month with field experts to explore and develop resources for pre-interns as described in the following sections.

Subject Matter Preparation

The most interesting challenge for implementation of the Pre-Intern Program is the great diversity of emergency permit teachers. In terms of subject matter preparedness these teachers range from ones who may barely meet the 40 unit requirement to those who may lack only a course or two for subject matter completion. Programs are required to offer subject matter preparation for passage of the MSAT examination to a group of individuals who need preparation in widely diverse academic areas. Some programs are using local teacher experts in the academic areas who have developed subject matter workshops for pre-interns. These preparations are not necessarily aligned with the examination but certainly aid pre-interns in their content knowledge. Other programs are subcontracting test preparation which may or may not provide any subject matter content that relates to the frameworks and subject matter standards. The challenge in providing subject matter preparation for pre-interns is addressing the specific subject matter deficiencies of each pre-intern with subject matter content that will not only aid their passage of MSAT but also give them real content knowledge for the classroom.

Traditionally, MSAT preparation has focused on test taking skills, emphasizing content knowledge only in terms of how it might appear on the test. Such test preparation does not answer the needs of pre-interns who must fully function as teachers of record without the benefit of formal preparation. They need the academic background as well as the skills to pass the exam. In keeping with the principles of SB 2042, pre-interns should receive professional development in subject matter knowledge in

their areas of greatest need. However, their considerable challenge as first year untrained teachers does not afford them the luxury of enrolling in full semester courses.

With these limitations in mind, the subject matter development team is working with the California Subject Matter Projects to design subject matter modules that will be available statewide under subcontract to local agencies. The Projects already have a paradigm for targeted, specific preparation which is aligned with the frameworks and the content standards and which pays some attention to pedagogy. Such offerings will ensure some consistency of quality in subject matter preparation even in local programs with limited resources. In addition, Educational Testing Service has inserviced the Projects and the team members, who are made up of program directors, coordinators, and administrators, on the MSAT subject areas at several recent director and team meetings. The Projects hope to have services available to pre-intern programs by the end of this school year.

Formative Assessment

In an effort to assist support providers with some training and guidelines for serving pre-interns, local programs have adopted existing support models such as Pathwise, Mentoring, and CFASST. While such initiative is commendable, these models were developed for trained teachers and are often too sophisticated in language, scope, and goals for pre-interns. Pre-interns do need focus and structure in their relationships with their support providers to make best use of the time they spend together, but it must be at a level they can understand and relative to their particular challenges as teachers. It should reinforce and expand in a pragmatic way on the basic pedagogy training that the program provides. Without the structure of an assessment instrument to guide the pre-intern and support provider, much time can be wasted searching for the right questions to ask and the solutions to suggest. Or worse yet, the questions may not come up at all. With these considerations in mind, the assessment development team, made up of pre-intern program directors, coordinators, and administrators, is anticipating a contract with WestEd Corporation to design an assessment instrument which aligns with CFFAST and AB 2042 but fits pre-intern needs. A preliminary model could be available for use in the field by April 1999 in time to train support providers in its use for the 1999/2000 school year.

PROGRAM CHALLENGES

Several concerns have arisen in the first year of the Pre-Intern Program. One lies in the recruitment of pre-interns who under current emergency permit hiring practices are required to enroll in a program and complete six units even if they have not completed subject matter competency. Lines of communication between program directors, site administrators and the ongoing employment processes need more clarification in the relationship between the Pre-Intern Program and previous practices in advising emergency permit holders. The start-up schedule of the programs in the first year (July 1, 1998) made it difficult to complete these communications before teachers were already hired under previous conditions of employment. Program directors are confident that they will be able to rectify this recruitment issue for the coming year by starting to recruit early in the spring. Also centralized hiring in some districts places new teachers without the participation of site administrators. Where this is the case, program directors are committed to educating administrators early next year in the benefits and services of the Pre-Intern Program. Staff will issue a statement to human resource personnel statewide that clarifies the hiring requirements of emergency permit and pre-intern teachers and their relationship to alleviate concerns in the field regarding renewal requirements of these two licenses.

The substitute shortage has made observation time for pre-interns and their support providers difficult this year. The diligent and creative have worked out exchanges with other teachers to facilitate this essential piece of a pre-intern's training. Observation of good models is the most expedient method for pre-interns to improve their teaching skills, and since pre-interns often do not know what questions to ask, it is essential that support providers observe pre-interns to know the areas in which they need advice. In an effort to ease the substitute shortage, the Commission has approved the hiring of individuals who have completed 90 units of undergraduate work and passed the CBEST exam; however, the effects of this new permit have not had time to trickle down to pre-interns yet.

As with any new program, training for program administrators is a necessity. Fortunately, a number of pre-intern programs are administrated by veterans in teacher support programs, who are interested in forming a consulting team to train new program directors. It may be appropriate to consider planning grants for these directors to develop such training as the BTSA Program has done. Staff is working with program directors to search out other forms of funding as well that might be available for development and implementation of alternative programs.

The BTSA and Intern Programs offer some excellent models for adoption with modification in the Pre-Intern Program. The challenge is in the modification design to have some consistency of quality throughout the statewide programs. In one crossover example, introductory college intern courses appear to provide the type and amount of pedagogy that pre-interns initially need. BTSA's formative assessment provides a good model but requires tailoring to pre-intern level. Another advantage to using BTSA and Intern models for program structure is in insuring the articulation of the Pre-Intern Program to these programs in the learning-to-teach continuum.

Although the initial intent of the Pre-Intern Program was to serve first year emergency permit teachers, we have discovered that a significant number of teachers have been on emergency permits for up to five years but have still not completed their subject matter competency. Many of these individuals have completed all or most of their formal teacher preparation courses but cannot complete student teaching without subject matter to obtain their credentials. These teachers are relegated to teacher aide positions after their fifth year on an emergency permit even though they are fully trained teachers. The Pre-Intern Program can salvage this valuable teaching resource by providing such teachers with subject matter preparation for the passage of MSAT.

In preparation for the next round of funding, staff will try clarify to the field the placement of all new teachers in the most appropriate programs and provide greater assistance in that placement to ensure that all new teachers receive appropriate

support where funding will allow. In anticipation of this charge staff will present an agenda item to the commissioners in February defining the connections and distinctions between Pre-Intern, Intern and BTSA Programs. The three programs will coordinate their requests for proposals for simultaneous issue on January 15, 1999, to include these clarifications.

Part Three: Expansion

In the 1998/99 budget Governor Pete Wilson proposed and the legislature approved funding for the Pre-Intern Program in the amount of \$11.8 million. This expansion from the previous year's funding of \$2 million will allow a significant increase in the number of pre-interns served throughout the state. The current programs serve a total of 1,000 pre-interns. A new request for proposals will be issued by mid-January in coordination with the release of BTSA and Internship RFPs to invite new multiple subject programs and to add the single subject shortage areas of Mathematics, Science, and English to new and existing programs. In addition to expanding the numbers of pre-interns which the program can serve, the increased funds will accommodate the development of program services to increase the consistency and quality of services statewide as detailed in the previous section on developing program resources.

A number of school districts which use large numbers of emergency permit teachers are not currently participating in the Pre-Intern Program. Staff will ensure that these school districts are aware of the program, its benefits and the procedures for applying for funds. Staff also continues to promote the program at a variety of conventions and conferences for educators and administrators such as PASSCO, CSBA, CCET, and NAAC.

APPENDIX A

1998 Approved Pre-Intern Grant Awards

DISTRICTS	PI's SERVED	GRANT AWARD
Ontario-Montclair SD	50	\$100,000
San Diego City Schools	25	50,000
Ventura COE (3)	50	100,000
Santa Cruz COE (4)	35	70,000
SFUSD	50	100,000
Oakland USD	50	100,000
Orange COE (5)	100	200,000
Los Angeles COE (4)	100	200,000
Hawthorne SD (4)	100	200,000
San Joaquin COE (4)	100	200,000
Monterey COE (6)	25	50,000
Alameda COE (2)	50	70,000
Alisal USD	25	50,000
Paramount USD (9)	50	100,000
Kings COE (9)	40	80,000
Long Beach USD	50	100,000
West Contra Costa USD	50	100,000
Tulare COE (8)	50	70,000

APPENDIX B

Approved Pre-Intern Agencies

Tulare County Office of Ed

1. Cutler Orosi Joint SD
2. Exeter Union Elementary SD

Monterey County Office of Ed

1. Chualar Union ESD
2. Greenfield Union SD

3. Farmerville USD
4. Liberty Elementary SD
5. Lindsey USD
6. Pixley USD
7. Porterville USD
8. Woodlake USD

IHEs

FPU

CU

CSUFR

Ventura County Office of Ed

1. Fillmore USD
2. Moorpark USD
3. Hueneme ESD
4. Ocean View SD
5. Oxnard ESD
6. Pleasant Valley SD
7. Rio SD
8. Santa Paula SD
9. Ventura USD

IHEs

CLU

CSUN

Hawthorne School District

1. Lennox SD
2. Whittier SD
3. Inglewood USD
4. Lynwood USD

IHEs

CSUDH

3. King City Union SD
4. N. Monterey County USD
5. San Lucas UESD
6. Soledad USD

IHEs

CSUMB

Alameda County Office of Ed

1. Hayward USD
2. Berkeley USD

IHEs

CSUH

Santa Cruz County Office of Ed

1. Live Oak SD
2. Santa Cruz City Schools
3. Pajaro Valley USD
4. Soquel UESD

IHEs

UCSC

Orange County Office of Ed

1. Anaheim City SD
2. Garden Grove USD
3. Orange USD
4. Placentia-Yorba Linda USD
5. Santa Ana USD

IHEs

APU

CSUFU

CU

UCI



[Back to the Top](#) |
[Back to January 1999 Agenda](#) |
[Back to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: January 6-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PERF-1

Committee: Performance Standards

Title: RICA Video Performance Assessment: Scoring and Score Reporting for Candidates Who Submit One or More Video Packets That Do Not Meet Requirements

✓ Information

Prepared by: Bob Carlson, Ph.D., Administrator
Professional Services Division

RICA Video Performance Assessment: Scoring and Score Reporting for Candidates Who Submit One or More Video Packets That Do Not Meet Requirements

Professional Services Division

December 21, 1998

Overview of this Report

California Education Code §44283 requires that most candidates for initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). Candidates can satisfy this requirement either by passing the RICA Written Examination or by passing the RICA Video Performance Assessment. Candidates who choose to take the RICA Video Performance Assessment are required to prepare and submit three Video Packets according to procedures and policies described in the *RICA Video Performance Assessment Procedures Manual* sent to all registered candidates. Questions have been raised about scoring and score reporting on the Video Performance Assessment. The issue pertains to the scoring of Video Packets and score reporting for candidates who submit one or more Video Packets that do not meet specified requirements. The purpose of this report is to provide information relevant to this issue as requested by the Commission.

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal One: To promote educational excellence in California schools.
Objective One: Develop candidate and program standards.
Objective Two: Develop and administer teacher assessments.

Fiscal Impact Statement

The costs of preparing this report have been supported from the agency's base budget resources. There is no fiscal impact associated with either policy option described in this report.

Questions have been raised about scoring and score reporting on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) Video Performance Assessment. The issue pertains to the scoring of Video Packets and score reporting for candidates who submit one or more Video Packets that do not meet specified requirements. The purpose of this report is to provide

Background

California Education Code §44283 requires that most candidates for initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). Candidates can satisfy this requirement either by passing the RICA Written Examination or by passing the RICA Video Performance Assessment. Because they are options to each other, these two RICA assessments were developed to be as equivalent as possible. Both are based on the RICA Content Specifications adopted by the Commission in January 1998. This report will discuss both RICA assessments but will focus on a scoring and score-reporting issue related to the Video Performance Assessment.

Candidates who choose to take the RICA Video Performance Assessment are required to prepare and submit three Video Packets according to procedures and policies described in the *RICA Video Performance Assessment Procedures Manual* sent to all registered candidates. Each Video Packet is to include a completed Instructional Context Form, a videotape of the candidate providing reading instruction, and a completed Reflection Form.

Specific requirements that must be met for the Video Performance Assessment are delineated in the Procedures Manual and provided on the next two pages. The requirements relate to the submission as a whole as well as to individual Video Packets. The requirements relate to the elements of the submission, the content of the Video Packets, and the characteristics of the videotapes and videotaped instruction. The purpose of these requirements is to provide a fair and "level playing field" for all candidates by assuring that candidates follow the basic directions for the assessment and submit Video Packets that can be scored on the basis of the Commission-adopted performance characteristics and scoring scale. Essentially, these requirements are "prerequisites" that must be met in order for Video Packets to be scored.

VIDEO PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

Before beginning work on your Video Packets, carefully review the RICA Video Performance Assessment requirements listed below.

1998-1999 RICA VIDEO PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS

If your submission does not meet all of the following requirements, it will receive a rating of "Requirements Not Met," none of your Video Packets will be scored, and you will not pass the RICA Video Performance Assessment. If that happens and you would like to retake the RICA Video Performance Assessment, you will have to reregister and submit new fees.

- 1. SUBMIT A PROPERLY COMPLETED CANDIDATE IDENTIFICATION FORM.** You and the principal, or his/her designee, of the school in which the videotaping occurred must properly complete and sign the Candidate Identification Form. You must submit this form with your completed Video Packets.
- 2. SUBMIT THREE COMPLETE VIDEO PACKETS.** You must submit all three Video Packets at the same time. Each Video Packet must contain a videotape of your instruction and the appropriate Video Packet Forms Booklet, with the Instructional Context Form and the Reflection form completed according to the directions in this manual. Each of your Video packets must contain a separate videotape. You must attach the correct identification label to each videocassette, and each videotape must be submitted in the correct folder.
- 3. SUBMIT VIDEO PACKETS THAT HAVE NOT BEEN PREVIOUSLY SCORED.** You may not resubmit a Video Packet or any portion of a Video Packet that has previously been scored by RICA scorers.
- 4. SUBMIT VIDEO PACKETS WITH LESSONS DELIVERED TO THE SPECIFIED NUMBER OF STUDENTS.** Each Video Packet must include a lesson that is delivered to the specified number of students.

Video Packet #1 must include a lesson that is delivered to a **whole class**, with no fewer than 15 students.

Video Packet #2 must include a lesson that is delivered to a **small group**, with a minimum of 3 students and a maximum of 12 students.

Video Packet #3 must include a lesson that is delivered to an **individual students**.

- 5. SUBMIT VIDEO PACKETS WITH LESSONS BASED ON THE SPECIFIED RICA DOMAINS.** Each Video Packet must include a lesson that is based on a specified domain of the RICA Content Specifications (pages 25-32).

Video Packet #1 must include a lesson that is planned and delivered to develop students' **reading comprehension skills and/or promote their independent reading** as described in **Domain III** of the RICA Content Specifications.

Video Packets #2 must include a lesson that is planned and delivered to support students' **reading proficiency through oral and/or written language development** as described in **Domain IV** of the RICA Content Specifications.

Video Packet #3 must include a lesson that is planned and delivered to develop the student's **phonological and/or other linguistic processes related to reading** as described in **Domain II** of the RICA Content Specifications.

(continued on next page)

6. **SUBMIT VIDEO PACKETS WITH SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS IN RICA COMPETENCIES.** In each Video Packet you must *demonstrate* your knowledge and skills in the teaching of reading in two domains of the RICA Content Specifications: Domain I (Planning and Organizing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment) *and* the domain on which the lesson is based (see requirement 5). Each video Packet must have sufficient evidence of your knowledge and skills from the applicable RICA domains so that scorers are able to make judgments about the adequacy of the knowledge and skills demonstrated. *You bear the burden of proof* to demonstrate, across all three elements of each Video Packet, your knowledge and skills. A "Requirements Not Met" rating will be assigned to a submission that includes a Video Packet that does not provide sufficient evidence of your knowledge and skills in the applicable RICA domains; for example, a Video Packet with a lesson that relies primarily on the use of educational media (e.g., a film) or a Video Packet with a lesson that is taught primarily by another person.
7. **RECORD AT LEAST FIVE MINUTES BUT NO MORE THAN TEN MINUTES OF INSTRUCTION AT THE BEGINNING OF EACH VIDEOTAPE.** For each Video Packet, the videotaped instruction must be at the beginning of the videotape, must be at least five minutes long, and should be no longer than ten minutes. Only the first ten minutes of each videotape will be viewed by scorers.
8. **SUBMIT VIDEOTAPES WITH NO BREAKS IN THE RECORDINGS.** Each videotape must be recorded using only a single VHS camera, without stopping the recording or later editing it. Any edits or breaks in the recording will result in a "Requirements Not Met" rating.
9. **SUBMIT VIDEOTAPES WITH CLEAR VISUAL AND AUDIO RECORDINGS AND FORMS WITH LEGIBLE RESPONSES.** Your Video Packets must be of a quality such that scorers are able to view your instruction, hear you and your students, and read your written responses on the Instructional Context Forms and the Reflection forms.
10. **SUBMIT ONLY ORIGINAL WORK.** Your responses on the Instructional Context Forms and Reflection Forms must be your original work, written in your own words, and not copied or paraphrased from some other work.
11. **COMPLETE THE ASSESSMENT IN ENGLISH.** You must complete the Instructional Context Forms, the videotaped instruction, and the Reflection Forms in English.
12. **SUBMIT YOUR VIDEOTAPED INSTRUCTION ON STANDARD 1/2-INCH VHS TAPES THAT CAN BE PLAYED IN A STANDARD VCR.** A "Requirements Not Met" rating will be assigned to a submission that includes a videotape in any format other than the standard 1/2-inch VHS tape (e.g., 8mm, VHS-C, S-VHS, 3/4-inch VHS, Beta, DVD) or that cannot be played in a standard VCR (e.g., a videotape that is broken or damaged).

Scoring and Score Reporting

During discussion following presentation of a RICA report at the Commission's October 1998 meeting, staff informed the Commission that Video Packets that do not meet the requirements on pages 5-6 are not scored. Staff also indicated that, if a candidate submits one or two Video Packets that do not meet the requirements, none of that candidate's packets are scored, including the packets that meet the requirements. Concern was expressed about this, and staff was directed to investigate the possibility of scoring the Video Packets that meet the requirements submitted by a candidate who also submits one or two Video Packets that do not meet the requirements. This report is a result of that staff direction.

All submitted Video Packets are reviewed by trained scorers in a scoring session. Video Packets that do not meet the requirements are identified as such by the scorers and are not assigned scores. Contrary to what staff communicated in October, all Video Packets that meet the requirements are scored, even packets submitted by candidates who also submit packets that do not meet the requirements. This is because of the way the scoring session is organized. A candidate's three Video Packets are assigned randomly to different scorers. Scorers work independently of each other, reviewing the Video Packets and scoring those that meet the requirements. In this way, all Video Packets go through the process, and it is really not until the process is complete that candidates who have submitted one or more packets that do not meet the requirements are identified.

Thus, if a candidate submits one or two Video Packets that do *not* meet the requirements, the packets submitted by that candidate that *do* meet the requirements are, in fact, scored. Those scores, however, are not reported to the candidate. The rationale for not reporting the scores of Video Packets that meet the requirements to candidates who also submit one or two packets that fail to meet the requirements is described below.

Rationale for Not Reporting Scores to Candidates Who Submit Video Packets That Do Not Meet Requirements

The rationale for not reporting scores to candidates who submit Video Packets that do not meet the requirements is based on a fundamental characteristic of the RICA: Both the Written Examination and the Video Performance Assessment are unitary assessments. That is, each one is to be taken as a whole, and a candidate's passing status on each is based on combined performance on the entire assessment. Although, for example, the Written Examination has multiple-choice questions, focused educational problems and instructional tasks, as well as a case study based on a student profile, candidates take the entire examination at one time and receive a pass/not pass score based on combined performance across all three sections. Candidates do not pass or fail separately the multiple-choice questions, the focused educational problems and instructional tasks, or the case study. No such passing standards have been set. A candidate who fails the exam (a) must retake the entire examination and (b) can not combine scores on one section of the exam earned on one date with scores on other sections of the

exam earned on other dates.

Similarly, the Video Performance Assessment is a single, unitary assessment with three "items" (Video Packets). Candidates are required to submit all three Video Packets at one time, and the pass/not pass decision is based on the combined performance of the candidate across the three Video Packets. Candidates do not pass or fail any one Video Packet (no such standards have been set), and a candidate who does not pass the assessment must submit three new Video Packets. A passing score must be earned on three packets submitted together. A candidate may not combine packet scores from packets submitted at different times.

The reason that the RICA Written Examination and the RICA Video Performance Assessment are unitary assessments with the characteristics described above is to maximize their reliability (and, hence, their validity because reliability is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition of validity). The reliability of an entire properly constructed assessment (e.g., the Written Examination or the Video Performance Assessment) is greater than the reliability of any of its constituent parts. Scores on individual Written Examination sections and scores on individual Video Packets are insufficiently reliable for the credentialing decision to be made; scores on the entire assessments are sufficiently reliable for the purposes of that decision.

Measurement error would have a greater influence on a candidate's total score if the candidate were allowed to retake sections of the Written Examination and combine section scores across administrations, or allowed to combine Video Packet scores from packets submitted at different times for the Video Performance Assessment. Given this, allowing a candidate to take or retake only sections of the Written Examination or to submit multiple Video Packets over time until the passing standard is finally reached would give the candidate the opportunity to capitalize on chance (measurement error). In short, it is much more likely that a candidate will achieve a score that, due to measurement error, is greater than that candidate's "true" score on a *section* of an assessment than on the assessment as a *whole*. Allowing Written Examination section scores or Video Packet scores to be combined across multiple administrations would reduce the reliability and validity of the RICA assessments because (a) the reliability of each entire assessment is greater than the reliability of any of its parts, and (b) the reliability of any part of each assessment is insufficient.

In keeping with the unitary nature of the Video Performance Assessment, candidates who take the assessment:

- must submit three Video Packets together each time they take the assessment,
- may not resubmit Video Packets for which they have previously received scores, and
- may not combine Video Packet scores across multiple submissions.

The rationale for not providing scores for Video Packets that meet all requirements if one (or two) of a candidate's Video Packets fails to meet the requirements is as follows. Consistent with the unitary nature of the RICA Video Performance Assessment, candidates may not submit Video Packets for which they have previously received scores (see requirement 3 on page 5). A candidate who fails to meet the requirements for one Video Packet may, within the same program year, reregister for the Video Performance Assessment, modify or redo the packet that failed to meet the requirements, and submit it with copies of the previously submitted Video Packets that did meet the requirements (but did not receive scores). Not reporting the scores gives such a candidate an opportunity to fix the Video Packets that did not meet the requirements without having to create new Video Packets to replace the ones that did meet the requirements. This does not violate the unitary nature of the Video Performance Assessment because, rather than allowing candidates to combine Video Packet scores across submissions, it allows candidates to, within a single submission, rectify a technical problem before receiving any scores.

If scores were reported for the originally-submitted Video Packets that met the requirements, the candidate would *not* be able to submit copies of them with the corrected Video Packet that originally did not meet the requirements. Rather, the candidate would have to virtually start all over. The candidate would have to modify or redo the packet that failed to meet the requirements and create two brand new packets. The candidate's efforts on the two originally-submitted Video Packets that met the requirements would be mostly wasted (in relation to purposes of the assessment). Thus, the policy of not reporting scores for packets that meet the requirements provides an *advantage* to candidates who, for one reason or another, fail to meet a technical requirement of the assessment.

Summary

Candidates who choose to take the RICA Video Performance Assessment (instead of the RICA Written Examination) must submit three Video Packets at one time that meet specified requirements. All submitted Video Packets are reviewed by trained scorers. Video Packets that meet the specified requirements are assigned scores. Video Packets that do not meet the requirements are identified as such and are not assigned scores. To maximize its reliability (and, therefore, validity) the RICA Video Performance Assessment (like the Written Examination) is a unitary assessment. Candidates may not combine packet scores across multiple submissions.

All Video Packets that meet the specified requirements are assigned scores, even those submitted by candidates who also submit one or two Video Packets that are not assigned scores because they do not meet all the requirements. Those packet scores, however, are not reported to such candidates. This allows the affected candidates to reregister for the Video Performance Assessment, modify or redo the packet that failed to meet the requirements, and submit it with copies of the previously submitted Video Packets that did meet the requirements (but did not receive scores). Not reporting the scores gives such a candidate an opportunity to fix the Video Packets that did not meet the requirements without having to create new Video Packets to replace the ones that did meet the requirements.





[Back to "Agenda Archives"](#)
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: January 6-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PERF-2

Committee: Performance Standards

Title: The California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST): A Progress Report

✓ Information

Prepared by: Margaret Olebe, Ph.D., Consultant
Professional Services Division

The California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST): A Progress Report

Professional Services Division

December 21, 1998

Executive Summary

The following report summarizes work completed during the past two years on the design and development of a new formative assessment system for first and second year teachers in California's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs

Fiscal Impact Statement

The principal costs associated with CFASST are recovered through the BTSA projects that elect to use CFASST. The remaining costs are covered by the base budget of the Professional Services Division.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission review this report, ask questions, and, if desired, provide staff direction for future reports on the development and implementation of CFASST.

The following report summarizes work completed during the past two years on the design and development of a new formative assessment system for first and second year teachers in California's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs (BTSA), and potentially other teacher education programs as well. This system is known as the California Formative Assessment & Support System for Teachers (CFASST). The concepts found in the CFASST system build on earlier developmental work in formative assessment for beginning teachers, which was led by Educational Testing Service and the WestEd Laboratory for Educational Research and Development and in the original Support Provider Training developed at the University of California, Santa Cruz.

First, the report describes the initial thinking of the BTSA Interagency Task Force about the key elements of the new integrated assessment and support system. Next the report describes the process used for the design and development of the system. Third, the report describes more fully the specific components of CFASST Year One and accompanying training. Then the evaluation plan for Year One is described, and an update on implementation in BTSA programs from July 1998 through December 1998 is provided. Finally, the report describes initial work on the CFASST Year Two design and development process.

Section One: Background for the Development of CFASST

The California Formative Assessment & Support System rests on the same assumptions about teaching that have been embraced in the overall design of the BTSA Program, and were articulated by the Commission in the introduction to the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* (CSTP). These assumptions include a holistic vision of teaching, a developmental view of teaching, and recognition of the diversity of teaching in California. The CSTP are intended for use in concert with a performance assessment system in order to provide beginning teachers with accurate, reliable information about their teaching. The integrated assessment & support model is intended to render information that will be more comprehensive and more responsive to the developmental needs of new teachers, while still being accurate and reliable bases for determining the course of each new teacher's extended preparation.

In addition, it is assumed that an integrated system of formative assessment & support will continue to be used in the context of induction programs that are guided by the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs, which the Commission adopted on May 1, 1997.

The BTSA Program expanded in 1997-98 as a result of a \$10 million augmentation to the BTSA budget that was initiated by the Commission and the Department, and sustained by Governor Wilson. It again expanded in FY 1998-99 with a total allocation of \$67.2 million for BTSA System. This rapid growth reinforced the need for a statewide approach to formative assessment to stabilize the system and ensure quality by providing high quality materials and substantive training for support providers in formative assessment and differentiated support strategies. In this environment, BTSA Programs are the primary vehicles for the delivery of assessment services for credentialed teachers.

Design Features of CFASST

Support and Assessment Cycle. CFASST is intended to meet certain design criteria that are incorporated in the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs*. Beginning teachers should experience support and assessment as a seamless, integrated process, rather than as distinct program elements. Assessment data will help to drive support and extended preparation activities that will, in turn, generate new assessment data. Each participating teacher should be able to describe their previous and current professional practice in relation to the CSTP, based on formative assessment outcomes, and use that knowledge to plan their extended preparation in consultation with an experienced support teacher.

Two-Year Process. CFASST should cycle over a two-year period, measuring and informing new teacher growth in appropriate ways at each stage of preparation. To address the developmental needs of teachers who are completing their preparation, assessment activities for first-year and second-year teachers should be distinct. Recognizing that interns and pre-interns have developmentally different needs than previously prepared teachers, the integrated system should be flexible enough to potentially serve interns and pre-interns as well as newly credentialed teachers. It will function as a stand-alone performance-based formative assessment process, independent of employment decisions. At the same time, the assessment information it generates should be sufficiently accurate and reliable so that it could potentially inform an advanced certification process in the future. The integrated model is *not* intended to serve as a *summative assessment system*, however, and the design does not include the more robust features that must characterize summative assessments.

Integrated Training. Program evaluation data collected during the five years of the BTSA Program's pilot phase has indicated that the integration of support provider and assessor roles leads to more cohesive understandings and practices in formative assessment for BTSA's beginning *and* experienced teacher participants. Yet the training for each of these roles/activities had remained separate. The new design includes an integrated training plan for support provider/assessors, with distinct modules on the CSTP, coaching, formal observation skills, collecting and interpreting evidence, development of portfolio entries, and use of scoring rubrics. Training packages allow for flexible delivery of component modules, to reflect diverse local contexts such as multiple school year calendars, regional service delivery, and unique program designs.

Ongoing Evaluation. Consistent with best practices that have been used in the development of the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession* and the *BTSA Program Standards*, the CFASST design has been developed on the basis of ongoing, regular consultations with current BTSA program participants, as well as the advice of performance assessment experts from the broader teacher education community in California. An essential feature of CFASST is ongoing formative program evaluation. As the new system is piloted and implemented, data from the field will be systematically collected on the effectiveness of the new design and the materials, trainings and activities associated with it. This will foster and inform ongoing improvements and adjustments to the assessment process so that it remains congruent with the changing contexts and new understandings of teaching and teacher education in California.

Assessment Methods for CFASST

As in the past, the Individual Induction Plan (IIP) remains the keystone of BTSA's seamless support and assessment design. The IIP is informed by periodic, ongoing assessment of teacher growth that relies primarily on two tools, classroom observation and inquiry. Educational Testing Service's *Pathwise Observation System* and WestEd's *California Teaching Portfolio* are the closest previous approximations of the CFASST methods.

The Individual Induction Plan

In the new design, the IIP is strengthened and used in somewhat different ways with first and second year teachers. The

reconceptualized IIP identifies areas for individual growth, and takes into account learning expectations placed on new teachers by district and school-site leaders. Beginning teachers will write their plans for extended preparation in consultation with their support providers during both the first and second years of teaching. However, the IIP-planning activity will function somewhat differently during the two years.

For the first-year teacher, the Individual Induction Plan is structured to guide the teacher through the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*, specific assessment activities, district and school priorities, and reflective practice. A first-year teacher will focus primarily three standards in her plan:

- *The Standard for Engaging and Supporting All Students*
- *The Standard for Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning*
- *The Standard for Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students*

Second-year teachers will build on the skills acquired in preservice preparation and the first year, by developing Individual Induction Plans that focus on classroom-based research to be documented in more sophisticated inquiries. They focus on three teaching standards to extend their preparation, including:

- *The Standard for Assessing Student Learning*
- *The Standard for Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter*
- A closer examination of *the Standard for Engaging and Supporting All Students*

Second-year teachers will be offered extended inquiries and flexible options for the inclusion of observations and other sources of evidence. All Year Two portfolio entries will contain elements of the *Standard for Developing as a Professional Educator*; the entire process itself should function as an enactment of this standard.

Formal Classroom Observations in CFASST — The Profile of Practice

When classroom observations are conducted carefully by assessors who are well trained to make inferential judgments on the basis of comprehensive standards, such assessments establish a clear picture of teacher performance. Well-crafted observations also provide succinct, discrete evidence about the preparation, execution and analysis of individual lessons. The Profile of Practice, like the *Pathwise* system, is an observation that:

- explores several teaching standards during an assessment;
- is a completely open system, with assessment standards, materials and criteria available to beginning teachers before, during and after an assessment;
- provides specific information about teaching proficiency in each assessed standard based on written and observed evidence;
- takes into account the beginning teacher's perceptions of the teaching events observed through post-observation reflective writing; and
- incorporates coaching support before and after the classroom observation.

A key function of the formal observation is to compose a CSTP-based profile of teaching performance early in the first year of extended preparation, through the collection of observation evidence by trained, experienced support providers. Beginning teachers will move to more independent assessment activities as they gain in confidence over the year. Unlike the current *Pathwise* system, this formal observation process uses the CSTP as the underlying conceptualization of teaching practice.

Teaching Portfolios in CFASST — The Inquiry Process

Inquiry in CFASST is similar to investigations though the collection of evidence found in a teaching portfolio. The inquiry in CFASST, derived from both the *WestEd Teaching Portfolio* and the *National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Portfolios*

- fosters the ongoing practice of collecting evidence of teaching practice, assessing its meaning, and reflecting on it in writing;
- focuses on collecting evidence of student learning to document extensions of the new teacher's prior preparation;
- uses analysis of student work samples as bases for assessing current practice and setting new directions for growth; and
- integrates support and assessment through ongoing conversations between new teachers and support providers on selected focus areas/portfolio entries.

The evidence of teaching growth collected over the year through the three methods — individual induction plan, formal classroom observation and inquiry — is collected in the folders for each event that are found inside the CFASST box. The completed CFASST Events will address all the teaching standards over the two-year period, and will be a material representation of the *Standard for Developing as a Professional Educator*.

Self-Assessment Tools in CFASST

To encourage teachers to become autonomous practitioners, able to make sound judgments about their own practice, the system includes evidence drawn from the beginning teacher's own professional insights. Such insights originate in individual reflections and collegial interactions with peers. These reflections and interactions are integral to both the observation and inquiry processes, and are captured through writing and conversation in each event. It is not possible to complete any of the CFASST Events without the active participation of both support provider and beginning teacher.

Section Two: Design and Development of the CFASST SYSTEM

Initial Phase: Preliminary Investigations of Feasibility of CFASST

Initial discussions on the feasibility of CFASST included the Directors of local BTSA Programs and representatives of Educational Testing Service and WestEd during February and April 1997. BTSA Program Directors provided extensive feedback on specific attributes of assessment they would like incorporated in the new design, and supported the concept of an integrated support and formative assessment system. With the assessment specialists, discussions focused on the extent to which existing products and trainings could be folded into a new system, the need for the development of completely new products, the articulation of work among potential technical contractors, and the timeline for development and completion of the new system.

During May and June 1997 follow-up discussions with the Directors of BTSA Programs and assessment contractors confirmed their continued interest. At the statewide meeting of BTSA Program Directors in May, approximately half of the programs indicated a willingness to pilot-test the new system in 1997-98, while it is under development. Representatives of Educational Testing Service, WestEd, and the BTSA Programs in Santa Cruz and Monterey met with each other independently, and with the Interagency Task Force to consider the technical aspects of future development work, including their own potential collaboration to create an integrated product. The assessment contractors indicated a strong willingness to collaborate on a new formative assessment system for BTSA, and felt that an approximate one-year timeline for development is adequate given the existence of several components of the system, and the continued participation of their original developers.

Second Phase: Creating & Implementing a Workplan for the Development of CFASST

On July 17, 1997, the Commission directed the staff to collaborate with the Department of Education, Educational Testing Service, the WestEd Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, and selected directors of local BTSA Programs to develop a joint scope of work, including a workplan, timeline and budget for the design, development, and initial piloting of an integrated model formative assessment system for use in local Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs beginning in the 1998-99 school year. The specific attributes of the system are described above, and were previously discussed by the Commission on July 17, 1997. This section presents the outcomes of the collaborative development of a plan, including a summary of the detailed workplan for the proposed assessment development project.

On August 21, 1997, the Commission adopted staff recommendation to: (1) enter into a no-cost contract with Educational Testing Service for assessment development work to be carried out during 1997-98; and (2) the development of a California Formative Assessment & Support System for Teachers (CFASST) for the BTSA Program. The next sections of this report describe the organization and work process now in place.

Organization of the CFASST Design Team

As a result of collaborative discussions and negotiations among the potential participants, it was decided that Educational Testing Service would assume an overall leadership role for the management of the developmental work and production of initial materials. WestEd Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, and UC Santa Cruz, as well as local assessment experts and directors of local BTSA Programs agreed to participate as Design Team members together with selected ETS staff. Two ETS staff shared project coordination. Members of the wider teacher preparation and induction communities are contributing to the development of the system through reviews of work-in-progress and examination of prototype materials. In addition, an eight- to ten-member Advisory Committee, composed of support providers, BTSA Directors, school district administrators, and university faculty met quarterly to provide guidance and feedback to the design team. California Department of Education staff participated on the Design Team and monitored project progress through the Interagency Task Force. Dr. Margaret Olebe and Dr. Terry Janicki, Consultants in the Commission's Professional Services Division monitored the overall project management.

Budget for CFASST

Educational Testing Service entered into a contract with the Commission and Department for the design and development of CFASST at no cost to the two agencies or the State of California. ETS was willing to enter into such an agreement because it will give them an opportunity to learn from Californians how to develop such a system, which may prove to be useful in other states.

Development Process & Timeline for CFASST

For each element of the system, a similar design process was followed. The steps of this process, and development timeline for year one materials were:

Preliminary design specifications prepared by specialists. (September, '97)

- Design specifications reviewed by the design team, revised by specialists. (October, '97)
- Design specifications reviewed by the Advisory Committee and revised as needed. (October, '97; December '97; March '98)
- Existing materials (from the various existing programs) examined for possible inclusion in the final product (October & November '97)
- Outline of the product (for example, sequencing and presentation of materials) drafted by specialists and reviewed by the design team (December '97).
- Outline of the product reviewed by the Advisory Committee and revised as needed (December '97; March '98).
- Development of the product (inquiries, training modules, etc.) according to the outline. (December '97, Jan., Feb., March '98)
- Review of the product by all members of the design team as revised by Advisory Committee and user comments, and coordinated with all other elements of the program to ensure consistency and coherence. (April '98)
- Pilot test of the training design and materials in a local BTSA program (May '98)
- Formatting of the products for the field review version. (May, '98)
- Field testing of the product by selected local BTSA programs. (July '98 - May '99)
- Revision of the materials as required following field reviews. (July - March '99)
- Formatting of final version for production (July '00)

The design team piloted the design in a local BTSA program in May, '98, and initial trainings in the new system occurred in June 1998. This constrained timeline was achievable because many components of the system already existed. The primary challenge for the design team was the integration of the essential components and the inclusion of the support strategies for experienced teachers. The CFASST design team met regularly as outlined above and was able to complete the formative assessment design, materials and training within the proposed timeline.

Section Three: Components of CFASST

The CFASST design team workplan had three essential components: (1) design and development of the assessment tools themselves and supporting documents for their use; (2) design and development of integrated training for support provider/assessors; and (3) review of products by the advisory group and other potential users. This section of the report deals primarily with the first two components, as the initial year of use of the materials will constitute the major field test of the system. A research and evaluation design for this component is currently under development, and will be presented in detail in the next progress report.

Overview of the Assessment Cycle for First Year Teachers

The design team based its work on the design principles outlined in Section 4, an examination of assessment tools currently in use in local BTSA program, and the legislative purposes outlined in AB 1266. It has created an integrated formative assessment and support process that embraces both a professional growth curriculum for all teachers and individualized professional development that reflects local contexts using multiple measures. The design measures all of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession at the element level over the two years, and provides assessment events that articulate work over elements from several standards, as well as events that examine single standards independently. The teaching standards are examined initially and recursively, with each assessment event adding layers of complexity as the beginning teachers' practice develops over the academic year. The design team has also created a new assessment lexicon, moving away from terminology associated with previous systems, reflecting the uniqueness of the new assessment tools. Table 1 below outlines the assessment cycle.

Year One CFASST Cycle

EVENT & Estimated Timeline	ORIGIN in Earlier Work in BTSA	Primary CSTP MEASURED
Class, School, Community & District Profile <i>Month 1</i>	Pathwise, California Teaching Portfolio & Local Assessment Tools	Developing as a Professional Educator
Inquiry 1: Creating an Effective Environment	California Teaching Portfolio	Creating & Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

for Learning <i>Month 2</i>		
Profile of Practice, #1 <i>Month 3</i>	Pathwise Observation Instruments	Engaging & Supporting All Students in Learning, Creating & Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning, Planning Instruction & Designing Learning Experiences for All Students. (also others)
Begin Individual Induction Plan <i>Month 4 & recursively</i>	BTSA Program Local Assessment Tools	Based on evidence collected from CSDC, Inquiry 1 & POP
Inquiry 2: Developing an Instructional Experience & Revisit IIP Afterwards <i>Month 5</i>	California Teaching Portfolio & National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	Engaging & Supporting All Students in Learning; Planning Instruction & Designing Learning Experiences for All Students; Understanding & Organizing Subject Matter for Learning
Profile of Practice, # 2 & Revisit IIP Afterwards <i>Month 6</i>	Pathwise Observation Instruments	Engaging & Supporting All Students in Learning; Creating & Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning; Planning Instruction & Designing Learning Experiences for All Students (also others)
Inquiry 3: Examining Student Work (Some teachers may begin Inquiry 2) <i>Month 7</i>	California Teaching Portfolio & National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	Engaging & Supporting All Students in Learning, Planning Instruction & Designing Learning Experiences, Understanding & Organizing Subject Matter, Assessing Student Learning
Assessment Summary: Reflecting on Professional Growth <i>Month 8</i>	California Teaching Portfolio	All the above, and Developing as a Professional Educator
CFASST Colloquium <i>Month 8</i>	California Teaching Portfolio & Local Assessment Practices	An opportunity to discuss the year's work and celebrate the profession of teaching.

Each event is designed to meet specifications that reflect both the specific nature of each measurement tool, and the developmental progress of beginning teachers. Overall the assessment events move from less to more complex; from support provider guided to beginning teacher directed; and from single to multiple standard examination. At all points in the system there are opportunities for beginning teacher choice. These specifications are described next.

Assessment Events in CFASST

Class, School, Community & District Profile: A paper and pencil survey of the beginning teacher's class, school, community and district that directs the beginning teacher to seek out information on students backgrounds, prior knowledge and experiences at the outset of the year. It begins with demographic data about the class, and then leads to an examination of the school, community and district environments that impact daily teaching. It has two sections, one that guides data collection, and a second that guides individual reflection on how the data may influence teaching choices. This tool is updated over the year as the class composition changes, and as the beginning teacher's understanding of the context for teaching deepens.

inquiries: Formerly referred to as portfolio entries, the inquiries are six to eight week investigations of teaching practice, each of which is connected to an earlier component of the system and leads into the following component. The inquiry format uses the Plan, Teach, Reflect, Act cycle that was highly successful with beginning teachers using the California Teaching Portfolio. The inquiry begins by stating the purpose, learning goals, CSTP elements to be examined, and the timeline for completion. The design specifications include:

- *Identification of 1 - 3 target students based on data collected in the CSDC*
- *A subject area focus; one class for secondary teachers*
- *A teaching challenge identified from the IIP*
- *Logs to record findings*
- *Informal observations focused on inquiry*
- *Research articles that support the inquiry*
- *Reflective writing and conversations*
- *Collection of evidence: teacher and student products*
- *Use of criteria to assess progress based on evidence collected*

Review of IIP based on evidence and findings

- *Hints to the beginning teacher on how to complete each step*

This design differs from past practice in the development of portfolio entries in the California Teaching Portfolio in one respect. The starting point for each inquiry is a teaching activity or process that every teacher engages in on a regular basis, rather than a teaching standard. The development of the new model was informed by the practices of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Staff from Educational Testing Service who are on the design team and also work on portfolio entries for the NBPTS shared this perspective with the California developers.

Profile of Practice: This assessment event is primarily a formal observation. Along with the observation itself, planning and reflection documents are created, and student work is collected. The entire assessment event measures in varying degrees all of the teaching standards. The overall process is modeled on Pathwise, and includes: the development of a detailed lesson plan; observation of the lesson selected by a trained support provider/assessor; reflection on the lesson by the beginning teacher; analysis of the lesson by the support provider; collection of student work for 2 students generated by the lesson observed; and summary conversation and analysis of evidence collected by support provider and beginning teacher using criteria for each of the teaching standards. The observation itself is constrained to one lesson, with the actual timeframe defined by the beginning teacher, although the completion of all the steps will occur over one to two weeks. The design criteria include:

- *A formal observation by a trained observer*
- *Identification of 1 - 2 target students based on data collected in the CSDC*
- *A subject area focus; one class for secondary teachers*
- *An instruction plan and reflection on lesson as taught*
- *Reflective writing and conversations*
- *Collection of evidence: teacher and student products*
- *Analysis of teaching event observed based on the CSTP by support provider*
- *Use of criteria to assess progress based on evidence collected*
- *Development of IIP based on evidence and findings*
- *Hints to the beginning teacher on how to complete each step*

The Profile of Practice is intended to provide the beginning teacher and support provider an overall portrait or profile across the standards based on a deep examination of a single teaching event. This contrasts with the Inquiry, which looks deeply into teaching over time through the lenses provided by selected elements from a few standards.

Individual Induction Plan (IIP). In the CFASST design the IIP serves as a tool for decision-making and an agenda for professional development. It begins by asking beginning teachers to reflect on the evidence gathered on their teaching to date (from the CSDC, POP, and Inquiry One), analyze it and identify their areas for strength, areas for growth, and special challenges they may face. Challenges might include communicating with non-English speaking parents, working without a sink in a science classroom, a wide range of reading abilities, or gender imbalance in a class. Based on this information, the beginning teacher outlines a plan for extended preparation that includes a decision on how to approach the next Inquiry in CFASST, and other professional development activities might be engaged in to move their practice forward. These might include looking at new materials, attending a class or training, observing colleagues, or watching demonstration lesson. The plan will direct the teacher to make such choices informed by classroom context, extended preparation priorities, and school and district staff development foci. In CFASST, the beginning teacher will be asked to reexamine the IIP at the conclusion of each assessment event, and adjust it as appropriate based on the analysis of new evidence collected.

Assessment Summary and Colloquium. The purpose of the Assessment Summary is to provide an opportunity for the beginning teacher to reflect on the work completed during each of the earlier CFASST events, review the history of their first year of teaching practice, and to self-assess on their development in each of the teaching standards assessed. Beginning teachers use the Description of Practice for each element they have collected evidence for, and mark the appropriate level as revealed by the evidence. They then meet with their support providers and advocate for the levels they chose, using the evidence collection to support their conclusions. They then select the evidence from the entire collection that most meaningfully represents their growth over the year, and share it with colleagues in a short presentation at the end of year Colloquium. The Colloquium provides a unique opportunity for the induction community to learn from each other about the previous year of teaching, and to celebrate the profession.

Design and Use of Supporting Documents

Use of the CFASST system by both beginning teachers and support providers depends on the use of key support documents for both the assessment of teacher progress and for guidance in how to use the system. Measurement in CFASST is entirely based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, which provide descriptions of teaching practice at the standard level. To make the standards useful to teachers, additional tools must be developed to provide details of what practice looks like at different levels of professional accomplishment. CFASST is developing two such tools, the Descriptions of Practice and the Element Descriptions. It is also intended that the Element Descriptions and Descriptions of Practice will be supplemented in future by anchor papers that offer concrete examples of completed assessment events at various levels of teaching accomplishment.

Element Descriptions. Since this system examines teaching practice at the element level within and across standards, it is necessary to provide additional descriptions and examples of what teaching looks like in a variety of settings for teachers at different levels of teaching accomplishment. Similar to the criteria descriptions used in Pathwise, the element descriptions will offer support providers and beginning teachers alike a richer text than the CSTP themselves provide. This will inform both the

training of the support providers by helping them analyze practice more specifically, and the reflective conversation and analysis that takes place at the conclusion of each assessment event.

Descriptions of Practice. CFASST, like other assessment systems, measures teacher growth through the use of criteria. During the final activity of each assessment event, the beginning teacher and support provider will examine and analyze the evidence collected and together make a professional judgment about the beginning teacher's growth in teaching using a set of criteria. The technical term for this process is mediation. The design criteria for the Descriptions of Practice, the term selected for the criteria to be used, include:

- *Practice is described at 4 levels*
- *Practice is described at the element level for each standard*
- *Each level contains a descriptive statement of teaching practice*
- *The highest level describes practice that meets the standard, i.e. practice of experienced teachers; few beginning teachers will find themselves here.*
- *The lowest level describes practice that is below minimal expectations for beginning teaching in California; few beginning teachers will find themselves here.*
- *The two intermediate levels describe practice of teachers who are working toward meeting the standards, one at a higher degree of accomplishment than the other; most beginning teachers will find themselves at one of these levels.*

Effective use of the Descriptions of Practice relies on an understanding of and familiarity with the CSTP, and, as needed, the Element Descriptions. In CFASST, the Descriptions of Practice are not intended to be used as numerical score equivalents nor as pre/post assessments of performance. The Descriptions of Practice are distinct in this way from the Scoring Guides of the Pathwise system. Additionally they are distinct from previously created "Developmental Scales" or "Developmental Continuum" which describe developing teachers as individuals at different stages of development. It should be noted, however, that those scales were relied upon and informed the thinking of the design team, whose members include individuals who created both the Developmental Scales and Pathwise Scoring Guides.

Guidebooks. To assist both support providers and beginning teachers in successful use of CFASST, individual guidebooks will be provided to all users. The support provider guidebook will contain the beginning teachers' materials, as well as materials for their own use. Beginning teacher guidebooks will assist them in engaging in each CFASST event, providing a resource in addition to the support provider.

Training Design

In the same way that the CFASST model itself integrates support and assessment into a seamless system, the training that accompanies it mirrors that design. To date local BTSA programs have engaged in training activities for program participants that include: Orientation to BTSA, Support Provider Training, Assessment Training (varying by local option), Diversity Training, and local professional development events. These trainings for the most part delivered as separate elements of the local program, whether state developed, as in the case of support provider and diversity training, contractor developed, as in the case of most assessment training, or locally developed, as is the case for professional development events. The new design integrates support provider and assessor training, more closely mirroring what actually occurs during the support and assessment cycle over the course of an academic year. It additionally includes two new elements, Orientation to the BTSA Program and Understanding the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. At this time the state developed Diversity Training is being revised to supplement and complement CFASST.

This training covers 45 hours overall, considerably less than what was required for programs previously using Pathwise and/or the California Teaching Portfolio in addition to Support Provider Training. The training is modularized, so that local programs may use a variety of delivery options, and guidance is provided on the sequence and timing of delivery. Each module is approximately 3 hours in length. Training is intended to be delivered to support providers, although some units are suitable for use with beginning teachers as well. Initially, training will be provided by senior trainers trained by the design team; once the system moves from the field test to the adopted version, a training of trainers model will be employed. The training design is outlined in Table 2.

Training Module	CFASST Event	Delivery Schedule
Module 1: Introduction to BTSA, CFASST, and the CSTP		Prior to/at the outset of the school year
Module 2: Working with the CSTP; SP/BT Relationship		Prior to/at the outset of the school year
Module 3: SP Skills/ CSDC	CFASST 1 Class, School, Community, District Profile	Prior to/at the outset of the school year
Module 4: Inquiry and Working with Evidence	CFASST 2: Inquiry on Establishing an Environment for Student Learning	Prior to delivery of CFASST 2/at the outset of the school year
Module 5	CFASST 2: Inquiry on Establishing an	Prior to delivery of CFASST 2/at the

Inquiry, Informal Observation & Support Skills	Environment for Student Learning	outset of the school year
Modules 6 - 9: Formal Classroom Observation Skills	CFASST 3 & 6 Profile of Practice	Prior to delivery of POP/at the outset of the school year
Module 10: Individual Induction Plan	CFASST 4 & 7: Individual Induction Plan	Prior to delivery of CFASST 4
Module 11 Review of Previous Work		When appropriate to local context
Module 12 : Second Inquiry	CFASST 5 : Designing an Instructional Experience	Prior to CFASST 5
Module 13: Third Inquiry	CFASST 8 & 9, Inquiry on Understanding Student Learning &	Prior to CFASST 8
Module 14 Assessment Summary and Colloquium	CFASST 9: Assessment Summary CFASST 10: Colloquium	Prior to CFASST 9 & 10

This training design provides a curriculum of professional development for support provider/assessors as called for in the BTSAs program standards, thus assuring local program directors that each support provider will be well trained and all participating teachers will have the highest level of individual support available. Consistent with past practice, since the training is intended for support providers, local program directors have considerable discretion in the design and delivery of the CFASST components to beginning teachers.

Section Four: CFASST Evaluation Plan & Implementation Update

The evaluation of the field review year for CFASST Year One is being conducted in conjunction with Educational Testing Service researchers. The overall purpose of the evaluation is to examine the feasibility and effectiveness of the program by analyzing key attributes of the system: local program implementation, training for support providers, and perceived effectiveness of the system to improve practice. The "perceived effectiveness" component is further divided into two elements - the ability of support providers to deliver individualized support informed by formative assessment to beginning teachers; and the appropriateness of the CFASST materials, content and process for beginning teachers. These elements were selected based on suggestions from the advisory committee, the Interagency Task Force, and professional evaluators.

The evaluation methodology is summarized in the table below.

Evaluation Plan Summary

COMPONENT	METHOD	OUTCOMES
Training for Support Providers	Survey of participants in state and local trainings, July - September 1998. (N = 1800)	Modification and/or revision of training design and content for 1999/00 trainings.
Local Program Implementation	Survey of local BTSA program directors in November, '98, January, March and June '99. (N = 71)	Revision of director' resource guide; recommendations on future implementation options and strategies.
Local Program Implementation Quality of Feedback to Beginning Teacher	Focus groups of beginning teachers and paired support providers from 10 local programs in January, March and June, 1999. (BT N = 80) (SP N = 80)	Modifications of training design and content; inform revisions of CFASST assessment design and content.
Quality of Feedback to Beginning Teachers	Support providers complete open-ended comment form for each CFASST event. N = up to 6500 per event	Inform revisions of CFASST assessment design and content.
Quality of Feedback to Beginning Teachers	Examination of 75 completed beginning teacher boxes selected from among volunteer programs. N = 75	Inform revisions of CFASST assessment design and content; modification of training design; revised local implementation options.

The evaluation activities are in place and proceeding as planned. The data from the summer trainings has been collected and a report is due at the time of writing. This report will be supplemented in the spring with additional data from programs that spread the training implementation over a longer period of time (e.g. A program may have delivered some modules in September, some in October, some in November, etc.). Program directors were surveyed in November; the second surveys of directors, and the focus groups have been scheduled for this month.

It is anticipated that all the data will be collected by July 30, 1999. Revisions to the training design will begin in March 1999 for implementation in July 1999. Data related to local program implementation will be analyzed in July 1999 and revised recommendations on local implementation will be available to local BTSA program directors in August 1999. Data collected on the assessment design itself will be analyzed and reported on in September 1999. Actual revisions to CFASST Year One will be completed by March 2000, with the intent that the final version will be available by June 2000. During the 1999 - 2000 academic year local programs will continue to use the field review version.

Progress to Date on Implementation of the Field Review

Local BTSA programs originally funded between 1992 and 1997 were invited to participate in the field review of CFASST during the 1998-99 school year. The 40 local programs funded under AB1266 during the 1997-98 year as planning grants began implementation in July, 1998 using CFASST, unless there was an existing formative assessment system for credentialed teachers in the district that had the potential meet to the program standard on formative assessment (Standard 8). Of the 83 local BTSA programs, 71 are using CFASST. Three of the 40 new programs continue to use local assessment systems. Nine of the original 33 programs continue to use their local assessment systems. At the time of writing, approximately 6500 support providers have been trained and 10,000 beginning teachers are using CFASST in local BTSA programs.

During the field review local programs may choose from among four implementation options:

- Option A: CFASST Events 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10
- Option B: CFASST Events 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10
- Option C: CFASST Events 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
- Developmental Option: Option A minimally; beginning teacher's growth guides the process.

Analysis of the directors' survey responses will reveal the exact number of programs selecting each of the options. Providing implementation options allows flexibility that takes into account local factors, including familiarity with formative assessment, BTSA program experience, start up implementation problems, etc. These options will be available through June 2000. By that time the program evaluation report will have been received and reviewed, and the CFASST materials and process modified as recommended in the findings.

Training Sessions

The first training of CFASST Senior Trainers took place in June 1998. Eighty individuals participated in training of trainers by the design team at sites in Pasadena and Sacramento. This initial cadre was selected from among over 120 applications received statewide. The group contained almost equal numbers of university faculty and K-12 professional development specialists. These trainers in turn delivered the training during July, August and September to approximately 1800 support providers in local programs statewide.

Qualified applicants not selected to be trained in June were invited to train in fall, 1998. Additional trainings were held in October and December; two more trainings are scheduled for February and May 1999. In addition, to support the commitment of Los Angeles Unified School District and United Teachers of Los Angeles to train all of the district's 1935 mentors in CFASST, a separate training of trainers for 40 people will be held in Los Angeles Unified in January, 1999. Altogether 280 CFASST trainers will have been trained to deliver the training to support providers by May 1999.

After May, 1999 the training delivery system will move to a regional cluster model. Training teams of 5 & 6 will be identified in each of the five BTSA clusters, and training of trainers for local programs will be delivered in each cluster. Each cluster will hold at least one training session during July or August 1999. This will add an additional 200 trainers to the pool. To build capacity and facilitate this process, senior trainers who have been successful in delivering training to local programs have been to participate as trainers of trainers at each of the sessions scheduled between now and May. One or more members of the original design team who have overall responsibility for the training process guide them in this process. In this way we are building a cadre of high quality trainers while expanding capacity to meet the demands of local programs.

In summary, it is anticipated that 480 CFASST Trainers will be prepared to deliver training to support providers in local programs by August 1999.

Section Five: Design and Development of CFASST Year Two

Context

The context for the development of CFASST Year Two differs in salient ways from the one that prevailed during the design and development of Year One.

With the expansion of the BTSA Program statewide it is anticipated that several key attributes of the program may change. For the first time, the majority of second year teachers will participate in the program. In addition, the participation in the

program will become more evenly balanced among elementary, middle and secondary level teachers. This will greatly increase the need for support providers. Differentiated support for secondary and middle school teachers, and second year teachers will need to be explored and defined.

The enactment of SB2042 into law will also have an impact on the BTSA program. In particular, the identification of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the State Board Adopted Student Content Standards as foundational documents for teacher preparation throughout the learning to teach continuum offers new challenges. Integration of student standards into BTSA in a systematic way will be new to the program, although the CSTP themselves are embedded within it. How the award of the Professional Clear Credential after two years of successful participation in an induction program will impact BTSA is unclear, as the term "successful completion" has not yet been defined. It is anticipated, however, that beginning teachers will be expected to develop their practice by examining it through the lenses of each of the six teaching standards over the two years.

With these factors in mind, the Interagency Task Force approved an overall approach to the design of year two that:

- Builds on the knowledge and skills developed during the first year
- Examines closely adopted student standards and frameworks
- Includes an emphasis on low performing students and English Language Learners
- Focuses on teaching standards relatively unexamined in the first year: Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning and Assessing Student Learning

The challenge to the designers is to create formative assessment events for second year teachers that are distinct, yet build from the experiences and on the teaching skills established during the first year. To frame this task, it was necessary for the design team to restate the teacher performance expectations for Year One and establish the teacher performance expectations for Year Two. The outcomes for the second year assume significant progress on first year outcomes. They are:

Year One: Intended Outcomes

1. Establish reflective practice through the Plan, Teach, Reflect, and Apply cycle.
2. Use student work to examine teaching practice.
3. Use multiple sources of data to examine and analyze practice.
4. Understand the CSTP as the basis for a systematic approach to teaching.
5. Work collaboratively with professional colleagues.
6. Acquire a deep understanding of three teaching standards: Engaging All Students; Establishing an Environment for Student Learning, and Organizing and Planning Instruction for Student Learning; and initial understandings of three standards: Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning, Assessing Student Learning, and Developing as a Professional Educator.
7. Change practice based on evidence - proof.

Year Two: Intended Outcomes

1. Know what to teach with respect to the discipline your are working in.
2. Know what to teach with respect to the student content standards for the subject matter and grade span.
3. Know how to plan activities that collectively produce student understanding of the content of the standards for the grade level and subject matter.
4. Know how to assess student learning of the content standards.
5. Critically evaluate instruction and materials in light of the standards, framework, and student needs.
6. Acquire a deep understanding of two additional teaching standards: Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning and Assessing Student Learning
7. Experience an opportunity to learn and enhance practice in each of the CSTP

Design Features

The CFASST Year Two design will use the same assessment methods employed during the first year in new ways. The methods are Observation, Inquiry and Individual Induction Plan. These methods will be embedded within a structure that relies primarily on inquiry as a formative assessment method. It is envisioned that the overall structure will include:

Class, School, Community & District Profile - similar to year one, but with enhanced attributes including pre-assessment of prior student learning. This will be completed at the outset of the academic year.

Individual Induction Plan - includes selection of a content area, student content standards and accompanying framework to focus professional development during the year.

Inquiry on Planning and Teaching a Lesson Series and Assessing Student Learning - an 8 to 10 week investigation on a selected student content standard that follows the Plan, Teach, Reflect, Apply cycle. Classroom observations are embedded within the investigation. Completed during the first semester.

Inquiry on Planning and Teaching an Instructional Unit and Assessing Student Learning - a 10 to 12 week investigation on a selected student content standard that follows the Plan, Teach, Reflect, Apply Cycle. Classroom observations are embedded within the investigation. Completed during the second semester.

Assessment Summary and Colloquium — Self- assessment on growth in teaching against the Descriptions of Practice in all six teaching standards; sharing of professional portfolio based one or both inquiries with colleagues.

Initially, CFASST Year Two will offer content specific materials and activities for English Language Arts and Mathematics teachers pitched at four grade spans: primary, upper elementary, middle and secondary. Materials in social studies and science will be developed next. A generic "shell" will be available for single subject teachers working in disciplines not yet covered. As all the work will be subject specific, it is anticipated that support providers will be selected and matched from among a larger pool of experienced teachers than previously; it is also anticipated that second year teachers will work in small groups with their subject specific support providers.

Design and Development Teams

All CFASST work is completed under the guidance of the Interagency Task Force. The introduction of student content standards as a basis for the design made it necessary to reconfigure the design team to include subject matter specialists. This was accomplished by creating two related work groups, a design team and a development team. Members of the design team include staff of the California Department of Education, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, WestEd, and Educational Testing Service. Costs of staffing the design team are met through the employing agencies. The design team is responsible for creating the assessment design, guiding the work of the Development Team, and developing the training.

Development team members in English Language Arts and Mathematics have been identified. They include staff developers, BTSA coordinators and support providers, and university staff from the Sacramento County Office of Education, Sacramento City Unified and Yuba City Unified School Districts, and the California State University Institute for Education Reform. They are responsible for instantiating various components of CFASST, including the element descriptions, assessment events, and guidebooks with subject-matter specific content for each of the four grade spans. Costs of staffing the development team are met through the CCTC/CDE development contract with Educational Testing Service. Professional Services Division consultant Margaret Olebe monitors the entire project.

The advisory process will not use a formal advisory committee as was convened for the development of CFASST Year One, but will rely primarily on focus sessions at BTSA cluster meetings for local program teams. Support providers from local BTSA programs currently using CFASST Year One who are subject matter specialists in English Language Arts and Mathematics at each of the grade spans will be invited to review the draft material in March — April 1999.

Development Process for CFASST YEAR TWO

The design and development teams will work both separately and together to ensure that the work products are created, developed, reviewed, revised, and completed in a timely manner. It is anticipated that the English Language Arts, Mathematics, and generic versions of CFASST Year Two will be available for use by local BTSA programs in July 1999. Work on the social studies and science versions will begin in summer, 1999. CFASST Year Two will be piloted during the 1999-2000 academic year by a few invited local BTSA programs that have teachers who have had substantive success in completing CFASST Year One. The overall timeline is presented in the table below.

Year Two Timeline

TEAM(S)	ACTIVITIES	MONTH
Design Team	Develop structure and design "shell." Identify development team members.	September, 1998
Design and Development Teams	Define tasks and work products; agree on scope and sequence of work.	October, 1998
Design and Development Teams	Further development of assessment "shell" in light of content standards and frameworks.	November, 1998
Development Team	Initial framing of revised element descriptions	December, 1998

Design Team	Review revised work with development team.	
Development Team	First drafts of assessment activities and materials; refined element descriptions.	January, 1999
Design Team	Review and advise on work products.	
Development Team	Second drafts of assessment activities and element descriptions	February, 1999
Design Team	Create training design.	
Development Team	Materials ready for final review. Begin work on training.	March, 1999
Design Team	Articulate with training developers. Review final materials.	
Development Team	Continue on training development.	April, 1999
Design Team	Work with editors and production staff - copy ready for production.	
Development Team	Training materials ready.	May, 1999
Design Team	Review training materials - prepare for production. Identify social studies and science teams.	

Next Steps

At the time of writing, the development teams have completed their initial drafts of the first Inquiry and outlined work for the content instantiated Guidebooks and Element Descriptions. Later this month the teams will meet to develop the second inquiry and complete work on the Guidebooks and Element Descriptions. It has been necessary to work in concert with the State Board of Education's adoptions of the English Language Arts and Mathematics Frameworks so that CFASST Year Two is aligned with them.



[Back to the Top](#) |
[Back to January 1999 Agenda](#) |
[Back to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: January 6-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PUBLIC HEARING - 1

Title: Proposed Amendments of Section 80049 and Addition of Section 80049.1 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to the Requirements and Authorizations for Pupil Personnel Services Credentials

✓ Action

Prepared by: Jim Alford, Program Analyst
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

PUBLIC HEARING

Proposed Amendment of Section 80049 and Addition of Section 80049.1 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to the Requirements and Authorizations for Pupil Personnel Services Credentials

December 22, 1998

Introduction

The proposed amendments to section 80049 and the addition of section 80049.1 concerning the requirements and authorizations for Pupil Personnel Services credentials are being presented for public hearing. Included in this item is the background of the proposed regulations, a brief discussion of the proposed changes, and a description of the fiscal impact. Also included are the responses to the notification of the public hearing and a copy of that notification distributed in coded correspondence #98-9820 dated November 5, 1998.

Background of the Proposed Regulations

At its August 1998 meeting, the Commission approved a plan proposed by staff to develop or amend regulations to clarify sections pertaining to certificated assignments that are sufficiently vague to create confusion or allow questionable interpretation among educational employers. At its October 1998 meeting, the Commission reviewed these proposed clarifications to regulations related to Pupil Personnel Services authorizations and approved the opening of a rulemaking file and the scheduling of this public hearing.

Proposed Changes

Section 80049 is being expanded to clarify the requirements for obtaining each of the four Pupil Personnel Services credential authorizations:

Section 80049 (a) states the four Pupil Personnel Services areas currently issued and clarifies that the School Child Welfare and Attendance Services specialization may only be obtained by individuals holding one of the other Pupil Personnel Services authorizations.

Section 80049(b) describes the requirements for Pupil Personnel Services credentials for individuals prepared in California.

Section 80049(c) describes the requirements for Pupil Personnel Services credentials for individuals prepared outside of California.

Section 80049(d) refers to Section 80049.1 for the authorization for each of the four Pupil Personnel Services areas.

Section 80049(e) refers to Section 80553 for dating of the credentials.

Section 80049.1 is being added to provide specific authorization statements for each Pupil Personnel Services area as well as to clarify administrative duties authorized by these credentials and the appropriate circumstances under which community-based service providers may be included in the provision of pupil services:

Section 80049.1(a) contains the authorization statement for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential.

Section 80049.1(b) contains the authorization statement for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work Credential.

Section 80049.1(c) contains the authorization statement for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Credential.

Section 80049.1(d) contains the authorization statement for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Child Welfare and Attendance Services Credential.

Section 80049.1(e) clarifies that the holder of a Pupil Personnel Services Credential holder is authorized to serve as an administrator of a Pupil Personnel Services program, as described in Education Code Section 44270.2.

Section 80049.1(f) allows for the involvement of community-based service providers in the implementation of Pupil Personnel Services programs, provided that they are supervised in their activities by an individual holding a pupil personnel services credential.

Fiscal Impact

Cost or savings to any state agency: None. These proposed regulations clarify appropriate assignment practices for certificated pupil personnel services positions and thus have no fiscal impact on any state agency.

Mandated costs to local agencies or school districts: These proposed regulations will not impose a mandate on local agencies or school districts which must be reimbursed in accordance with Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of the Government Code.

Other non-discretionary costs or savings imposed upon local agencies: None.

Cost or savings in federal funding to the state: None.

Effect on private persons: None.

Assessment regarding the creation or elimination of jobs in California (Govt. Code §11346.3(b)): The Commission has made an assessment that the proposed amendment to the regulations would not (1) create nor eliminate jobs within California, (2) create new business or eliminate existing businesses within California, or (3) affect the expansion of businesses currently doing business within California.

Significant adverse economic impact on businesses including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states: None. This proposed amendment affects only the Commission, school districts and county superintendent of schools' offices, who are not businesses.

Effect on small businesses per Govt. Code §11346.5(a)(3)(B): None. This proposed amendment affects only the Commission, school districts and county superintendent of schools' offices who are not small businesses.

Significant effect on housing costs: None.

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Mailing List and Responses

The Notice of Public Hearing was mailed to individuals on the following mailing lists:

- Members of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- California County Superintendents of Schools
- Credential Analysts at the California County Superintendents of Schools' Offices
- Superintendents of Selected California School Districts
- Deans of Education at the California Institutions of Higher Education with Commission-Approved Programs
- Credential Analysts at the California Institutions of Higher Education with Commission-Approved Programs
- Presidents of Selected Professional Educational Associations

This notice was also placed on the Internet at "<http://www.ctc.ca.gov>".

Tally of Written Responses Received prior to December 22, 1998:

Type of Response	IN SUPPORT	IN OPPOSITION
Organizational	5	0
Personal	4	0
TOTAL	8	0

Organizational Opinions in Support:

- Huntington Beach Union High School District; Dorothy Crutcher, Director, Pupil Personnel Services
- Point Loma Nazarene University; Jo Birdsell, Director, Graduate Education
- Irvine Unified School District; Leah Laule, Director, Human Resources
- John Swett Unified School District; Susan Scott Martinez, Business/Personnel Manager

• **Personal Opinions in Support:**

- Richard White, Assistant Superintendent, Personnel, El Monte City School District
- Sheila Rocker Heppe, Secondary Education Coordinator, Humboldt State University Department of Education
- Kathy Kessler, Assistant Superintendent, Personnel Services, Huntington Beach City School District
- Andrea Carlin, PPS Coordinator, Department of Social Work Education, California State University, Fresno

• **Organizational Opinions in Opposition:**

None

(Two representatives of United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) previously expressed some concerns about issues related to Pupil Personnel Services preparation requirements and have provided written notification that they will attend the public hearing to address the Commission. This notification did not indicate opposition to these proposed regulations or provide opinions in favor or in opposition to them. Those individuals are:

- Doris Wilson, UTLA Board Member/Mental Health Services, Los Angeles Unified School District
- Allison Tsukimura, Mental Health Services, Chapter Chair, Los Angeles Unified School District)

• **Personal Opinions in Opposition:**

None.

Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed regulations.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PETE WILSON, Governor

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

1812 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814-7000



(916) 445-7254

CERTIFICATION, ASSIGNMENT AND WAIVERS DIVISION

98-9820

November 5, 1998

All Individuals and Groups Interested in the Activities of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Subject: Proposed Amendment of Section 80049 and Addition of Section 80049.1 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to Pupil Personnel Services Credentials

Notice of Public Hearing is Hereby Given:

In accordance with Commission policy, proposed Title 5 Regulations are being distributed prior to the public hearing. A copy of the proposed regulations is attached. The added text is underlined, while the deleted text is lined-through. The public hearing is scheduled on:

January 7, 1999

1:30 p.m.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing Office

1900 Capitol Avenue

Sacramento, CA 95814

Statement of Reasons

Purpose/Effect of Proposed Action

While Education Code Section 44266 establishes general requirements for obtaining PPS credentials, Title 5 regulations require amendments to provide more specific credential requirement information related to these credentials. Amendments to Title 5 section 80049 will clarify the requirements for obtaining each of the Pupil Personnel Services authorizations.

In addition, Education Code Section 44225(e) requires the Commission to "determine the scope and authorization of credentials, to ensure competence in teaching and other educational services, and establish sanctions for the misuse of credentials and the misassignment of credential holders." In carrying out these duties, and in responding to inquiries by school district personnel, the Commission has determined that some sections of the Education Code and Title 5 regulations pertaining to assignment are sufficiently vague to create confusion or allow questionable interpretation among educational employers. Specifically concerning Pupil Personnel Services (PPS) credentials, the absence of clear statements defining the services that PPS credentials authorize the holder to perform limits the ability of employers to make appropriate decisions in the staffing of certificated personnel to perform pupil personnel services. Section 80049.1 will establish authorization statements which provide the specific duties that each PPS specialization authorizes the holder to perform. This will aid educational employers in determining appropriate staffing decisions for the provision of pupil personnel services.

Section 80049(a) lists the four PPS authorizations currently issued by the Commission: School Counseling, School Psychology, School Social Work, and School Child Welfare and Attendance. This subsection also clarifies that the School Child Welfare and Attendance Services authorization may only be obtained by individuals holding one of the other Pupil Personnel Services authorizations.

Section 80049(b) describes the requirements for Pupil Personnel Services Credentials for individuals prepared in California, including a baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally-accredited institution of higher education, completion of a Commission-accredited professional preparation program in the PPS area of specialization, passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test and the recommendation from an institution of higher education that has a Commission-accredited professional preparation program in the PPS area of specialization.

Section 80049(c) describes the requirements for Pupil Personnel Services Credentials for individuals prepared outside of California, including a baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally-accredited institution of higher education, completion of a professional preparation program in the PPS area of specialization requested which is comparable to a Commission-accredited program in the same area of specialization, and passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test. This subsection also provides the minimum number of units of postbaccalaureate study required for each authorization.

Section 80049(d) refers to Section 80049.1 for the authorization for each of the four Pupil Personnel Services Credentials.

Section 80049(e) refers to Section 80553 for dating of the credentials.

Section 80049.1 establishes the authorization statements for each of the four PPS specializations currently issued by the Commission. These authorization statements were developed upon extensive input from a panel of experts in the field of Pupil Personnel Services. Subsection (a) contains the authorization statement for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential. Subsection (b) contains the authorization statement for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work Credential. Subsection (c) contains the authorization statement for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Credential. Subsection (d) contains the authorization statement for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Child Welfare and Attendance Services Credential. Subsection (e) clarifies that the holder of a Pupil Personnel Services Credential holder is authorized to serve as an administrator of a Pupil Personnel Services program, as described in Education Code Section 44270.2. Subsection (f) allows for the involvement of community-based service providers in the implementation of Pupil Personnel Services programs, provided that they are supervised in their activities by an individual holding a pupil personnel services authorization.

Documents Relied Upon in Preparing Regulations

None.

Documents Incorporated by Reference

None.

Written Comment Period

Any interested person, or his or her authorized representative, may submit written comments on the proposed action(s). The written comment period closes at 5:00 p.m. on January 6, 1999.

Any written comments received 14 days prior to the public hearing will be reproduced by the Commission's staff for each Commissioner as a courtesy to the person submitting the comments and will be included in the written agenda prepared for and presented to the full Commission at the hearing.

Submission of Written Comments

A response form is attached for your use when submitting written comments to the Commission. Please send it to the Commission, attention Executive Office, at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814, so it is received at least one day prior to the date of the public hearing.

Public Hearing

Oral comments on the proposed action will be taken at the public hearing. We would appreciate 14 days advance notice in order to schedule sufficient time on the agenda for all speakers. Please contact the Executive Director's office at (916)445-0184 regarding this.

Any person wishing to submit written comments at the public hearing may do so. It is requested, but not required, that persons submitting such comments provide fifty copies to be distributed to the Commissioners and interested members of the public. All written statements submitted at the hearing will, however, be given full consideration regardless of the number of copies submitted.

Modification of Proposed Actions

If the Commission proposes to modify the actions hereby proposed, the modifications (other than nonsubstantial or solely grammatical

Contact Person/Further Information

Inquiries concerning the proposed action may be directed to Jim Alford, at (916) 323-5067. Upon request, a copy of the express terms of the proposed action and a copy of the initial statement of reasons will be made available. In addition, all the information on which this proposal is based is available for inspection and copying.

Attachments

Title 5 Section 80049. Specific Requirements for Professional Clear Services Credential with a Specialization in Pupil Personnel Services.

- (a) A Services Credential with a Specialization in Pupil Personnel Services shall be issued for five years may be issued in the following areas: School Counseling, School Social Work, School Psychology, and School Child Welfare and Attendance on the basis of the completion of all requirements in subsections (b) or (c). Individuals seeking the School Child Welfare and Attendance area must also hold or be issued concurrently an authorization in School Counseling, School Social Work, or School Psychology.
- (b) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential for applicants who complete a professional preparation program in California shall include (1) through (4):
 - (1) a baccalaureate or higher degree except in professional education from a regionally accredited institution of higher education;
 - (2) the completion of a post baccalaureate professional preparation program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the requested pupil personnel services area of specialization, including successful completion of a supervised field practice appropriate to the specialization area, in a school setting in direct contact with pupils;
 - (3) passage of the California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST) described in Education Code Section 44252(b); and
 - (4) the recommendation from a regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the professional clear credential sought.
- (c) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential for applicants who complete a professional preparation program outside California shall include (1) through (3). Applicants may apply directly to the Commission for the professional clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential under this section:
 - (1) a baccalaureate or higher degree except in professional education from a regionally accredited institution of higher education;
 - (2) passage of the California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST) described in Education Code Section 44252(b); and
 - (3) the completion of a post baccalaureate professional preparation program comparable to a program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the requested pupil personnel services area of specialization, including successful completion of a supervised field practice appropriate to the specialization area, in a school setting in direct contact with pupils, but taken outside California. The program must be from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and approved by the appropriate state agency where the course work was completed;
 - (A) The professional preparation program of study for the school counseling specialization area must include a minimum of 30 semester units, or the equivalent in quarter units, of post baccalaureate study;
 - (B) The professional preparation program of study for the school social work specialization area must include a minimum of 45 semester units, or the equivalent in quarter units, of post baccalaureate study;
 - (C) The professional preparation program of study for the school psychologist specialization area must include a minimum of 60 semester, units or the equivalent in quarter units, of post baccalaureate study;
 - (D) The professional preparation program of study for the added school child welfare and attendance specialization area must include a minimum of 9 semester units, or the equivalent in quarter units of post baccalaureate study;
- (d) The professional clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential authorizes the services specified in Section 80049.1.
- (e) The professional clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential issued on the basis of the completion of all requirements shall be dated per Title 5 Section 80553.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference Sections 44252 and 44266, Education Code.

Title 5 Section 80049.1 Authorization for Service.

A Services Credential with a specialization in Pupil Personnel Services authorizes the holder to perform pupil personnel services in the specialization(s) named, as described below, in grades 12 and below, including preschool, and in programs organized primarily for adults;

- (a) The Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling Credential authorizes the holder to develop, plan, implement and evaluate a school counseling and guidance program that includes academic, career, personal and social development; advocate for the high academic achievement and social development of all students; provide consultation and staff

development to teachers regarding students' needs; and supervise a district-approved advisory program as described in Education Code Section 49600.

- (b) The Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work Credential authorizes the holder to assess home, school, personal and community factors that may affect a student's learning; identify and provide intervention strategies for children and their families including counseling, case management, and crisis intervention; consult with teachers, administrators and other school staff regarding social and emotional needs of students; and coordinate family, school and community resources on behalf of students.
- (c) The Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Credential authorizes the holder to provide services that enhance academic performance; design strategies and programs to address problems of adjustment; conduct psycho-educational assessments for purposes of identifying special needs; consult with other educators and parents on issues of social, developmental, behavioral and academic difficulties; provide psychological counseling for individuals, groups and families; and coordinate intervention strategies for management of individual and school-wide crises.
- (d) The Pupil Personnel Services: Child Welfare and Attendance Credential authorizes the holder to access appropriate services from both public and private providers, including law enforcement and social services; provide staff development to school personnel regarding state and federal laws pertaining to due process and child welfare and attendance laws; address school policies and procedures that inhibit academic success; implement strategies to improve student attendance; participate in school-wide reform efforts; and promote understanding and appreciation of those factors that affect the attendance of culturally-diverse student populations.
- (e) An individual holding any of the authorizations described in this section may serve as an administrator of a pupil personnel services program per Education Code Section 44270.2
- (f) Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude school districts from utilizing community-based service providers, including volunteers, individuals completing counseling-related internship programs, and state licensed individuals and agencies to assist in providing pupil personnel services, provided that such individuals and agencies are supervised in their school-based activities by an individual holding a pupil personnel services authorization.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 44225, 44266, Education Code.

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

1812 Ninth Street
Sacramento, California 95814-7000
(916) 445-0184
FAX (916) 327-3166



Attn.: Sam Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director

Title: Pupil Personnel Services Credential
Requirements and Authorizations

Section Nos.: 80049 and 80049.1

Response to the Attached Title 5 Regulations

So that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing can more clearly estimate the general field response to the attached Title 5 regulations, please return this response form to the Commission, attention Executive Office, at the above address by 5:00 pm on January 6, 1999, in order that the material can be presented at the January 7, 1999 public hearing.

- 1. **Yes**, I agree with the proposed Title 5 regulations. Please count me in favor of these regulations.
- 2. **No**, I do not agree with the proposed Title 5 Regulations for the following reasons: (If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of this sheet.)
- 3. Personal opinion of the undersigned. and/or
- 4. Organizational opinion representing: _____
(Circle One) School District, County Schools, College, University, Professional Organization, Other
- 5. I shall be at the public hearing, place my name on the list for making a presentation to the Commission.
- 6. No, I will not make a presentation to the Commission at the public hearing.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____ Phone: _____

Employer/Organization: _____



- | [Back to the Top](#) |
- | [Back to January 1999 Agenda](#) |
- | [Back to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
- | [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: January 6-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-1

Committee: Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Title: Proposed Amendments and Additions to Title 5 Regulations § 80071, Related to Examination Score Validity

✓ Information

Prepared by: Yvonne Novelli, Program Analyst
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Regulations §80071 Related to Examination Score Validity

December 22, 1998

Summary

The following proposes to amend Title 5 Regulations §80071 regarding the five-year time limitation on examination scores used for certification purposes. The proposed amendments detail the time limitation imposed and clarify the specific examinations not affected by the limitation. A copy of the proposed regulation is attached.

Fiscal Impact Statement

There will be a minor short-term cost to the agency related to the public hearing if the recommendation is adopted, but there is no long-term fiscal impact. This action will place existing procedure into regulations.

Policy Issues to Be Resolved

Shall the Commission require that each examination score used to satisfy certification requirements be earned within five years of the issuance date of the credential for which the score is used? Shall the Commission exempt specific examinations from this five-year validity limit?

Background

Title 5 Regulations §80071 was last updated in 1981. It maintains that passing examination scores are applicable toward certification if the credential is granted within five years of the date the test was passed. This was implemented at a time when relatively few examinations were used toward certification and each examination had a single passing score. Since then, the number of examinations used to satisfy certification requirements has increased and many examinations have multiple passing score requirements. Due to these changes, the wording in §80071 no longer clearly addresses all concerns regarding the length of validity for examination scores used to satisfy credential requirements.

Proposed Amendments to §80071

Under the current §80071, an applicant is required to use an examination score for certification within five years of the date the examination was passed. There are several issues not clearly addressed in the regulation that have created some concern because of varying interpretations or conflicts with Commission procedure. The greatest concern is regarding the lack of clarity regarding the five-year limit on the use of examinations for which the Commission has established multiple passing score requirements. The Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT) is one of the examinations with a multiple passing score

requirement. The MSAT has three passing score requirements: 1) a score of at least 148 on the Content Knowledge section, 2) a score of a least 147 on the Content Area Exercise section, and 3) a total score of at least 311. Using the MSAT as an example, should the five-year limit apply to a) each score that meets one of the three passing standard requirements or b) only the most recently earned score of the three? This is discussed in more detail below, followed by the rationale for other changes found within each subsection of the proposed regulations.

Five-Year Limit Defined

With regard to examinations that have multiple passing score requirements, the current wording in §80071 does not specify if the five-year limit applies to each required score or to the examination in its entirety. The following discusses the two options.

For an examination that has multiple passing score requirements, the current wording of the regulations may be interpreted to require the five-year limit on only the last score earned by the candidate because that is when, as a whole, the examination was passed (i.e., all passing score requirements were met). This interpretation would allow an individual to meet the passing score requirement for all but one section of the examination then, years later, meet the passing score requirement for the final section and apply for the credential. It would also allow individuals to meet the passing score requirement for the entire examination and then, again years later when they are ready to apply for the credential, retake a single section in order to be within the five-year limitation. This interpretation would not verify current knowledge of all subject area topics.

A second interpretation of this regulation would apply the five-year limit to each score required for the examination. In this interpretation, an individual who meets the passing score requirement for a section of an examination must meet the passing score requirement for the remaining sections, complete any other credential requirements, and apply for the credential within five years of meeting the passing score requirement for the first section. This is the current interpretation used by the Commission. It is more consistent than the first interpretation, and, more importantly, it establishes the individual's *current* subject matter knowledge. Staff has incorporated this interpretation into the proposed amendments to §80071(b).

The Article Title

In the proposal, Article 3 has been re-titled to reflect the changes that have occurred over the years. The proposed title reflects the numerous exam-related regulations found in this article, and, with the addition of the credential waiver structure in 1994, the re-naming of the examination waivers to subject matter programs.

§80071(a)

This proposal would make the following changes to this subsection.

1. The indecisive term "elects" would be replaced with "seeks" to make the sentence more direct.
2. The addition of "certificate, permit, or waiver" clarifies that this subsection applies to any examination regardless of the type of document requested.
3. Within the first sentence, "on academic achievement and/or proficiency examinations approved by the Commission" has been removed because it adds no new information and makes the sentence difficult to read.
4. The proposal will remove the next to the last sentence because part of it is redundant and the remainder is re-worded elsewhere. It states that the Commission sets the passing score requirements and that the passing score requirements are those in effect for the year the exam was taken. The first sentence in this subsection now addresses both issues.
5. The last sentence is unnecessary because the basic premise of this regulation is that the examination is used or "processed" at the point when the document requiring the examination is granted.

§80071(b)

The proposed amendments to this section, as discussed previously, would clarify the five-year limit and apply it to each examination score used to satisfy certification requirements.

§80071(c)

The proposal adds consistency between the treatment of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) Video Performance Assessment and the RICA Written Examination so, even though the former is not

labeled an "examination" in Education Code §44283, the five-year limit still applies.

§80071(d)

The addition of (d) places current policy into regulations by clarifying that the five-year limit does not apply to examination scores that have been previously used for certification. An example would be MSAT scores used to apply for an internship Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and then used again to apply for a professional clear Multiple Subject Teaching Credential.

§80071(e)

Subsection (e) is added for clarification. The specific examinations listed in this section have traditionally been unaffected by the five-year limit. Requirements such as knowledge of the United States Constitution and experience learning a second language for the Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development Certificate do not represent knowledge of subject matter that educators must teach to their students. Additionally, units granted by an institution based on an examination, such as the College-Level Examination Program or Advanced Placement, have traditionally been given the same status as units granted based on actual coursework. They are also used to satisfy course requirements, rather than examination requirements, for certification such as supplementary authorizations and child development permits.

Article 3. Subject Matter Examinations and Examination Waivers Subject Matter Programs

80071. Qualification by Examination for Issuance of Credential

- (a) Every applicant who elects seeks to qualify for issuance of satisfy a credential, certificate, permit, or waiver requirement by examination shall be required to must meet the passing score requirements(s) established by the Commission on academic achievement and/or proficiency examinations approved by the Commission that were in effect at the time the examination was taken. A list of the adopted examinations and passing scores requirements will be made available upon request to the Commission. The standard applicable to an examination score is the standard established by the Commission for the year during which the examination is taken. Passing scores shall be processed by the Commission at the time of application for a credential requiring such examination.
- (b) Scores will be usable for certification purposes for a period of five years from the date the test was taken, provided the individual's passing test score met or exceeded the passing score standard in effect at the time the test was taken. For each examination score used to satisfy a requirement for the issuance of a credential, certificate, permit, or waiver, there can be no more than five years between (1) the date the score was earned and (2) the issuance date of the credential, certificate, permit, or waiver for which the examination score is used.
- (c) For purposes of this section, the Video Performance Assessment of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment, described in Education Code §44283, is considered an examination.
- (d) Once an examination score has been used to satisfy a California certification requirement, it may be used to satisfy a requirement of another certification document regardless of the five-year limit described in subsection (b) if the score satisfies the passing score requirement for the new document.
- (e) The five-year limit described in subsection (b) shall not apply to scores on examinations used to 1) verify knowledge of the Constitution of the United States, as specified in Education Code §44335; 2) grant credit by an institution of higher education; or 3) verify experience learning a second language required for the Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development Certificate, as specified in Section 80015 of the Title 5 Regulations. The five-year limit on scores described in subsection (b) shall not apply to any examination that is exempt from this requirement by statute or regulation.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 44225(d) and 44252(a), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44252, 44253.3, 44280, 44283, and 44289, and 44335, Education Code. (Filed 4-17-81; effective thirtieth day thereafter; Register 81, No. 16).



[Back to the Top](#) |
[Back to January 1999 Agenda](#) |
[Back to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: January 6-8, 1999

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-2

Committee: Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Title: Proposed Amendments and Additions to Title 5 Regulations Concerning Administrative Services Credentials and Teachers Serving in Non-Instructional Assignments

✓ Report

Prepared by: Terri H. Fesperman, Program Analyst
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

Proposed Amendments and Additions to Title 5 Regulations Concerning Administrative Services Credentials and Teachers Serving in Non-Instructional Assignments

December 22, 1998

Summary

This item introduces proposed amendments and additions to Title 5 Regulations pertaining to the Administrative Services Credential and teachers in non-instructional assignments. These proposed regulations include authorization statements for the Administrative Services Credential and teachers in non-instructional assignments and includes the specific requirements for the Administrative Services Credential.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact in this information item.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

Should the Commission define more specifically the requirements for the Administrative Services Credential? Are the proposed authorizations appropriate for the Administrative Services Credential and for teachers in non-instructional assignments?

Background

Education Code Section 44225(e) requires the Commission to "determine the scope and authorization of credentials, to ensure competence in teaching and other educational services, and establish sanctions for the misuse of credentials and the misassignment of credential holders." In carrying out these duties, staff has found that some sections of the Education Code and Title 5 regulations pertaining to assignment are sufficiently vague to create confusion or allow questionable interpretation among educational employers. Staff proposed at the August 1998 Commission meeting a general plan to clarify in regulations those areas pertaining to assignment that are open to misinterpretation. At this meeting, staff is proposing regulations for the Administrative Services Credential and teachers in non-instructional assignments.

The Commission has issued Administrative Services Credentials under the General, Standard and Ryan statutes. The specific authorizations are listed clearly on each document in addition to the grades for which they apply. The Education Code specifies requirements for the Administrative Services Credential, states when a principal is required to hold an administrative credential at a school site, outlines local level assignment options, and exempts some positions from requiring an administrative credential.

Education Code Section 44270(a) sets out the requirements for obtaining an administrative credential including the holding of a prerequisite teaching or services credential with a specialization in pupil personnel, health, clinical or rehabilitative, or library media teacher. Other requirements include a minimum of three years of experience on the prerequisite credential and

completion of a professional preparation program.

There are several sections of the Education Code which specify administrative or supervisory assignments that may not require an administrative services credential. Section 44860 sets a threshold of six or more teachers at a school site before an administrative credential is required for the principal. An occasionally used §35029, shown below, allows the governing board to waive the credential for the chief administrative officer of that school district.

A local governing board may waive any credential requirement for the chief administrative officer of the school district under its jurisdiction. Any individual serving as the chief administrative officer of the school district who does not hold a credential may be required by the local governing board to pursue a program of in-service training conducted pursuant to guidelines approved by the commission.

Other sections that exempt an individual from holding an administrative credential include, EC §44270.2 which authorizes the holder of a pupil personnel services credential as well as the holder of an administrative services credential to supervise pupil personnel services. Education Code §44834 allowed the governing board of a school district to hire as an administrator a teacher with at least fifteen years of specified teaching experience, ten of which must have been in the district that employed the administrator. In 1990, this section was amended to apply only to persons who were employed by the governing board of a school district in a supervisory or administrative position on or before January 1, 1991. The same statute added Section 44834.1 to allow the Commission to adopt criteria to exempt individuals from administrative and teaching credentials in school districts that participate in innovative alternative programs for school site reform. Since 1991 only two school district programs have been approved using Commission-approved criteria.

There are positions that are administrative, but do not always require an administrative credential. The business manager of a school district is not required to hold an administrative services credential as found in §44069(c). Education Code §44065(d) allows non-credentialed individuals to perform personnel examinations, selection, and to make assignments of teachers, principals, or certificated personnel in instructional programs without holding a teaching or services credential. Directors of personnel or human services generally perform such duties.

The Education Code and administrative regulations lack sufficient specificity about what constitute administrative duties and, thus it is unclear what duties a certificated school administrator may perform that other credentialed personnel are not authorized to perform. Education Code Section 44065 lists thirteen areas of responsibility that the Commission is expected to determine which credentials authorize the service, administrative or non-administrative. The Commission has not made such designations in regulations as stipulated in §44065. Some of the duties listed in the section such as supervising the work of instructors and the instructional program for pupils are clearly administrative while others such as the in-service training of teachers, principals, or other certificated staff is not exclusively an administrative duty.

School districts and county offices of education have repeatedly raised the question of the legitimate role for teachers outside of classroom teaching. The role of the teacher has evolved over the years from that of strictly classroom teaching to being involved in activities beyond the classroom. Staff development, mentoring new teachers, working on standards and curriculum are a few of the duties teachers engage in at school-site, district, and county levels. The expansion of such teacher-based programs as the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) and mentor teacher and the increased interest in peer evaluation push the idea that talented teachers have legitimate and essential roles beyond the classroom. There exists the need to develop leadership opportunities for teachers who are interested in becoming administrators or who might be recruited into administration.

The Education Code was amended in 1987 (Section §44258.9) to require each county superintendent of schools to monitor and review the certificated employee assignments in one-third of their school districts each year (recent legislation has moved this to a four-year cycle). The law also requires that the Commission monitor and review certificated assignments for the State's seven single-district counties at least once every three (now four) years. Education Code §44258.9 also directs county superintendents of schools to submit an annual report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing summarizing the results of all assignment monitoring and reviews. The absence of regulations that determine which duties are administrative and which non-instructional duties a teacher may perform has made monitoring a difficult task for the county offices as well as Commission staff. Staff of the Assignment Unit frequently are asked by school districts and county offices of education to determine whether the specific job duties require a person to hold an administrative credential. In addition, it has been difficult for county offices to decipher which credential, teaching or administrative, is required for teachers on special assignment, resource teachers in non-special education assignments, and teachers coordinating programs at the school-site, district or county level. Appendix A is an example of a job description received by the Commission that mixes administrative, counseling, and teaching duties. A job description of a non-special education resource teacher may be found in Appendix B.

At the August Commission meeting, staff was directed to meet with a group of educators to discuss proposed changes to regulations governing the authorization for the Administrative Services Credential. The individuals listed below participated in an all day discussion on December 8. They represent diverse organizational views.

Name	Job Title	Agency	Representing
Linda Frost	Principal	Manteca USD	ACSA
Kathleen McCreery	Educ. Services Director	Temple City USD	ACSA
Rhonda Kramer	Credential Analyst	Rialto USD	CCAC
Kathy Sloan	Credential Analyst	Ramona USD	CCAC

Cynthia Free	Credentials Supervisor	San Diego County	PASSCo
Merilee Johnson	Personnel Director	Glenn County	PASSCo
Linda Lester	Asst. Superintendent, Human Resources	West Contra Costa USD	District Administrator
Richard Pierucci	Asst. Superintendent, Human Resources	Woodland Joint USD	District Administrator
Kim Breen	Teacher	West Covina High	CTA
Sandra Mack	Teacher	Lowell High	CFT
Betty Gardin	Personnel Director	Los Angeles USD	Los Angeles USD
Albert Koppes	School of Educ. Director	Loyola Marymount Univ	IHE
Carol Riley	Cred. Office Supervisor	CSU Long Beach	IHE

The discussion at the December 8th meeting focussed on the duties of administrators and on the non-instructional duties that could be performed by an individual who is prepared to be a teacher. It was the consensus of the group that the responsibilities of an administrator need to be more clearly identified and differentiated from the non-instructional duties of a teacher. Many of those in attendance stressed the move by school districts to expand the role of teachers, especially in the area of mentoring other teachers. This type of assignment usually does not allow a teacher to evaluate the performance of a fellow teacher, but instead to perform the role of coach and support person. In most situations, teachers provide peer assistance as opposed to peer evaluation although in a very few districts the collective bargaining agreement allows such evaluation. Teachers regularly serve as program coordinators at school-sites, and in district, and county offices while under the supervision of credentialed administrators. Serving in these positions provides a career ladder for teachers, some of whom may want to pursue an administrative services credential. Additionally, this allows the school district to study the teacher's potential for administrative leadership.

As a result of this discussion, the importance of defining the non-instructional duties a teacher could perform as program director under the supervision of an individual holding an Administrative Services Credential was evident. It was also clear to the group that a teacher should be able to provide staff development at the school site, district or county level. The group drafted three proposed authorization statements for the Administrative Services Credential, teachers serving as program coordinators, and teachers providing staff development. In addition, staff drafted regulations for the requirements for the Administrative Services Credential since previously none existed in regulation other than those concerning the accreditation of the program.

Proposed Amendments for the Administrative Services Credential - Requirements

The existing content of Title 5 Section 80054 concerning the Administrative Services Credential references the valid period of the clear credential which is out-of-date and does not include the preliminary credential which the Commission has been issuing since 1994. The dating information for the *professional* clear credential is contained in another section of regulations (80053). The proposed amendments to this section would revise the existing language for the valid period of the credential and propose appropriate content for the requirements for the credential. Staff proposes that Section 80054 be amended to include the requirements for the Administrative Services Credential and that Section 80523.5 be deleted as it will be redundant if the changes in Section 80054 are made.

The proposed changes to Title 5 §80054 clarify the requirements and the valid period for the preliminary and professional clear Administrative Services Credential with the elements summarized below:

- Subsection (a) includes the requirements for the preliminary Administrative Services Credential: a valid prerequisite credential, completion of a professional preparation program, passage of CBEST, verification of experience, and an offer of employment. Applicants prepared in California must apply through a college or university with an accredited program while out-of-state applicants may apply directly to the Commission. The availability of the Certificate of Eligibility is also included in this subsection.
- Subsection (b) describes the validity period of the preliminary credential that ties the dates of the preliminary credential to the expiration date of the prerequisite credential.
- Subsection (c) states that the authorization for the preliminary credential may be found in Section 80054.5. (This section will be described in the next section of the agenda.)
- Subsection (d) includes the requirements for the professional clear Administrative Services Credential: valid preliminary Administrative Services Credential, verification of experience, completion of an individualized advanced program, and the recommendation of a college or university with an accredited program.
- Subsection (e) describes the five-year validity period of the professional clear credential.

- Subsection (f) states that the authorization for the professional clear credential may be found in Section 80054.5. (This section will be described in the next section of the agenda.)

Proposed Amendments:

Title 5 §80054. Services Credential with a Specialization in Administrative Services; Requirements.

- (a) The minimum requirements for the preliminary Administrative Services Credential include (1) through (6).
 - (1) One of the following:
 - (A) a valid California teaching credential that requires a baccalaureate degree and a program of professional preparation, including student teaching or the equivalent; or
 - (B) a valid California designated subjects teaching credential provided the applicant also possesses a baccalaureate degree; or
 - (C) a valid California services credential in pupil personnel services, health services, library media teacher services, or clinical or rehabilitative services requiring a baccalaureate degree and a program of professional preparation, including field work or the equivalent;
 - (2) Completion of one of the following:
 - (A) a specialized and professional preparation program in administrative services taken in California and accredited by the Committee on Accreditation as described in Title 5 Section 80096; or
 - (B) a professional preparation program in administrative services, including successful completion of a supervised field work or the equivalent, taken outside California that is comparable to a program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation. The program must be from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and approved by the appropriate state agency where the course work was completed; or
 - (C) one-year internship program in administrative services accredited by the Committee on Accreditation;
 - (3) Passage of the California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST) described in Education Code Section 44252(b);
 - (4) Verification of one of the following:
 - (A) three years of successful, full-time teaching experience in the public schools, including, but not limited to, service in state- or county-operated schools, or in private schools of equivalent status; or
 - (B) three years of successful, full-time experience in the fields of pupil personnel, health, library media teacher, or clinical or rehabilitative services in the public schools, including, but not limited to, service in state- or county-operated schools, or in private schools of equivalent status;
 - (5) One of the following:
 - (A) a recommendation from a California regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a preliminary administrative services program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation; or
 - (B) an individual who completed his or her professional preparation program outside of California as described in (a)(2)(B) above, may apply directly to the Commission for the preliminary Administrative Services Credential; and
 - (6) Verification of an offer of employment in a full- or part-time administrative position in a public school or private school of equivalent status.
 - (7) An individual who has completed requirements (1) through (5) above but does not have an offer of employment may apply for a Certificate of Eligibility which verifies completion of all requirements for the preliminary Administrative Services Credential and authorizes the holder to seek employment.
- (b) A Preliminary Administrative Services Credential with a Specialization in Administrative Services issued on the basis of the completion of all the requirements in subsection (a) shall be issued initially only until the date of expiration of the valid prerequisite teaching credential, or Services Credential with a Specialization in Pupil Personnel, Health, or Librarian Services, as defined in (a)(1) of this section but for not more than five years.
 - (a) A Preliminary Administrative Services Credential with a Specialization in Administrative Services that expired in less than five years shall be renewed until the date of expiration of the valid prerequisite teaching credential, or Services Credential with a Specialization in Pupil Personnel, Health, or Librarian Services, as defined in (a)(1) of this section but for not more than five years.
- (c) A preliminary Administrative Services Credential authorizes the services specified in section 80054.5.
- (d) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Administrative Services Credential include (1) through (4).
 - (1) Possession of a valid preliminary administrative services credential;
 - (2) Verification of two years of successful experience in a full-time administrative position in a California public school or California private school of equivalent status, while holding the preliminary administrative services credential;
 - (3) Completion of a individualized program of advanced administrative services preparation accredited by the Committee on Accreditation designed in cooperation with the employing agency and the college or university as described in Title 5 Section 80097; and

- (4) A recommendation from a California regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a professional clear administrative services program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation.
- (e) A professional clear Administrative Services Credential issued on the basis of the completion of all requirements shall be dated per Title 5 Section 80553.
- (f) A professional clear Administrative Services Credential authorizes the services specified in section 80054.5.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44065, 44252(b), 44270, 44270.1, 44372, and 44373, Education Code.

With the addition of the credential requirements to Section 80054 including a designated subjects credential with a bachelor's degree serving as a prerequisite credential, Section 80523.5 is no longer necessary. Staff is proposing to delete this section.

Proposed Deletion:

Title 5 §80523.5. Administrative Services Prerequisite.

A valid designated subjects adult education teaching credential shall be accepted as an appropriate prerequisite credential for the Administrative Services Credential, provided the applicant also possesses a baccalaureate from a regionally accredited college or university.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(m) and 44270(a)(1), Education Code.

Proposed Addition to Regulations for the Administrative Services Credential - Authorization

Three sections with authorizations are proposed. First, staff is proposing to add Title 5 §80054.5 to define the authorization for the Administrative Services Credential with the elements summarized below:

- The Administrative Services Credential authorizes the holder to perform the services in subsections (a) through (h) in grades preschool, K-12, and adults.
- Subsection (a) allows the holder to develop, coordinate and assess instructional programs as found in EC §44065.
- Subsection (b) allows the administrative services credential holder to evaluate both certificated and classified personnel.
- Student discipline as found in EC §48000 and sections following is described in subsection (c).
- Subsection (d) contains the authority to perform both certificated and classified personnel discipline as found in EC §44800 and sections following.
- Subsection (e) allows the holder to supervise both certificated and classified personnel.
- Management of fiscal services is specified in subsection (f).
- Subsection (g) describes recruitment, employment, and assignment of personnel as found in EC §44065.
- The authorization to develop, coordinate, and assess student support services is contained in subsection (h).

Proposed Amendments:

Title 5 §80054.5. Services Credential with a Specialization in Administrative Services; Authorization.

A Services Credential with a Specialization in Administrative Services authorizes the holder to provide the services described below in grades twelve and below, including preschool, and in classes organized primarily for adults.

- (a) Development, coordination, and assessment of instructional programs;
- (b) Evaluation of certificated and classified personnel;
- (c) Student discipline, including but not limited to suspension and expulsion, pursuant to Education Code Section 48000 et seq.;
- (d) Certificated and classified employee discipline, including but not limited to suspension, dismissal, and reinstatement, pursuant to Education Code Section 44800 et seq.;
- (e) Supervision of certificated and classified personnel;
- (f) Management of school site, district or county level fiscal services;
- (g) Recruitment, employment, and assignment of personnel; and
- (h) Development, coordination, and supervision of student support services including but not limited to extracurricular

activities, pupil personnel services, health services, library services, and technology support services.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Section 44065, 44800 et seq., and 48000 et seq., Education Code.

In the second authorization statement, staff is proposing to add Title 5 §80020.4 to allow the holder of a teaching credential to provide staff development with the elements summarized below:

- Subsection (a) describes the type of credential an individual must hold to provide staff development at the school-site, district or county level. Requiring a credential based on a bachelor's degree, teacher preparation, and student teaching, it eliminates the holder of an emergency permit or waiver from performing this service. The subsection limits providing staff development that is subject specific to holders of teaching credentials in the subject area.

Proposed Amendments:

5 80020.4. Teachers Providing Staff Development.

- (a) The holder of a California teaching credential based on a baccalaureate degree and a teacher preparation program, including student teaching or the equivalent, may provide school-site, district, and county-wide staff development in grades twelve and below, including preschool, and in classes organized primarily for adults. Staff development which is subject-specific must be provided by an individual holding a credential in that subject area.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(b) and 44225(d), Education Code.

In the third authorization statement, staff is proposing to add Title 5 §80020.41 to allow the holder of a teaching credential to serve as coordinator of a program. The proposed regulations differentiate between programs at the school site and those at the district and county level with the elements summarized below:

- Subsection (a) allows the holder of a teaching credential based on a bachelor's degree and a teacher preparation program including student teaching to serve as school site program director.
- Subsection (b) contains the authorization for a teacher with a credential based on a bachelor's degree and a teacher preparation program including student teaching to serve as a district or county level program coordinator if the teacher consents to the assignment and has five years of experience and has attained permanent status.
- Reading programs at the school site, district or county level must be coordinated by an individual holding the appropriate reading credential or certificate or Administrative Services Credential.

Proposed Amendments:

Title 5 Section 80020.41. Teacher Serving as Program Coordinator.

- (a) The holder of a California teaching credential based on a baccalaureate degree and a teacher preparation program, including student teaching or the equivalent, may serve as the school-site program coordinator in grades twelve and below, including preschool, and in classes organized primarily for adults.
- (b) The holder of a California teaching credential based on a baccalaureate degree and a teacher preparation program, including student teaching or the equivalent, may, with his or her consent, be assigned to coordinate staff development or curricular development programs designed to improve instruction and enhance student learning at the district or county level in grades twelve and below, including preschool, and in classes organized primarily for adults if he or she verifies both of the following.
- (1) The attainment of permanent status as defined in Education Code Section 44929.21 or 44929.22 or 44929.23 in a California school district within the previous ten years; and
 - (2) Completion of five years of full-time teaching experience in a public school within the previous ten years.

Irrespective of the provisions set out in this section above, only individuals who hold either a Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential or Administrative Services Credential may coordinate district or county level reading programs. School site reading programs may be coordinated only by individuals who hold a Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential, Restricted Reading Specialist Credential, Reading Certificate, or Administrative Services Credential.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(b), 44225(d), 44929.21, 44929.22, and 44929.23, Education Code.

DEAN
(Senior High/Junior High)

I. ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

1. Directly responsible to the Principal of the school to which assigned.
2. Directly responsible for the specific classified personnel concerned with pupil personnel services.

II. MAJOR DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Implements the philosophy, goals, objectives, and policies adopted by the Board of Education.
2. Performs specific supervisory assignments designated by the Principal.
3. Assists the Principal in planning the master teaching schedule.
4. Has charge of room assignments.
5. Assists the Principal in teacher selection and evaluation.
6. Handles student discipline.
7. Oversees faculty advisors of student clubs and student activities.
8. Promotes and coordinates the social activities of the school.
9. Serves as liaison official between school and community groups.
10. Coordinates use of buildings and grounds.
11. Helps interpret school program to community.
12. Assist in working on district activities as requested.
13. Serves as director of athletics.

III. CREDENTIAL REQUIRED

1. Possession of a California Pupil Personnel Services Credential.

Appendix B

SCHOOL SITE
PROGRAM RESOURCE TEACHER

JOB DESCRIPTION

The Program Resource Teacher provides leadership in planning, implementing, and evaluating the school program as described in the school plan. This description may be adapted to the needs of the particular school, or specific curriculum emphasis e.g., Reading/Language/Mathematics.

The Program Resource Teacher will provide services to students in small groups (average ratio: 1:5) or individually based on assessed diagnosed need.

THE PROGRAM RESOURCE TEACHER will provide services to the staff by:

1. Implementing student identification process.
2. Facilitating implementation of services as stated in school plan.
3. Assisting in compliance with the State and Federal Guidelines in all areas.
4. Assisting in selection and purchase of materials.
5. Organizing a Resource Room to best facilitate the maximum use by all participants of curriculum materials and equipment, etc.
6. Coordinating and conducting staff development activities as described in school plan.
7. Assisting classroom teachers in implementing and evaluating an effective management system to provide services to participants.

8. Assessing needs and providing inservice to paraprofessionals.
9. Attending staff development sessions as required and sharing information with staff.
10. Assisting staff and parents in monitoring school programs throughout the year so that compliance is maintained.
11. Keeping informed of all changes in the guidelines and communicating this information to staff and parents as they relate to the State and Federal Programs.

THE PROGRAM RESOURCE TEACHER will provide services to the parents by assisting the principal in:

1. Disseminating program information to parents of participants.
 2. Facilitating SSC/SAC/BAC elections.
 3. Involving all parents as volunteers in the parent education activities described in the school plan.
-



[Back to the Top](#) |
[Back to January 1999 Agenda](#) |
[Back to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |

