

Agenda

California
Commission on
Teacher Credentialing

April 14-15, 1999
Commission Offices
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814

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

Click on the  to view the items that are available.

WEDNESDAY, April 14, 1999

Commission Office

1. Closed Session - (Chair Norton) 1:00 p.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)

2. 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

THURSDAY, April 15, 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 March 1999 Minutes
- GS-4 Approval of the April Agenda
- GS-5 Approval of the April 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. Legislative Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Gary Reed)

-  LEG-1 Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission
-  LEG-2 Consent Calendar for Bills of Interest to the Commission
-  LEG-3 Analysis of Bills of Interest to the Commission

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

-  PERF-1 RICA Written Examination Passing Rates by Preparation Program
-  PERF-2 Results of the Standard Setting Studies for Praxis and SSAT Examinations

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

-  **FPPC-1** Update on the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget
-  **FPPC-2** Proposed Spring Finance Letter Budget Change Proposals

5. Credentials and Certificated Assignments Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Dauterive)

-  **C&CA-1** Proposed Regulations to Implement Aspects of AB 1620 Related to Experienced Teachers from Outside of California
-  **C&CA-2** Proposed Regulations Related to Single Subject Credential Authorizations
-  **C&CA-3** Review of the Fee Collected for Out-of-State Trained Teachers Credentialed Under AB 838 (Pacheco)

6. Preparation Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Ellner)

-  **PREP-1** Approval of Subject Matter Programs
-  **PREP-2** Recommended Institutional Accreditation of an Additional Regionally-Accredited Institution Pursuant to AB 2730 and The Accreditation Framework
-  **PREP-3** Pilot Study for Approval of Early Childhood Education Programs and Alternative Education Coursework for Child Development Permits - A Progress Report
-  **PREP-4** Second Progress Report and Additional Recommendations Regarding Implementation of AB 1620 (Scott)

7. Public Hearing 1:30 p.m.

-  **PUB-1** Proposed Amendments to Section 80003 Pertaining to the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential
-  **PUB-2** Proposed Amendments to Section 80053 of Title 5, Pertaining to Authorization for Service as a Library Media Teacher

8. Reconvene General Session (Chair Norton)

- GS-10** Report on the Appeals and Waivers Committee
- GS-11** Report of Closed Session Items
- GS-12** Commissioners Reports
- GS-13** Audience Presentations
- GS-14** Old Business
 - Quarterly Agenda for April, May & June 1999
- GS-15** New Business
- GS-16** Adjournment

NEXT MEETING
May 5-6, 1999
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: LEG-1

Committee: Legislative

Title: Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action/Information

Prepared by: Rod Santiago

Office of Governmental Relations

**BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
March 30, 1999**

CCTC-Sponsored Bills

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
AB 309 — Mazzoni Would increase the cap on per intern expenditures in the alternative certification program	Sponsor (3/99)	Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 457 — Scott Would add internet-based sex offenses to the list of specified mandatory revocation offenses	Sponsor (3/99)	Assembly Education Committee
AB 466 — Mazzoni Omnibus clean-up bill	Sponsor (3/99)	Assembly Education Committee
AB 471 — Scott Would require CCTC to report to the Legislature and the Governor on numbers of teachers who received credentials, internships and emergency permits	Sponsor (3/99)	Assembly Education Committee

SENATE BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
SB 142 - Baca Would establish the Teacher Corps University Grants Program	Seek Amendments (2/99)	Senate Education Committee
SB 151 - Haynes Would allow a person who meets prescribed requirements to qualify for a Professional Clear teaching credential	Seek Amendments (2/99)	Senate Education Committee
SB 179 - Alpert Would establish model alternative teacher preparation programs	Support if Amended (2/99)	Senate Education Committee
SB 237 — Karnette Would require that a person may not qualify for an Administrative Services Credential unless he or she has ten years or teaching experience	Oppose (3/99)	Senate Education Committee

ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
AB 1X - Villaraigosa and Strom-Martin Would establish the Peer Assistance and Review Program for Teachers	Seek Amendments (2/99)	Governor's Office
AB 2X - Mazzoni and Cunneen Would establish various programs related to reading and teacher recruitment	Support (2/99) Seek Amendments (3/99)	Signed by the Governor
AB 6 - Calderon Establishes the Teachers for the Future Program	Seek Amendments (2/99)	Assembly Education Committee
AB 17X - Bates Would delete option for local development by IHEs of a teaching performance assessment and require CCTC to administer the assessment	Oppose (2/99)	Dropped by the author
AB 18X - Zettel and Bates Would require all teaching credential holders to pass a subject matter exam to renew the credential. Would require CCTC to establish a Peer Review Task Force	Oppose Unless Amended (2/99)	Dropped by the authors
AB 25X - Baldwin Would make changes to statutes governing the demonstration of subject matter competence	Oppose (2/99)	Dropped by the author
AB 27X - Leach Would require CCTC to conduct a validity study of the CBEST	Oppose Unless Amended (2/99) Watch (3/99)	To enrollment
AB 28X - Leach Would make changes to statutes governing the accreditation framework	Oppose (2/99)	Assembly Education Committee
AB 31 - Reyes Extends APLE Program to applicants who agree to provide classroom instruction in school districts serving rural areas	Support (2/99)	Assembly Higher Education Committee
AB 108 - Mazzoni Subject Matter Projects	Support (2/99)	Assembly Floor
AB 192 — Scott Would create the California Teacher Cadet Program	Support (3/99)	Assembly Higher Education Committee



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: LEG-2

Committee: Legislative

Title: Consent Calendar for Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action

Prepared by: Rod Santiago

Office of Governmental Relations

Legislative Committee Consent Calendar March 30, 1999

Staff is recommending a position of **WATCH** on the following bills. These bills are in either language stating legislative intent or findings and declarations. If there are future amendments to these bills, staff will bring them back to the Commission for review and modification of its' position as necessary.

1. Senate Bill 489 (Solis)
Bill makes findings and declarations related to educational paraprofessionals.
2. Senate Bill 573 (Alarcon)
Bill states legislative intent to establish an incentive program for teachers who are assigned to hard-to-staff schools.
3. Senate Bill 624 (Schiff)
Bill states legislative intent to enact legislation to allocate \$1,000,000 to the federal Child Care and Development Block Grant for publishing and distributing prekindergarten reading and development guidelines and training child care providers to use the guidelines.
4. Senate Bill 1076 (Vasconcellos)
Bill makes findings and declarations related to teacher preparation and credentialing. Bill further expresses legislative intent to enact legislation to redesign teacher preparation and credentialing to teach teachers both the process of teaching and the information the teacher is responsible for their pupils learning.
5. Assembly Bill 1294 (Firebaugh)
Bill states legislative intent to enact legislation to expand, strengthen, and augment current teacher training programs that provide career ladder opportunities for teacher aides, opportunities for teachers to upgrade their skills, and intern opportunities for persons holding baccalaureate degrees.
6. Assembly Bill 1296 (Firebaugh)
Bill states legislative intent to: (1) define hard to staff schools as schools in which 25% of teaching staff are first or second year teachers, interns, or emergency permit holders, (2) ensure these schools receive BTSA funding, and (3) require school districts to establish mechanisms to attract and retain experienced and fully credentialed teachers to hard to staff schools.



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: LEG-3

Committee: Legislative

Title: Analysis of Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action

Prepared by: Rod Santiago

Office of Governmental Relations

PLEASE ALLOW SUFFICIENT TIME TO DOWNLOAD THIS FILE

CONTENTS

| [Legislative Guidelines](#) |
| [AB 1067](#) | [AB 1282](#) | [SB 1061](#) | [SB 395](#) | [AB 1059](#) | [AB 961](#) | [SB 1262](#) |
| [AB 707](#) | [SB 883](#) | [AB 1242](#) | [AB 1006](#) | [AB 578](#) | [AB 752](#) | [AB 908](#) | [AB 949](#) | [AB 770](#) |

LEGISLATIVE GUIDELINES OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Adopted February 3, 1995

1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.
 2. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards of fitness and conduct for public school educators in California, and opposes legislation which would lower standards of fitness or conduct for public school educators.
 3. The Commission supports legislation which reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation which would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.
 4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.
 5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.
 6. The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators, and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.
 7. The Commission opposes legislation that would give it significant additional duties and responsibilities if the legislation does not include an appropriate source of funding to support those additional duties and responsibilities.
 8. The Commission supports legislation that affirms its role as an autonomous teacher standards board, and opposes legislation that would erode the independence or authority of the Commission.
-

Bill Number:	AB 1067
Author(s):	Assembly Member Bob Margett
Sponsor(s):	Assembly Member Bob Margett
Subject of Bill:	Credential Revocation
Date Introduced:	February 25, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Sponsor
Date of Analysis:	March 19, 1999
Analyst(s):	Marilyn Errett and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Current law contains statutory inconsistencies with regard to sex offenses committed by credential and permit holders which trigger the mandatory suspension and/or revocation of their credential(s).

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission currently follows education code requirements concerning the mandatory revocation of credentials and permits. All other cases are considered on a case-by-case basis.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would amend Education Code sections to specify "lewd and lascivious" with respect to Penal Code violations and would include "other state violations or attempted violations." This bill is considered "clean-up" legislation and would bring Code provisions into conformity.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

Although the proposed statutory changes could result in a small reduction in the number of cases receiving discretionary review by Commission staff and the Committee of Credentials (and an even smaller reduction in the number of cases being forwarded to the Attorney General's Office for administrative hearing), the number of cases affected would represent a relatively small change in the Commission's disciplinary caseload. Consequently, the anticipated fiscal impact (and impact on staff's workload) would be negligible.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

2. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards of fitness and conduct for public school educators in California, and opposes legislation which would lower standards of fitness or conduct for public school educators.

Organizational Positions on the Bill

None known at this time.

Suggested Amendments

None.

Reason for Suggested Position

This proposed solution is characterized as "clean-up" since the changes do no more than bring Education Code sections 44424 and 44425 into conformity with one another.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	AB 1282
Author(s):	Assembly Member Hannah-Beth Jackson

Sponsor(s):	Assembly Member Hannah-Beth Jackson
Subject of Bill:	CBEST Administration
Date Introduced:	February 26, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Sponsor
Date of Analysis:	March 19, 1999
Analyst(s):	Marilyn Errett and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Current law requires the Superintendent of Public Instruction to adopt an appropriate state test to measure proficiency in certain basic skills, and requires each applicant to an approved credential program, unless otherwise exempted, to take the state basic skills proficiency test. Passage of the California Basic Skills Test (CBEST) is required prior to the initial issuance of a teaching or services credential.

The California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) has been a credentialing requirement since 1982. The law states that a fee shall be charged to individuals being tested to cover the costs of the test, including the costs of developing, administering, and grading the test. Currently in law there is an examinee fee cap of \$40 per administration.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

CBEST is administered 6 times a year at multiple sites within 25 testing areas in California and other states. The Commission currently contracts with National Evaluation Systems (NES) to administer the CBEST. This contract will expire June 30, 2001 at which time a new Request for Proposals will be disbursed by the Commission nation wide. Class size reduction has increased the need to prepare teachers for California classrooms. The demand for access to CBEST testing has increased substantially. Meanwhile, the capacity of CBEST administration sites is severely taxed. Additionally, the CBEST examination fee has not kept pace with inflation. At the current fee level, contract revenues are insufficient. When the current contract expires, it will be incumbent upon the Commission to subsidize the exam administration fee from its operating budget in order to reimburse the contractor for the exam costs.

The fee for CBEST in 1982 and 1983 was \$30. Beginning in 1994, the fee was raised to the legal maximum of \$40, and has remained at that level for the past five years. It should be noted that the original CBEST law authorized the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to raise the CBEST fee to \$40 beginning with the 1984-85 fiscal year. Through its efforts on behalf of teachers, the CTC was able to maintain the CBEST fee below the legal maximum until 1994, a decade after the date when an increase was allowed.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

1. The bill declares Legislative support of CBEST as a requirement for teachers in K-12 classrooms and underscores the importance of the Commission's ability to contract with a competent contractor for the purpose of test administration. It further states that the future administration of the exam is jeopardized by the increasing costs of the exam and statutory restrictions that remain in effect. Legislative intent is signaled to maintain the CBEST as administered by the Commission.
2. The bill would require the Commission to make improvements needed to enhance the effectiveness of the CBEST and to improve exam-related services provided to candidates for teaching credentials.
3. The bill appropriates to the Commission \$700,000 from the General Fund for the purposes outlined above.

By appropriating supplemental funds, the bill would enable the Commission to continue to meet the requirements of state law for a basic skills competency test without increasing the cost of becoming a teacher. Because this is a one-time appropriation, the bill would provide for needed services to prospective teachers by increasing exam frequency or by offering the exam at additional sites for a limited period of time. The appropriation could also be applied to exploring the possibility of offering the exam electronically.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

The bill authorizes the Commission to make improvements to enhance the effectiveness of the CBEST and improve exam-related services to the candidates.

Assumptions

The bill provides a one-time appropriation of \$700,000 which limits the number of enhancement options available. The Commission could consider short-term offerings of increased exam administration frequency or an increased number of test sites.

Funds could also be used to augment the difference between the actual cost of exam administration and the current exam fee.

The attached table displays the options available for CBEST enhancements.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.
5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.

Organizational Positions on the Bill

None known at this time.

Suggested Amendments

Staff recommends the following amendment to assure an adequate analysis of funding needs and the appropriate funding to implement this bill.

(c) The amount of seven hundred thousand dollars (\$700,000) is hereby appropriated from the General Fund to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for the purposes of this section. On or before January 1, 2000, the Department of Finance shall, after consulting with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, submit to the legislative budget committees a recommendation regarding the amount and source of funding of an appropriation needed to maintain the fiscal solvency of and to implement, pursuant to this act, needed improvements in the state basic skills proficiency examination known as the California Basic Educational Skills Test.

Reason for Suggested Position

The Commission is required by law to administer a viable basic education skills test to prospective credential holders. The original CBEST legislation closely linked the importance of a teacher's academic skill level with the success of his or her students. It is the responsibility of the Commission to assure applicants for credentials the opportunity to take the CBEST without causing undue hardship due to exam location or exam frequency. Augmentation of the CBEST schedule and/or administration locations will effectively address the increase in teaching credential applications due to class size reduction.

The proposed amendment recognizes the need to adequately address the ongoing solvency and effectiveness of the exam administration.

AB 1282 Appropriation

\$ 700,000

CBEST Enhancements	Cost per Administration	No. Administrations
Adding a test site, metropolitan area	\$ 40,000	6
Adding a test site, non-metropolitan area	\$ 28,000	6
Special Administration for counties having hiring difficulties	\$ 80,000	
Adding one new test date	\$ 290,000	

Electronic Testing based on NES response to RFP for the current CBEST Contract:

Five CBEST CAT centers with up to eight workstations at each center. NES would supply and install the system software, modular furniture, and wiring. NES would maintain the systems, the Commission would own the hardware, software and furniture at the testing centers.

Cost for equipment, furniture, supplies and installation = \$400,000

Service Fee to take the CBEST using CAT in addition to the test fee = \$55

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	SB 1061
Author(s):	Senator Adam B. Schiff
Sponsor(s):	Senator Adam B. Schiff
Subject of Bill:	Credential Fee Waiver
Date Introduced:	February 26, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Support
Date of Analysis:	March 19, 1999
Analyst(s):	Marilyn Errett and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Current law authorizes the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to set a fee for the issuance and renewal of teaching and service credentials that may not exceed \$70. Current law also authorizes the Commission to charge a single fee, not to exceed the charge for a single supplemental credential, for all supplemental credentials applied for at the same time.

In 1998, the Commission reduced credential fees, pursuant to budget trailer legislation, from \$70 to \$60 because of a large reserve. This provision is in effect for two years.

The Governor's 1999-2000 budget proposes \$1.5 million to reimburse the Commission for waived fees pursuant to this bill.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission requires fees for the issuance and renewal of teaching credentials, service credentials, certificates, and permits. These fees cover the cost of processing credentials and other supporting activities. Credential processing and associated activities are not supported through the state's General Fund.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would authorize the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to waive the application fee for first-time teaching credential applicants subject to funds being appropriated expressly for this purpose in the annual Budget Act.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

The bill would have not fiscal impact on the Commission because of the reimbursement provision.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.

Organizational Positions on the Bill

None known at this time.

Suggested Amendments

None.

Reason for Suggested Position

The Commission has a long history of concern over the accrued costs to applicants in obtaining a teaching credential. It has worked to keep fees as low as possible and to keep possible financial barriers to prospective teachers at a minimum. If credential fee costs are reimbursed to the Commission through an adequate appropriation in the annual Budget Act, it would seem appropriate to remove the financial burden from new teachers.

The proposed subsidy to new teachers would also allow for more expeditious processing of credentials.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Senate Bill 395
Author(s):	Senator Teresa Hughes
Sponsor(s):	California Teachers Association
Subject of Bill:	Certificates for Teaching LEP Students
Date Introduced:	February 12, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Oppose Unless Amended
Date of Analysis:	March 16, 1999
Analyst(s):	Maureen McMurray

Summary of Current Law

Education Code 44253.10 authorizes a teacher who is a permanent employee in a California public school district or county office of education employee as of January 1, 1995, to complete staff development by January 1, 2000, in order to add the authorization to teach specially designed content instruction delivered in English (SDAIE). The teacher can complete the English language development (ELD) training within 3 years of the SDAIE training. The staff development may be sponsored by any school district, county office of education or any regionally accredited college or university that meets the standards.

If the teacher has taught for at least nine years in California public schools and can document experience in teaching limited-English proficient students he/she can complete 45 clock hours of combined ELD and SDAIE training and receive certificates for both authorizations.

If a teacher has taught for less than nine years in California public schools or is unable to document experience or training in teaching limited-English proficient students, the teacher can complete 45 clock hours of SDAIE training and then complete 45 clock hours of ELD training and receive certificates of completion for each authorization.

A teacher who completes the staff development for SDAIE will receive a certificate of completion authorizing him or her to give instruction in a subject area in English that is specially designed to meet the needs of limited-English proficient students. A teacher who completes the staff development for ELD may be assigned to provide instruction designed specifically for limited-English proficient students to develop their listening, speaking, reading and writing skills in English in a self-contained classroom. The certificates of completion are valid in all California public schools.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) in conjunction with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction set the guidelines for the staff development. The guidelines for the SDAIE and ELD staff development training were established in 1995 by the CCTC and California Department of Education.

Currently, the certificates of completion issued by the school districts and county offices of education are sent to the CCTC to be filed.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

SB 395 changes four things in current law. This bill:

1. deletes the provision that a teacher must have permanent status by January 1, 1995, therefore, allowing all teachers with permanent status to participate in the staff development training;
2. deletes the sunset date of January 1, 2000, and extends this option indefinitely;
3. specifies that staff development guidelines be aligned with the requirements for the CLAD Certificate; and
4. deletes the provision limiting the ELD authorization to teaching in a self-contained classroom. This would allow a holder of a single subject teaching credential to teach ELD at the secondary level. This gives a teacher who completes the staff development training and holds a certificate of completion in both ELD and SDAIE the same authorization as the holder of a CLAD Certificate, but based on substantially less coursework.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

This bill will have a financial impact on the CCTC. The CCTC will have a loss in revenue as the number of applicants for the

CLAD Certificate decreases and the number of people taking the CLAD examinations also decreases. The CCTC will have an approximate 50-70% reduction in applications for the CLAD Certificate resulting in a projected loss of \$210,000 to \$294,000. However, this loss in revenue will be partially offset by the revenue received for the SDAIE and ELD certificates filed with the CCTC. The CCTC will lose \$18.00 for each person that does not take the CLAD examination. The total loss is not known, as the number of persons who do not take the examination cannot be projected. Since this bill would also require the CCTC to review and possibly revise the guidelines for the staff development, a cost of approximately \$44,000 would be incurred for a panel and CCTC staff support to review and revise the guidelines.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policies apply to this measure:

4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.

5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.

6. The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators, and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.

Suggested Amendments

Staff recommends that the following amendments be made to assure that the original intent of SB 1969, which was to provide district level training for individuals who had begun teaching prior to the emphasis on the need for CLAD competence, could meet the needs of English language learners without completing a full CLAD emphasis or certificate program.

1. Change, rather than delete, the sunset date to January 1, 2002.
2. Allow individuals who have worked in the field for thirteen years, rather than the nine years outlined under SB 1969, to participate in the program. (The purpose of this would be to include the same pool of individuals targeted under SB 1969).

If this bill goes forward in such a manner as to extend the program indefinitely and to open it to all teachers, language should be included that would incorporate the need for meeting the Commission's standards for CLAD credentials and certificates, for Commission approval of the programs, and for an ongoing review and approval cycle.

Reason for Suggested Position

Under SB 395 as it is currently written any teacher with permanent status who completes the SDAIE and ELD staff development training would be authorized equally to the holder of a CLAD Certificate. Teachers will not have any incentive to do the more in-depth CCTC evaluated coursework or examination and apply for the CLAD Certificate. Instead, teachers would complete the unmonitored and unaccountable staff development training at the school district or county level, which could be limited to 45 clock hours (equivalent to 3 semester units) and receive a certificate of completion that is valid statewide and has the same authorization as the CLAD Certificate which requires the completion of 12 semester units of CCTC evaluated coursework at a regionally accredited college or university or passage of the CLAD examination that is approved by the CCTC. The suggested amendments would either continue the limitations regarding SB 1969 training or provide for state standards, state approval, state review, and training equivalent to state sanctioned CLAD training and create a viable option for any teacher who has not completed CLAD training at a time when California desperately needs well-trained teachers to serve all of our students, including English language learners. For these reasons staff is recommending the above amendments and a position of **OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED** on this bill.

Bill Analysis California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	AB 1059
Author(s):	Assembly Member Denise Moreno Ducheny
Sponsor(s):	Assembly Member Denise Moreno Ducheny
Subject of Bill:	Teachers of English Language Learners
Date Introduced:	February 25, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Seek Amendments

Date of Analysis:

March 19, 1999

Analyst(s):

Marilyn Errett and Rod Santiago

Summary of Current Law

1. Current law authorizes institutions of higher education to offer teacher preparation programs accredited by the Commission's Committee on Accreditation. Among the credential types authorized are those targeting work with students who are English language learners. Credential candidates have several different options for obtaining a credential for English language instruction of students learning English or for a further authorization to teach in a bilingual classroom. Current law also recognizes training offered through staff development programs established under SB 1969.
2. Current law requires that the governing board of a school district employ for positions requiring certification qualifications, only persons who possess the qualifications prescribed by law. Such classrooms are designated by the school district. Under current law, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing has the authority to issue credentials and certificates that authorize specified services to English language learners pupils. Current law allows the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to issue waivers of teaching credentials under specific circumstances.
3. Current law supports the training of teachers through the State Bilingual Teacher Training Assistance Program (BTTP), presently inoperative, for individuals serving on B/CLAD waivers or who are otherwise enrolled in coursework leading to a B/CLAD certificate, emphasis, or specialist. Current law requires the State Department of Education to establish minimum requirements for teachers participating in this program.
4. Current law requires allocations for training programs conducted under the State Bilingual Teacher Training Assistance Program (presently inoperative) to be primarily directed towards school districts with high concentrations of pupils who are English language learners. The State Department of Education's annual report to the Legislature also targets geographic areas of the state with high concentrations of pupils of English language learners.
5. Current law requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission's Committee on Accreditation accredits teacher preparation programs for Multiple and Single Subject Credentials with CLAD and BCLAD emphasis and for the Bilingual Specialist Credential. Along with coursework, a CLAD Certificate or Emphasis Credential has a second language requirement which can be met in several different ways including six semester units of coursework in a language other than English. BCLAD requires proficiency in the target language of the credential, certificate, or authorization. The Commission issues the above-mentioned credentials upon the recommendation of an accredited institution of higher education or an approved District Intern Program. The Commission issues CLAD Certificates on direct application based upon specified coursework and requirements. Applicants may also choose to obtain CLAD or BCLAD Certificates upon passage of the appropriate exam developed and approved by the Commission. Before 1996, the Commission also issued Supplementary Authorizations in English as a Second Language. Upon the request of an employing school district or county office of education, the Commission issues CLAD and BCLAD Emergency Permits or waivers of the permit, credential, or certificate under circumstances of proven need. Certificates authorizing Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English and for English as a Second Language based upon criteria specified by the Commission can be earned through SB 1969 staff development programs are recorded at the Commission.

When BTTPs were operative, the Commission allowed the use of such training to meet the language experience requirement for the CLAD credential or certificate.

The Commission monitors assignments of all certificated individuals in the public schools. This includes assuring that all students requiring services in English language development and in specially designed academic instruction for English language learners have teachers who are authorized to instruct in this area. All teachers in designated bilingual classrooms must hold a credential, certificate, or authorization for such instruction. These classrooms are designated by the school district.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

The bill would require the following:

1. The bill would require, with some exemptions, that the governing board of a school district on and after August 1, 2001, employ for positions serving limited-English-proficient students only individuals who hold a certificate authorizing such services.

The bill would also prohibit the Commission from waiving the credential or certificate requirement except on a case-by-case basis. Teachers from out-of-state and emergency permit holders would be eligible for a two-year waiver.

2. This bill would make operative and rename the BTTP. It appears that the new *State Multilingual Professional Development Centers* program would be established as an alternative district program providing preparation for CLAD Certificates.
3. These programs would be offered in school districts in need of teachers certified to offer the above services rather than in areas with a high concentration of English language learners. (The bill language does not preclude a school district from

being both high population need and in need of certified teachers.)

4. The bill would require all institutions of higher education offering a teacher preparation program to provide students who will graduate from a teacher preparation program after March 1, 2000, courses leading to the issuance of certificates that authorize the holder to provide specified services to limited-English-proficient pupils.
5. The bill would prohibit the Commission on and after July 1, 2000, from issuing an initial credential to an applicant unless the applicant also satisfies the requirements for a certificate authorizing services to limited-English-proficient pupils.
6. This bill would provide reimbursement of costs to school districts mandated by the state.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

According to the Commission's budget analyst, the following assumptions apply to AB 1059.

Assumptions

- **Requirement to view waiver requests on a "case by case basis"**
- Would likely increase the waiver workload by 10-15%. Given that this analysis would be accomplished by staff at the AGPA level, a cost of \$6,400 - \$9,500 in overtime would be anticipated.
- **Adding a CLAD requirement for the issuance of an initial credential**
- Costs to the accreditation process:
 - Additional time/work to the Accreditation panel meetings (course verification, deliberation on program standards, etc.)
 - Because the accreditation process begins at least a year in advance, the IHE programs would need to be informed of the new requirements (each teacher preparation program would be required to include CLAD courses as part of their program)
 - Carrying out the functions described would be integrated with current duties. But increased printing, postage, and travel charges could be anticipated. In proportion with the overall Commission budget, the costs would be negligible but could still amount to several thousand dollars.
- Waiver Workload:
 - With this requirement becoming effective July 1, 2000, the waiver workload would temporarily increase pending the full implementation of the new requirements.
- Costs to IHE's:
 - With the new requirements, the costs to the IHE's would include: program modification, costs to modify and print new catalogs, and the costs to receive Commission approval on their programs to ensure that they are in compliance with the new mandate.
 - For those IHE's with a scarcity of CLAD instructors, the additional burden of hiring qualified staff would be assured.
- **State Multilingual Professional Development Centers**
 - Because the Commission would be required to issue CLAD certificates based on passage of courses taken in the new *State Multilingual Professional Development Centers* (presumably these would be administered by school districts and/or county offices of education), Commission approval of the programs would be necessary prior to the consideration of the certificate. This necessity would place an additional fiscal burden on both the Commission and the local entities.
- **State Mandates**
 - To the degree that the legislation would mandate additional, reimbursable costs to the IHE's and local districts, those reimbursements (budgeted with the Commission on State Mandates) would increase. This is primarily a General Fund item that doesn't impact the Commission's budget but is, nevertheless, an additional cost to the program.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.
3. The Commission supports legislation which reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation which would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.

Organizational Positions on the Bill

None known at this time.

Suggested Amendments

Commission staff recommends the following amendments:

1. Delete the proposed section limiting the Commission's waiver authority.

§44225 (m) (1) (E) (3) *Notwithstanding paragraph (1). The commission may not waive the requirements set forth in subdivision (n) of Section 44830 except as follows:*

A) The commission may grant a two-year waiver to out-of-state teachers and holders of emergency permits.

(B) The commission may, in its discretion and on a case-by-case basis, grant a waiver in extraordinary hardship circumstances.

2. Address the concern regarding waivers with the following addition.

§44225 (m) (1) (E) (3) The commission shall review the need for waiving credential requirements as set forth in subdivision (n) of Section 44830 and report on the findings at a public meeting by June 30, 2000.

3. Give the nine institutions of higher education not offering CLAD programs time to develop and implement such a program by extending the proposed date.

§44253.11 (a) An institution of higher education that offers a teacher preparation program shall offer students who will graduate from a teacher preparation program after March 1, 2000, June 30, 2001, courses leading to the issuance of certificates or credentials authorized pursuant to Sections 44253.3 and 44253.4.

4. Allow credential applicants not already in the pipeline for CLAD Certificates or Emphasis Credentials time to complete a program by extending the proposed date. Allow individuals who are unable to take the extra courses needed for a CLAD Emphasis Credential because of monetary concerns time to serve on a preliminary credential while earning a CLAD Certificate for the professional clear level. Assure that the CLAD Certificate is not the only route available by adding the term "credential."

§44253.11 (b) On and after July 1, 2000, June 30, 2003, the commission shall not issue a professional clear credential to an applicant unless the applicant also satisfies the requirements for a certificate or credential authorized pursuant to Section 44253.3 and 44253.4.

5. Allow time for all IHE programs to be up and running and for other reform efforts to take place.

Assure that an inadvertent elimination of all CLAD Emphasis Credentials issued after January 1, 1998 does not occur.

Assure that Specially Designed Academic Instruction In English (SDAIE) is not inadvertently excluded.

§44830 (n) On or after August 1, 2001, June 30, 2003, the governing board of a school district shall employ for positions requiring certification qualifications, only persons who possess the certificate or credential pursuant to Section 44253.3 or 44253.4. This subdivision does not apply to persons who hold any credential, permit, certificate, or supplementary authorization that authorizes bilingual instruction, Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English, or instruction in English language development and that was acquired before January 1, 1998. In addition, this subdivision does not apply to any certificated employee currently employed by a school district.

6. Allow the new *State Multilingual Professional Development Centers* to continue offering instruction in languages other than English that would satisfy the second language requirement for the CLAD Certificate or Emphasis Credential. Emphasize the importance of the support and continuing professional growth services that can be offered through these programs.

§52182 (c) (2) Demonstrated capability to prepare educators in accordance with the certificates issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing pursuant to Sections 44253.3, 44253.4 and 44253.7 for the second language requirement for certificates and credentials issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing pursuant to Sections 44253.3, 44253.4, and 44253.7 authorizing the holder to provide instructional services to culturally and linguistically diverse English language learners. Programs must also demonstrate the capability to provide support services including professional development.

Reason for Suggested Position

1. The Commission is committed to reducing the number of credential waivers issued each year and has undertaken a strategic plan to recruit potential teachers, increase the pool of teachers, and retain experienced teachers. The waiver process itself is based upon strict criteria under which school districts must show strong need to hire an underprepared individual. Each application is considered separately. Individuals must make progress toward the appropriate credential before a waiver renewal is approved. However, once each application has been reviewed and has been found to meet the criteria, staff places the request on a "consent list" for Commission approval. California is experiencing a teacher shortage. In fiscal year 1997/98, the Commission issued 219 waivers of credentials which included authorization to teach English language learners. To issue this number of waivers for Commission consideration on a case-by-case basis would severely tax the time and resources of the Commission and staff.

Teachers who hold a basic teaching credential qualify for an emergency CLAD or BCLAD permit (BCLAD requires proof of language proficiency) and must complete six semester units toward the full certificate before renewal is allowed.

2. Currently all teacher preparation programs in the CSU System and the UC system offer preparation for the CLAD emphasis credential or the certificate. Of the independent universities, only nine remain without the CLAD program. It is anticipated that all programs will offer CLAD within the next two years. However, many programs offer non-CLAD programs as an option. Because the CLAD program, at the moment, requires coursework beyond the basic credential,

some individuals choose to earn the credential first and later pursue the CLAD Certificate. In a time when fully prepared teachers are at a premium, keeping avenues open may well be the best option. By relaxing the timeline for mandating that all credentials include a CLAD authorization and by allowing the *initial* issuance of a credential without the CLAD option, some of these concerns may be addressed.

3. The Commission's SB 1422 Panel on Teacher Education Reform recommended that, under the reformed teacher education plan, all teaching credential programs prepare candidates to work with California's growing population of English language learners. The SB 2042 Panel, now writing standards for the reformed credential structure, is working to incorporate CLAD standards into all teacher preparation programs. In essence, the Commission plans to do what is proposed in this bill, but on a different timeline. Given that most programs offer CLAD now and that a very thoughtful and cohesive CLAD incorporation is taking place, it seems sensible to incorporate state mandates more slowly than is outlined in this bill. Staff estimates that new SB 2042 programs will be in place by June 30, 2003.
4. It appears that this bill would give school districts and the Department of Education the authority to offer preparation programs for CLAD Certificates. There is no reference to Commission oversight of this program other than in a consultative role. Commission standards, and the Commission review and accreditation process are not mentioned.

Because the CLAD option is available in all but nine universities in the state and in District Intern programs, and because, after new standards are in place via SB 2042, all programs will offer only preparation that includes CLAD competencies, it seems appropriate to stay the course rather than initiate new programs that appear to avoid Commission standards and accreditation review. However, district support, resources, and professional development for all teachers of English language learners, including those still earning appropriate certification, would be most welcome.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	AB 961
Author(s):	Assembly Member Darrell Steinberg (Coauthors: Assembly Members Aroner, Calderon, Corbett, Florez, Keeley, Longville, Mazzoni, Romero, Torlakson, Vincent, and Wesson) (Coauthors: Senators Alpert, Baca, Hayden, Johnston, Ortiz, Solis, and Vasconcellos)
Sponsor(s):	Assembly Member Darrell Steinberg
Subject of Bill:	Challenged Schools - Teacher Attraction and Retention
Date Introduced:	February 25, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Support
Date of Analysis:	March 19, 1999
Analyst(s):	Marilyn Errett and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Under current law, school districts determine expenditures for school sites and teacher salaries. Schools serving poor students may receive federal grants or state funding to address the needs of the students, but this type of funding is tied to particular programs. There are currently no programs aimed at attracting and retaining highly qualified teachers to schools serving low income families and/or schools in which students perform in the lowest percentile rankings on statewide tests. Because the poorest and lowest performing schools often represent extra challenges and working conditions that make teaching a formidable task, school districts have a difficult time attracting fully qualified, experienced teachers to these positions. The result of this is a disproportionate number of teachers serving on emergency permits and waivers in the schools in which there is often the most dire need for well prepared teachers.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission supports programs, such as internship programs, in large urban areas to aid in providing teacher training and increasing teacher retention rates in areas of high need. The successful BTSA program exists in many urban areas to support beginning teachers and to assure better teacher retention. BTSA programs show a 91 percent retention rate compared with attrition rates that range from 35 percent to 55 percent among new teachers in many districts.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

The Challenged School Teacher Attraction and Retention Act of 1999 (CSTAR) would attract highly qualified, fully credentialed teachers to the lowest performing schools in California by creating an incentive program that gives school districts and schools the flexibility to determine the most effective strategies for recruitment and retention. (Incentive

examples could include attraction and retention bonuses, additional classroom equipment and materials for teachers, or paid interns in the classroom.)

The sum of \$136,350,000 would be appropriated from the General Fund to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the portion of the 1999-2000 fiscal year remaining on and after this chapter becomes operative. The sum of \$272,350,000 would be annually appropriated from the General Fund for each of the five fiscal years for 2000/01 to 2004/05.

Participating schools must show progress toward ensuring that school facilities are clean, operational, safe and conducive to learning, and commit to delivering a strong academic program with quality textbooks, technology, and libraries.

The bill would fund schools in block grants equal to 25% of the base annual salary of full time teachers in the school. The money must be used solely for purposes designated to attract and retain highly qualified, credentialed teachers.

Selection of Schools

The Superintendent of Public Instruction will identify 10% of K-12 schools that have difficulty in producing academic achievement. The criteria are:

- The lack of fully credentialed teachers in each subject;
- percentage of low income students
- STAR and STAR augmented scores
- for high schools - percentage of students not qualified to attend a university

Application Process

The school district would apply on behalf of an identified school. The following criteria will be met:

1. The principal and administrative leadership have a high degree of training and commitment to students and full knowledge of academic content standards.
2. all teachers are fully credentialed;
3. all teachers will be chosen by the principal and two teachers selected by teachers;
4. funded schools are granted full flexibility in the expenditure of state categorical funds and that these funds are directed towards identified needs of students;
5. the fiscal plan provides that the needs of students are matched to the expenditures;
6. staff development activities will be directed to the needs of the students;
7. the school will be safe, operational, clean and educationally conducive;
8. textbooks and materials aligned to state adopted core academic standards will be available to all students;
9. academic progress of each student will be measured.

A district may seek a waiver to criterion 2, 7, and 8 if they submit a plan with verifiable benchmarks that the school will be in full compliance within 24 months. If they fail to do so, the district will be subject to an audit and be required to return up to 50% of funding received.

Evaluation

- Each school district will be in compliance with the statewide accountability plan (SB 1x).
- Will provide to the Superintendent of Public Instruction data on the achievement of the students. The data will include:
Results of STAR and STAR augmented achievement tests disaggregated by student, by quartile and by length of time students have been enrolled in the school and the district;
comparison of pupil progress to statewide and district-wide progress;
number and percent of pupils who have been redesignated from Non-English speaking to English speaking;
stability of teacher population compared to each year of the program operation;
other achievement data required by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

There will be no fiscal impact to the Commission.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

3. The Commission supports legislation which reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation which would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.

5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.

Organizational Positions on the Bill

None known at this time.

Suggested Amendments

None.

Reason for Suggested Position

Schools serving California's poor children face many challenges attracting and retaining high quality, credentialed teachers. In some of these districts, more than half of the newly hired teachers hold emergency permits. To exacerbate the problem, many emergency permit holders who remain in a preparation program and obtain their credential, are attracted by more affluent schools that are perceived by the teachers to be better work environments.

According to a study conducted by the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, Californians see quality teaching as the key to unlocking the promise of equal educational opportunity and achieving success. This bill would address that need by providing a clean and safe environment, qualified teachers, a stable learning environment with quality materials, and up-to-date technology to our most vulnerable children.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	SB 1262
Author(s):	Senator Jack O'Connell and Senator Betty Karnette Coauthors: Assembly Members Cunneen, Keeley, Mazzoni, Scott, and Wildman
Sponsor(s):	Senators O'Connell and Karnette
Subject of Bill:	Teacher Salary
Date Introduced:	February 26, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Support
Date of Analysis:	March 23, 1999
Analyst(s):	Marilyn Errett and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Under existing law, the governing board of each school district is generally required to establish the compensation paid to persons in public school service that require certification.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission sets standards and regulations for credential requirements. The Commission does not participate in compensation decisions.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would authorize the governing board of a school district, the county superintendent of schools, or the county boards of education, in the 1999-2000 and 2000-01 fiscal years to increase the lowest salary on the salary schedule for a certificated employee meeting certain criteria. The designation for the lowest salary under this bill would not exceed \$33,000 in the 1999-2000 fiscal year and \$36,000 in the 2000-01 fiscal year. The bill would set forth procedures for reimbursement for the cost of the increase.

To meet the criteria, teachers must:

- Hold a valid California teaching credential, not including an emergency permit, intern credential, or waiver;
- possess a baccalaureate or higher degree; and
- receive a salary paid from the general fund of the district or county office.

School districts or county offices of education would compute reimbursement totals according to a formula detailed in the bill. The adjustment to the district's revenue limit would continue as long as the increase in the salary schedule is maintained.

All other salary schedule cells must exceed levels included in this bill.

The bill does not prohibit a school district and its employees from negotiating salary schedules.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

This bill authorizes the governing boards of school districts to increase the lowest salary on the salary schedule for employees meeting certain criteria.

There is no fiscal impact to the Commission.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

- 5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.

Organizational Positions on the Bill

None known at this time.

Suggested Amendments

None.

Reason for Suggested Position

Studies show a direct link between teacher salary schedules and the recruiting and retention problems of school officials across the nation (Columbia Group Report, 1999). Because California faces a teacher shortage, issues regarding the recruitment and retention of teachers are of paramount importance.

The Commission has worked to assure that California students have well qualified teachers in every classroom. Aspects of the Commission's strategic plan include attracting individuals into teaching and retaining effective teachers. This bill provides a viable financial incentive that would help bring individuals into the field and would make teaching a more attractive profession in which to stay.

Bill Analysis
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 707
Author(s):	Assemblymember George House
Sponsor(s):	Assemblymember George House
Subject of Bill:	School Psychologist Credential Qualifications
Date Introduced:	February 24, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Assembly Education Committee
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Seek Amendments
Date of Analysis:	March 30, 1999
Analyst(s):	Rod Santiago

Summary of Current Law

Current law sets the minimum qualifications for a services credential with a specialization in health and for a services credential with a specialization in pupil personnel services.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission has appointed a 25-member panel of Pupil Personnel Services practitioners and trainers, teachers, administrators, parents, and students. The panel has been charged with reviewing existing standards and competencies. They have also been asked to make any necessary recommendations to improve pupil personnel services in California schools to insure that competent professionals are providing effective and efficient services.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would set forth requirements for a services credential with a specialization in school psychology which would include:

1. A postbaccalaureate or graduate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education. For applicants who complete a professional preparation program in a state other than California, the degree shall be approved by the appropriate state agency where it was completed.
2. Successful completion of 450 hours of approved practicum study.
3. Successful completion of a supervised field practice internship of at least 1,200 hours.

The bill would also list the various services that a holder of a school psychology credential could provide, including, but not limited to, services that enhance the academic performance of a pupil, designing of strategies and programs to address problems of pupil adjustment, and consulting with other educators and parents on issues of pupil social development, pupil behavior, and academic difficulties.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

This bill would require the Commission to establish a panel to develop standards for a services credential with a specialization in school psychology. Staff estimates that the cost of this would be \$90,000, including staff time.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.

Suggested Amendments

Staff suggests the following amendments:

- 1) Remove the requirement for a postbaccalaureate or graduate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.

Reason for Suggested Position

Historically, the Commission has not required a graduate degree as a condition for a credential. The pursuit and completion of a graduate degree is an individual's choice. The Commission's responsibility has been to ensure that individuals complete standards-based programs to ensure the necessary competencies to provide the services authorized by the credential being given.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Senate Bill 883
Author(s):	Senator Ray Haynes
Sponsor(s):	Senator Ray Haynes
Subject of Bill:	Underperforming Educator Preparation Institutions
Date Introduced:	February 25, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Oppose
Date of Analysis:	March 23, 1999
Analyst(s):	Rod Santiago

Summary of Current Law

Current law establishes the Committee on Accreditation for the purpose of making decisions about the accreditation of

educator preparation, making decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation, determining the comparability of standards submitted by applicants with those adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and adopting guidelines for accreditation reviews and monitoring the performance of accreditation teams.

Current law also requires that each program of educator preparation include a teaching performance assessment which is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession as set forth in Education Code Section 44320.2.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

Last year the COA reviewed and accredited 14 institutions and will review and make decisions on 14 other institutions this year.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would require the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to monitor the performance of graduates of various institutions that provide educator preparation.

The bill would authorize the commission to take administrative action against institutions who, in the determination of the commission, have produced a disproportionate number of graduates who have scored below the statewide median score on tests administered "pursuant to this chapter". The administrative action taken would be action taken that the commission deems appropriate to effect an improvement in the performance of the graduates of that institution. The administrative action may include requiring the institution to provide remedial instruction to its students or placing that institution on probationary status or suspending the accreditation of that institution pending demonstrable improvement in the instruction provided.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

There are a number of variables in the bill which make it difficult to do a fiscal analysis. However, assuming that the CBEST is the statewide exam referred to in the bill, the following applies.

A statewide median score would need to be determined. The database would need to be modified in such a way as to match up the 'below median scores' with the institutions in which they received their teacher preparation. (Note: CBEST examinees are not all graduates of teacher preparation programs: some take it 'in case' they decide to teach at a later date, some in the middle of the program 'to get it out of the way,' etc. So the modification would include additional data provided in the CBEST application (e.g. "Graduate of Teacher Prep Program?" "What institution?" "Is this a California accredited institution?") that is then put in the CBEST database.)

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) would need to determine how to view the proffered data (graduates over a period of time, half-year, with each exam administration, etc.).

Once that determination is made, the data will then need to be included in the scheduling of accreditation visits, a process that begins at least a year ahead of the actual visit.

Conferring with the CBEST test administrator (NES) regarding application and database modification, including any necessary contract amendments, extra printing costs, as well as internal database modifications, staff estimates the cost to be \$50,000.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

7. The Commission opposes legislation that would give it significant additional duties and responsibilities if the legislation does not include an appropriate source of funding to support those additional duties and responsibilities.

Reason for Suggested Position

Common Standard 4 of the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Multiple and Single Subject Credentials* requires institutions to involve program participants and program graduates in a comprehensive evaluation of the quality of courses and field experiences which lead to substantive improvements in each credential preparation program. Thus, information from graduates is already a part of the accreditation system. Further, accreditation teams interview employers to obtain information about the quality and effectiveness of the graduates of the institutions.

Currently, there is no system for the Commission to monitor each graduate of each program. The Commission would have to create a system whereby it would be possible to track each graduate from each educator preparation institution from the time she or he finishes the program to the time employment is gained and then continuously thereafter. This would be a very costly endeavor and the bill provides no funding to perform this new duty.

The bill is not clear on what aspect of the performance of the graduates must be monitored (i.e., student achievement, student improvement over the course of a year).

The teaching performance assessment will ensure that candidates who do not demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to work with students will not be awarded a credential.

There is no statewide median score on any of the tests administered by the Commission. The only common exam that all credentialed teachers must have taken is the CBEST.

It is for these reasons that staff is recommending a position of **OPPOSE** on this bill.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	AB 1242
Author(s):	Assembly Member Ted Lempert
Sponsor(s):	Assembly Member Ted Lempert
Subject of Bill:	Professional Credential
Date Introduced:	February 26, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Seek Amendments
Date of Analysis:	March 19, 1999
Analyst(s):	Marilyn Errett and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Current law authorizes the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to issue an eminence credential to any person who has achieved eminence in a field of endeavor taught or service practiced in the public schools of California. This credential authorizes teaching or the performance of services in the public schools in the subject or service and level approved by the Commission and designated on the credential.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission currently issues Eminence Credentials to those who qualify as truly eminent in their field based on Commission criteria such as recognition in the field beyond their geographic area, publications, and other types of recognition for outstanding knowledge and performance. In fiscal year 1997/98 the Commission issued four Eminence Credentials.

The typical avenue to credentialing for individuals who have worked in various professions prior to deciding upon teaching as a career is the internship program. To qualify for an internship credential an individual must first pass CBEST and a subject matter exam. District and university internship programs allow individuals to complete an intensive summer program in pedagogy and classroom management and then to work in the classroom as the teacher of record receiving a salary from the school district. Interns are then supported by mentor teachers throughout the eighteen months to two years of the program. Interns continue to take courses and seminars throughout the program. As part of the credential reforms proposed under SB 2042, intern graduates would be required to pass a teaching performance assessment before receiving a full credential and would be offered a third year of support as part of an induction program for new teachers.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would require the Commission, upon the recommendation of the governing board of a school district, to issue a professional credential to any person who meets the following criteria:

1. Holds a graduate degree in the subject area to be named on the credential;
2. has five or more years of practice in the subject area for which the graduate degree was awarded;
3. has passed the Basic Skills Proficiency Exam (CBEST); and
4. has demonstrated the ability to teach as measured by a teaching performance assessment approved or conducted by the Commission pursuant to SB 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni, 1998).

The professional credential would authorize teaching in the subject or the performance of services as approved by the Commission and designated on the credential. The Commission would also approve and designate on the credential the level for which the teaching or service authorization is valid.

The credential would be issued initially for a two-year period and would be renewable for a three-year period upon the request of the governing board of the school district. Upon completion of the three-year renewal period, the holder of a professional credential would be eligible for a professional clear teaching credential.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

There is no statistical sample to draw on to determine how many people with Master's degrees would be drawn to teaching as a result of this bill. Therefore, though there would be increases in both revenue and certification workload, a valid projection is not possible.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.
3. The Commission supports legislation which reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation which would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.
4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.
5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.
6. The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators, and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.
7. The Commission opposes legislation that would give it significant additional duties and responsibilities if the legislation does not include an appropriate source of funding to support those additional duties and responsibilities.

Organizational Positions on the Bill

None known at this time.

Suggested Amendments

Staff suggests that this bill be amended to clarify that:

1. The bill is restricted to the Single Subject Teaching Credential;
2. The individual, through a sponsoring school district, would apply for a Single Subject Emergency Permit in order to gain experience and facilitate the use of the teaching performance assessment;
3. Upon passage of the teaching performance assessment, the resulting credential would be a preliminary rather than a professional clear;
4. The name of the credential would be something other than "professional" to assure that it is not confused with the "professional clear" credential.

Reason for Suggested Position

The intent of this bill is to bring talented professionals into the field of teaching by allowing them to "test out" of coursework requirements by passing the teaching performance assessment now being constructed by the SB 2042 Panel. The professionals targeted by this bill are those with expertise in specific subject areas such as math or science. This tie to subject matter makes it more appropriate to narrow the program to Single Subject Teaching Credentials only. Because the assessment will be classroom based, the candidate must first have a classroom in which to demonstrate skills. Therefore, it is essential that the individual serve in the classroom on the basis of an Emergency Permit. Because the assessment will be designed for candidates at the preliminary credential level, it would be an inappropriate exam to determine if a teacher should qualify for a professional clear credential. By obtaining a preliminary credential, the candidate would then qualify for the induction phase of the credentialing process.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 1006
Author(s):	Assembly Member Denise Ducheny
Sponsor(s):	Assembly Member Denise Ducheny

Subject of Bill:	Beginning School Counselor Support and Assessment Program
Date Introduced:	February 25, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Support
Date of Analysis:	March 10, 1999
Analyst(s):	Maureen McMurray

Summary of Current Law

Existing law establishes the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment System (BTSA) which provides an effective transition into the teaching career for first and second year teachers. BTSA improves the educational performance of pupils by providing training, information, and assistance to new teachers. BTSA ensures that an individual induction plan is in place for each participating beginning teacher that is based on ongoing assessment.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

In October 1998 the Commission appointed an advisory panel to review existing standards and competencies for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential which includes specializations in school counseling, school psychology, school social work and child welfare and attendance.

Currently the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) jointly administers the BTSA program with the California Department of Education (CDE) through the BTSA Taskforce. There are 113 local BTSA programs that receive state funding; of those 84 are operational.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill expresses Legislative intent that a two-year pilot project be established to provide peer support and mentoring to newly hired school counselors who provide services to students enrolled in kindergarten through grades 12. The program is to be modeled on the current BTSA program.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

For the 1996/97 fiscal year the Commission initially issued 1,341 school counseling credentials and for the 1997/98 fiscal year 683 school counseling credentials to date. This results in a two-year average of an initial issuance of 1,012 school counseling credentials per year.

Current state BTSA costs are \$3,000 per participant, with matching funds of \$2,000 per participant from school districts. Assuming that the funding for the Beginning School Counselor and Assessment Program would be the same as for BTSA the state share would be \$3,036,000 and the local share would be \$2,024,000.

The Commission would need to hire 1 consultant for administration of the program. Therefore, it is estimated that \$78,000 would be needed for the salary of the consultant and operating expenses and equipment.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policies apply to this measure:

1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.

3. The Commission supports legislation which reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation which would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.

Organizational Positions on the Bill

Unknown at this time.

Suggested Amendments

None.

Reason for Suggested Position

The demand for counselors in California is increasing as are the job responsibilities. Programs to curb school violence, end

social promotion, provide students with a healthy start, insure parent involvement, and curtail substance abuse have increased the need for well-prepared counselors. Support and assistance in the beginning years of counseling will aid in assisting counselors to be more effective with students, faculty and the parents. Support and assistance will help counselors transition into a job with diverse duties and many demands.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 578
Author(s):	Assembly Member Mike Honda
Sponsor(s):	Assembly Member Mike Honda
Subject of Bill:	Domestic Violence Recognition and Training
Date Introduced:	February 24, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Watch
Date of Analysis:	March 30, 1999
Analyst(s):	Rod Santiago

Summary of Current Law

Current law requires the Commission to set standards for teacher training programs approved by the Commission. Current law also has in place certain child abuse reporting requirements for teachers.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission has appointed an advisory panel for the development of teacher preparation standards in accordance with last year's Senate Bill 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni). One of the charges given to the panel is to develop standards for multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

According to the author, this bill is designed to ameliorate the adverse impacts of domestic violence on children. The bill does this by requiring the Commission, in consultation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and institutions of higher education, to develop standards for the preparation of prospective teachers to provide an assurance that future teachers will be prepared to recognize and appropriately respond to, victimized children in classrooms. The bill would require the Commission to review these standards at least every four years and make necessary updates.

The language of this bill is the same as the language that appeared in last year's Assembly Bill 285. Then-Governor Wilson vetoed the bill. The veto message read in part:

"...current law already gives teachers and administrators wide latitude to make determinations of abuse, which they are required to report to the proper authorities. In fact, Education Code Section 44691 already requires the Department of Education to develop staff development seminars and instruction for school personnel in the detection of child abuse and neglect and the proper action to take in cases of suspected abuse and neglect. In addition, the Office of Child Abuse Prevention is charged with disseminating information to all school districts regarding the detection of child abuse."

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

The bill would impose some costs on the Commission to develop new standards in this area. Staff believes that the standard-setting process would cost less than \$20,000 to convene a small panel to recommend appropriate standards to the Commission. Once established, standards in this area would be subject to regular accreditation reviews, adding slightly, but not substantially, to the costs of accreditation reviews.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

Staff suggests that the following guideline may apply to this proposal:

1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.

Reason for Suggested Position

The child abuse reporting requirements for teachers cover issues of violence in the home and the effect on students. The extent of the training that would be mandated by this bill is currently unknown. The Commission may wish to consider the impact on programs that would result from yet another requirement. While greater knowledge of domestic violence and its effect on children would aid teachers in recognizing symptoms, in-service training may be the more appropriate placement of such training.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 752
Author(s):	Assembly Member Susan Davis
Sponsor(s):	Assembly Member Susan Davis
Subject of Bill:	New Single Subject Credentials in Dance and Theater
Date Introduced:	February 24, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Watch
Date of Analysis:	March 30, 1999
Analyst(s):	Rod Santiago

Summary of Current Law

State law authorizes the Commission to issue single subject credentials in thirteen subjects. California statutes require that the Commission make available two methods of demonstrating subject matter competence for earning each single subject credential: approved program and subject matter examination. California statutes also allow the Commission to issue and for credential holders to voluntarily elect to add supplementary authorizations to their existing multiple or single subject credentials.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 (SCR 31) (Johnston) required that the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing examine the adequacy of the teaching of dance and drama to students in California schools. In response to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31 the Commission completed a study of the effectiveness of dance and theater instruction that addressed the question: *what policies would contribute most effectively to excellence in the teaching of dance and drama for California students (K-12)?*

The study included a survey of dance and theater teachers, university professors of dance and theater, school and district curriculum coordinators and supervisors of dance and theater, and personnel administrators whose responsibilities include assigning teachers to dance and theater classes. The study showed that there is a clear need for better preparation of dance and theater instructors. A wide variety of methods is available to improve dance and theater instruction. The Commission recommended several non-legislative methods for doing so. The study also showed that, according to data collected by the California Department of Education and confirmed by the personnel administrators, there are relatively few teaching positions for dance and theater teachers in California classrooms.

The Commission is completing its work in developing and implementing subject matter standards and examination specifications for each of the existing single subject areas. The Commission has assembled subject matter panels in each area to develop the standards and specifications. Subject matter exams have been developed that include multiple choice sections as well as constructed response sections. The constructed response items assess the ability of candidates to solve problems, engage in higher order analysis, or display creativity in the subject area. Universities are now responding to the approved program standards, and credential candidates are completing approved programs or are taking subject matter examinations in the area(s) they wish to teach.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would add dance and theater to the list of Single Subject Teaching Credentials that the Commission would be required to issue. This bill would require that each holder of a single subject credential in dance or theater also earn a supplementary authorization in another subject. The bill states that this would allow greater employment opportunities and assignment flexibility in secondary schools.

The bill also deletes the term drama and replaces it with "theater" and adds the term "drama" in the section of the Education Code that lists the adopted course of study for grades 7-12.

Analysis of Potential Effects of the Bill: Quality of Dance and Theater Teaching

If AB 752 is enacted, more people who are well prepared to teach theater and dance classes would be available to school districts. The numbers of available positions for these teachers, however, would continue to be relatively small, compared with the numbers of teaching vacancies in subjects such as science and mathematics, and such as art and music.

Analysis of Potential Effects of the Bill: Greater Employability

AB 752 would improve *somewhat* the employability of holders of Single Subject Credentials in Dance and Theater. If teachers with Single Subject Credentials in Dance or Theater also held broad *Supplementary Authorizations in Introductory Subjects*, they would be qualified to teach broadly-defined subjects, but only in grades nine and below. Alternatively, if teachers with such credentials also held the narrower *Specific Subject Authorizations*, they would be qualified to teach at any level, but their authorizations in subjects such as ceramics or speech would not add much breadth to their credential authorizations in dance or theater. The bill would therefore have limited effectiveness in accomplishing its stated purpose of making the holders of Dance or Theater Credentials more employable.

In practice, however, nearly all *Supplementary Authorizations in Introductory Subjects* authorize service only in middle schools. A dance or theater teacher who earned a *Supplementary Authorization in an Introductory Subject* as the second authorization would be authorized to teach a broad subject such as English or Social Studies, but they would be limited to teaching these subjects in departmentalized classes in middle schools. A dance or theater teacher who earned a *Specific Subject Authorization* could also teach high school subjects, but these authorizations would be no broader than the Dance and Theater Credentials would be.

Finally, the bill's stated purpose of requiring supplementary authorizations in order to increase the employability of dance and theater teachers must be evaluated in relation to the prospect that districts would grant tenure to teachers who would be credentialed under AB 752. Enrollments in high school subjects fluctuate from year to year. When enrollments in a subject decline, then administrators are obliged to find other assignments for *some* of the teachers of those subjects, particularly the tenured teachers of those subjects. The extent to which school districts would, in practice, hire and retain teachers who were credentialed pursuant to AB 752 would depend entirely on the perceptions of school administrators regarding their capacity to re-assign these teachers to broad subjects such as mathematics and science during the years in which enrollments in dance and theater classes were down.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

If two new single subjects are added to the Education Code, the Commission would be required to establish subject matter standards and examination specifications for these subjects. The development of exams and the establishment of program standards are relatively expensive. Assessments must be validated, be found reliable, be clearly related to job performance, and be pilot-tested. Exam development and administration and scoring costs have ranged from \$50,000 to \$150,000 depending on the complexity of the exam for each subject area.

When the Commission adopted a policy to include more than multiple choice questions in each exam, the costs of exam development, administration and scoring increased markedly. Some exams, such as the physical education exam, require viewing and analysis of a videotaped segment for the analysis of human movement. Languages-other-than-English exams require translation of an audiotaped passage. The Visual Arts exam specifications require presentation of a portfolio of work in the subject. Each of these "performance assessments" measure the candidate's competence beyond what can be determined by multiple choice test items, but are more expensive to develop and score. It is expected that dance or theater exams would include performance measures also.

To date the costs of tests have been paid for by examinees, by testing companies who used a California test as the basis for a national test, or in the cases of some low-volume tests, revenues from high volume areas such as social science and English/language arts were sufficient to cover the costs of low-volume tests such as health. Otherwise, the fees for the low-volume exams might cost as much as \$500 to \$1000 to the examinee, clearly a prohibitive cost for most test takers. To date the California Legislature has not made an appropriation to cover test development costs as authorized in EC §44298.

It is estimated that the volume of test takers in dance or theater will generate revenues far below the amount that will be needed to develop and administer these exams.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following legislative guideline may apply to this measure:

7. The Commission opposes legislation that would give it significant additional duties and responsibilities if the legislation does not include an appropriate source of funding to support those additional duties and responsibilities.

Reason for Suggested Position

If the Commission establishes fees for examinations in dance or theater that "establish and collect fees to recover its costs for the development and administration of any subject matter examination" as Education Code Section 44235.3 requires, the costs per examinee would be between \$500-1,000 per examinee, which would be prohibitive. If this scenario plays out, the Commission would be caught "holding the bag" to pay the costs of developing new exams that few, if any, candidates would take. If the legislature wishes to add these single subjects, then the costs should be not be borne solely by credential candidates.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 908
Author(s):	Assemblymember Elaine Alquist
Sponsor(s):	American Association of University Women
Subject of Bill:	Gender Equity Training
Date Introduced:	February 25, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Seek Amendments
Date of Analysis:	March 23, 1999
Analyst(s):	Rod Santiago

Summary of Current Law

Current law requires the Commission to set standards for teacher training programs approved by the Commission.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission has appointed an advisory panel for the development of teacher preparation standards in accordance with last year's Senate Bill 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni). One of the charges given to the panel is to develop standards for multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs.

Commission staff is currently involved with a gender equity advisory group involving various stakeholders that will be surveying teacher preparation programs regarding gender equity issues.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

Assembly Bill 908 would require the Commission, in consultation with the Commission on the Status of Women, to survey a representative sample of approved multiple and single subject teacher credential programs and district internship programs to determine the extent to which gender equity training is included in those programs. The bill would also require the Commission to adopt or revise standards based on the results of the survey.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

Staff estimates the costs of this bill to be minor, absorbable costs.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.

Suggested Amendments

Staff suggests the following amendments:

1. Remove the survey from the bill.
2. Change the word "promote" to "disseminate" on page 3, line 21 of the bill.

Reason for Suggested Position

The language of this bill appeared in 1994 in Assembly Bill 1464 (Bronshvag) at which time the Commission supported the bill. The suggested amendments are for clarification purposes.

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 949
Author(s):	Assemblymember Patricia Wiggins
Sponsor(s):	Assemblymember Patricia Wiggins
Subject of Bill:	Clinical or Rehabilitative Services
Date Introduced:	February 25, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Oppose
Date of Analysis:	March 19, 1999
Analyst(s):	Rod Santiago

Summary of Current Law

Current law sets forth the minimum requirements for a services credential with a specialization in clinical or rehabilitative services.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission is currently sponsoring legislation that would allow a school district to contract with an individual who holds a license issued by the Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board and has earned a masters degree in communication disorders to provide speech and language services.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would provide that the minimum requirements for a services credential with a specialization in clinical or rehabilitative services would be deemed to have been met if the applicant holds a valid speech-language pathologist license or a valid certificate of clinical competence issued by the National Council on Professional Standards in Speech Language Pathology and Audiology.

The bill would also define "teacher" to include holders of services credentials who provide direct instructional services to pupils.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

The Commission may see an increase in the number of Clinical or Rehabilitative Services Credentials issued. However, it is not known how many individuals would choose to apply for the credential.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

8. The Commission supports legislation that affirms its role as an autonomous teacher standards board, and opposes legislation that would erode the independence or authority of the Commission.

Reason for Suggested Position

This bill goes farther than the legislation that the Commission is sponsoring. It seems imprudent to require well-prepared state licensed speech and language therapists who have passed CBEST and been cleared of any criminal history to go through the application process.

Bill Analysis California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 770
Author(s):	Assemblymember Mike Honda
Sponsor(s):	California League of Middle Schools
Subject of Bill:	Middle Grades Certificate
Date Introduced:	February 24, 1999
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CCTC Position:	None

Recommended Position: Seek Amendments
Date of Analysis: March 19, 1999
Analyst(s): Marilyn Errett and Rod Santiago

Summary of Current Law

Current law provides for the issuance of credentials for teaching specialties including early childhood education, bilingual education and special education.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

There are currently three institutions of higher education in California that provide a middle level emphasis in their teacher preparation programs.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

1. This bill would require the Commission, in consultation with the State Department of Education, institutions of higher education, and professional associations, by January 1, 2001, to adopt standards for the issuance of a middle grades certificate to credential holders who master special skills and content necessary to serve pupils in grades 6 to 8, inclusive as demonstrated on a commission approved assessment.
2. This bill would require demonstration of proficiency in teaching middle school students as determined by a Commission approved assessment modeled after the assessment used by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
3. This bill would appropriate funds in the annual Budget Act commencing in the 2001-02 fiscal year to award grants to teachers who are eligible to be issued a middle grades certificate.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

- The cost of convening a standard setting panel would range from \$18,000 to \$50,000.
The Commission has previously studied the possibility of having a Middle Grade Certificate. Therefore, a review could be all that would be necessary.
Upon further clarification of the legislation a 'two-pronged' approach might be in order to issue standards 1) for beginning teachers and 2) for experienced teachers in search of an additional certification.
- The cost of developing an assessment modeled after the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is unknown but would be sizable. As an example, due to the complexity of the existing assessment, the cost for development has been estimated at \$25-30 million. Additionally, the administration cost is \$2,000 per candidate (this is the cost borne by the candidate).

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

3. The Commission supports legislation which reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation which would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.
4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.
5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.
7. The Commission opposes legislation that would give it significant additional duties and responsibilities if the legislation does not include an appropriate source of funding to support those additional duties and responsibilities.

Suggested Amendments

Staff recommends the following amendments:

1. Clarify that the Commission would approve all initial Middle Grades Certificate Programs.
2. Clarify that the Commission would maintain ongoing review and approval of Middle Grades Certificate Programs.
3. Clarify that the Middle Grades Certificate would conform to other Commission issued certificate programs by requiring twelve to fifteen semester units of coursework designed to meet the standards in a comprehensive manner.
4. Clarify what the Middle Grades Certificate would authorize.

5. Remove language that would tie the assessment model directly to the costly National Board Assessment.
6. Assure the appropriation of funds for the Commission to develop standards and the assessment.

Reason for Suggested Position

If the Commission is required to develop standards and an assessment for a Middle Grades Certificate, it would seem appropriate that the quality of these programs be assured through initial and ongoing review and approval.

To develop standards and an assessment, the Commission must be assured of funding to support the endeavor. The Commission must also be assured that the Middle Grades Certificate would provide adequate incentive for prospective candidates to pursue the additional coursework.

According to the sponsors of the bill, this is a spot bill with different, more specific language to come later. The author and his staff are willing to work with the Commission on the language.



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PERF-1

Committee: Performance Standards

Title: RICA Written Examination Passing Rates by Preparation Program

✓ Information

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

Summary of an Agenda Report

Correction to PERF-3 (March 1999 Agenda): Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) Written Examination Cumulative Passing Rates by Preparation Program

Professional Services Division
March 29, 1999

Overview of this Report

At the Commission's March 3-4, 1999, meeting, staff presented a report summarizing the results of the four 1998 administrations of the RICA Written Examination and the two 1998 administrations of the RICA Video Performance Assessment. The report included 1998 RICA Written Examination cumulative passing rates by preparation program (Table 5 in the report). After preparing the report, but before presenting it orally at the Commission meeting on March 4, staff obtained information suggesting that the data in Table 5 were not what they were described to be. This current report describes what the data in Table 5 represented and what they were meant to represent. A corrected table of 1998 RICA Written Examination cumulative passing rates by preparation program will be provided at the Commission's April 14-15 meeting and mailed to all Commission agenda subscribers.

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 Summary

The ongoing administration costs of the RICA, which include the reporting of assessment results, must by law be recovered through examinee fees.

Recommendation

This is an information report only. There are no staff recommendations.

Background

The Commission's March 3-4, 1999, agenda included a report entitled "Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA): Results of the 1998 Administrations" (PERF-3). The report contained a table entitled "1998 RICA Written Examination Cumulative Passing Rates by Preparation Program" (Table 5 on pages 43-45 of the March agenda report) and the following description of a process by which the data in Table 5 were to have been generated (pages 39 and 42 of the March agenda report):

When candidates register to take the RICA Written Examination, they are asked about their preparation for reading instruction. Two options (among others) available for candidates to select are:

I will have completed a course in methods of reading instruction at an accredited college or university.

I will have completed instruction in methods of teaching reading in a district internship program.

Candidates who select either one of these responses are asked to indicate where they completed, or will have completed prior to taking the RICA, the instruction or course in methods of reading instruction. Candidates identify their preparation program from a list of all California public and private colleges and universities with Commission-accredited Multiple Subject Teaching Credential programs and California district internship programs.

To help ensure the validity of the information, NES (National Evaluation Systems, Inc., the Commission's RICA contractor) provides each preparation program an opportunity to verify the list of candidates who indicate they have completed the coursework or instruction at that institution. Rosters are mailed to programs, and program staff are encouraged to review the list and inform NES if any of the candidates are inappropriately identified with the program. NES removes these candidates from the rosters.

After preparing the March agenda report, but before presenting it orally at the Commission meeting on March 4, staff obtained information suggesting that the data in Table 5 did not reflect the verification process described above. During the Commission meeting, staff notified the Commission that there were questions about the data, and indicated that the data would be reviewed as soon as possible. The Commission directed staff to send a letter to all those who received the report alerting them about the situation.

Following the Commission meeting, staff learned from NES that the final step in the verification process described above had not taken place. That is, NES did not remove any candidates from the data file as a result of the verification process. This means that the data in Table 5 of the report are based on the self-reporting of candidates, without verification by programs.

Upon learning this information, the Executive Director mailed an explanatory memorandum (attached) to Commissioners and all Commission subscribers. The memorandum was also added to the agenda report that was on the Commission's website.

Staff then worked with NES to determine passing rates by preparation program that reflected the verification process. The goal was to have a corrected passing rate table in this agenda report. Because the process took longer than planned, that was not possible. A corrected table with 1998 RICA Written Examination cumulative passing rates by preparation program will be provided as an in-folder item at the Commission's April 14-15 meeting and will be mailed to all Commission agenda subscribers.

The Verification Process

The purpose of the verification process is to help ensure the accuracy of a preparation program's RICA results. The rationale is that a preparation program's passing rate should be based only on examinees who have completed at least one course in reading methods at that institution. Examinees may provide erroneous information, however. They may report that they have completed a reading methods course when, in fact, they have not. They may report that they have completed such a course at Program A when, in fact, they completed it at Program B. Unverified data would inappropriately include examinees who have made these types of errors when registering for the examination. The verification process has been implemented to correct for such errors so that a program's results are based only on examinees who have completed a reading methods course in the program, thus making the results better indicators of program effectiveness that would otherwise be the case.

The verification process was planned to work as follows. Shortly after the close of registration for the exam (i.e., prior to examination results being mailed to examinees and programs), NES sends to each program sponsor a list of registered examinees who indicated that they had completed a reading methods course in that program. Program sponsors are asked to review the list and identify any of the examinees who had not completed a reading methods course in that program. If there are any such examinees, the program sponsor is to return the list to NES with those examinees identified, within a specified period of time. If there are no such examinees, the program sponsor need not respond to NES. For purposes of computing passing rates by program, NES removes from a program's population of examinees those identified as not having completed a reading methods course at that institution.

Applying the Verification Process for the 1998 Administrations

Following the Commission's March meeting, Commission and NES staff reviewed, for each program at each administration, (a) the number of examinees who indicated they had completed a reading methods course in that program and (b) the number and percent of those examinees the program sponsor identified as not having completed a reading methods course in

that program. (The examinees identified by program sponsors as not having completed a reading methods course in the program will be referred to hereafter as "ineligible examinees.") Program sponsors at six institutions had identified, for one or more of the 1998 administrations, a relatively high number or percentage of ineligible examinees. To be sure that these six program sponsors had not misunderstood the eligibility criterion or completed the verification form incorrectly, NES staff called them. Sponsors of three programs indicated that they had correctly applied the eligibility criterion. Sponsors of two programs, after a discussion with NES staff, realized that they had applied the criterion incorrectly, and revised their eligibility lists to reflect the correct criterion. NES staff were not able to complete discussions with the sponsor of one program. (Data for this program will not be included in the corrected table with 1998 RICA Written Examination cumulative passing rates by preparation program provided at the Commission meeting.)

Caveats When Reviewing the Program Passing Rates

When reviewing the passing rates by program that will be provided at the Commission's meeting as an in-folder item, the reader should keep in mind the following caveats:

- (1) Included in the data are candidates who completed a reading methods course before programs revised their curricula in response to the Commission's new Multiple Subject Teaching Credential program standard in reading, writing, and related language instruction. The standard was adopted by the Commission in June 1997, and the certification process to assure that all programs were addressing the standard was completed in October 1998. The RICA Written Examination was first administered in June 1998, and passage of the RICA became a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential requirement on October 1, 1998. The impact of these candidates on the data is unknown and most likely varies across programs. It is not known how many such candidates are included in the data, nor is it known how they are distributed across programs. The effect on a program's passing rate of these candidates is probably related to the extent of the curricular revisions made by a program in response to the new standard. Some programs had to change their curricula very little; others substantially. In a very short time, however, the number of such candidates will significantly decrease in relation to candidates who have completed the new curricula, so their impact will diminish.
- (2) The process for linking RICA candidates to programs is not perfect. There are probably inconsistencies across programs in how program sponsors interpreted and applied the eligibility criterion. For three of the four 1998 administrations, program sponsors were able to verify candidates after candidate score reports had been mailed to candidates or programs. Candidates who completed a reading methods course at Program A but indicated, in error, having completed the course at Program B are not included in the data for either program. Candidates who completed a reading methods course but did not indicate so on the registration form, or did not indicate the program where they took the course, are also not included in the data.

Both of these caveats will decrease in significance over time as (a) most or all RICA candidates complete reading methods coursework that meets the new program standard and (b) program sponsors better understand and apply the eligibility criterion. Any remaining error in the data due to candidate registration mistakes that are not corrected in the verification process are likely to be very small and randomly distributed across programs.

Letterhead



Office of the Executive Director
(916) 445-0184

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 9, 1999
TO: Commissioners and Commission Agenda Subscribers
FROM: Sam Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director
SUBJECT: Correction to PERF-3 (March 1999 Agenda): 1998 RICA Written Examination Cumulative Passing Rates by Preparation Program

This letter is to inform you of an error in a recent Commission agenda report.

The Commission's March 3-4, 1999, agenda included a report entitled "Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA): Results of the 1998 Administrations" (PERF-3). The report contains a table entitled "1998 RICA Written Examination Cumulative Passing Rates by Preparation Program" (Table 5 on pages 43-45) and the following description of a process by

which the data in Table 5 were to have been generated (pages 39 and 42):

When candidates register to take the RICA Written Examination, they are asked about their preparation for reading instruction. Two options (among others) available for candidates to select are:

I will have completed a course in methods of reading instruction at an accredited college or university.

I will have completed instruction in methods of teaching reading in a district internship program.

Candidates who select either one of these responses are asked to indicate where they completed, or will have completed prior to taking the RICA, the instruction or course in methods of reading instruction. Candidates identify their preparation program from a list of all California public and private colleges and universities with Commission-accredited Multiple Subject Teaching Credential programs and California district internship programs.

To help ensure the validity of the information, NES [National Evaluation Systems, Inc., the Commission's RICA contractor] provides each preparation program an opportunity to verify the list of candidates who indicate they have completed the coursework or instruction at that institution. Rosters are mailed to programs, and program staff are encouraged to review the list and inform NES if any of the candidates are inappropriately identified with the program. NES removes these candidates from the rosters.

After preparing the report, but before presenting it orally at the Commission meeting on March 4, staff obtained information suggesting that the data in Table 5 did not reflect the verification process described above. During the Commission meeting, staff notified the Commission that there were questions about the data, and indicated that the data would be reviewed as soon as possible. The Commission directed staff to send a letter to all those who received the report alerting them about the situation.

Following the Commission meeting, staff learned from NES that the final step in the verification process described above had not taken place. That is, NES did not remove any candidates from the data file as a result of the verification process. This means that the data in Table 5 of the report are based on the self-reporting of candidates, without verification by programs.

Staff will obtain from NES cumulative passing rates that reflect the verification process before the end of this month. Staff will prepare a new Table 5 at that time and mail it to Commissioners and all subscribers of the Commission's agenda. No other data in the report were effected.

I apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused. If you have any questions about this information, please call Dr. Bob Carlson, Administrator of the Examinations and Research Unit, (916) 327-8663.



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PERF-2

Committee: Performance Standards

Title: Reestablishing Passing Standards for SSAT and Praxis Examinations in Twelve Subject Areas

✓ Action

Prepared by: Bethany Brunsman, Ph.D., Consultant

Professional Services Division

Summary of an Agenda Report

Reestablishing Passing Standards for SSAT and Praxis Exams as a Requirement for Twelve Single Subject Teaching Credentials

Professional Services Division
March 22, 1999

Overview of This Report

In December 1998, Commission staff, with the assistance of personnel from both National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) and Educational Testing Service (ETS), conducted standard setting studies for the SSAT and Praxis examinations in art, biology, chemistry, English, French, general science, geoscience, mathematics, music, physical education, physics, social science, and Spanish. This report describes the standard setting studies and their results, and provides staff-recommended passing standards and related policies.

Policy Issues to be Resolved by the Commission

What passing standards should be established on the SSAT and Praxis examinations in art, biology, chemistry, English, French, general science, geoscience, mathematics, music, physical education, physics, social science, and Spanish as a requirement for the Single Subject Teaching Credential in these subject areas and when should they be implemented?

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal One: To promote educational excellence in California schools.

Objective Two: Develop and administer teacher assessments.

Fiscal Impact Statement

The costs of the standard setting studies and analyses in this report are part of the Commission's annual Exam Development and Administration budget. According to state law, funds in the Exam Development and Administration Account are to be used by the Commission for the planning, development, administration, and interpretation of examinations and assessments. The following recommendations can be carried out without a budget augmentation or redirection of resources.

Recommendations

(1) Adopt the passing standards shown in Table 5 on page 17, and, for the SSAT exams in each subject area, passing

standards as equivalent as possible to the recommended standard for all test forms.

- (2) Adopt the effective dates for new passing standards shown in [Table 5](#) on page 17.
- (3) Until July 2000, allow candidates in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science to pass examinations by combining (a) scores earned prior to the effective date of the new passing standards that met the minimum score in effect at the time the exams were taken, and (b) scores earned after the effective date of the new passing standards.
- (4) Beginning in July 2000, require that candidates in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science use scores on the Praxis exams that were earned on the same administration date to meet combined passing standards for those exams. Authorize staff to pursue appropriate changes in the registration procedures for these examinations.

Part 1 Introduction

The Commission issues Single Subject Teaching Credentials that authorize the teaching of specific subjects in departmentalized classrooms, typically found in secondary schools. One of the requirements for earning a Single Subject Teaching Credential is verification of subject matter competence. Prospective teachers have two alternative ways to meet this requirement: (1) completion of a Commission-approved college or university program of subject matter preparation for teaching in the subject area, or (2) passage of subject matter exams. California Education Code Section 44281 requires the Commission to administer subject matter examinations and assessments for the purpose of assuring minimum levels of subject matter knowledge for teachers who take the exams in lieu of completing approved subject matter programs.

Since December 1995, the Commission has used the Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT exams), administered by National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES), and exams in The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers (Praxis exams), administered by Educational Testing Service (ETS), for this purpose. The Commission has previously established passing standards for these exams.

In December 1998, Commission staff conducted a set of standard setting studies in which committees of California teachers and teacher educators recommended passing standards for the examinations used for twelve Single Subject Teaching Credentials. [Table 1](#) on the next page lists, by subject area, the exams that were the subjects of the standard-setting studies and the format (multiple-choice and/or constructed-response) of each exam.

Table 1: Examinations Included in the Standard Setting Studies

Subject Area	Exams	Format*	
		MC	CR
Art	SSAT Art Praxis Art Making Praxis Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, & Aesthetics	✓	✓ ✓
Biology	SSAT Biology Praxis Biology: Content Essays SSAT General Science Praxis General Science: Content Essays	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
Chemistry	SSAT Chemistry Praxis Chemistry: Content Essays SSAT General Science Praxis General Science: Content Essays	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
English	SSAT Literature and English Language Praxis English Language, Literature, and Composition: Essays	✓	✓
French	SSAT French Praxis French: Productive Language Skills Praxis French: Linguistic, Literary, & Cultural Analysis	✓	✓ ✓
Geoscience	SSAT Geoscience SSAT General Science Praxis General Science: Content Essays	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
Math	SSAT Mathematics Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 1 Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 2	✓	✓ ✓
Music	SSAT Music Praxis Music: Concepts & Processes Praxis Music: Analysis	✓	✓ ✓
Physical	SSAT Physical Education	✓	

Education	Praxis PE: Movement Forms - Analysis & Design Praxis PE: Movement Forms - Video Evaluation		✓ ✓
Physics	SSAT Physics Praxis Physics: Content Essays SSAT General Science Praxis General Science: Content Essays	✓ ✓	✓ ✓
Social Science	SSAT Social Science Praxis Social Studies: Analytical Essays Praxis Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials	✓	✓ ✓
Spanish	SSAT Spanish Praxis Spanish: Productive Language Skills Praxis Spanish: Linguistic, Literary, & Cultural Analysis	✓	✓ ✓

* "MC" indicates multiple-choice items; "CR" denotes constructed-response items.

Standard setting studies were planned for December 1998 for five reasons.

- When the Commission originally adopted passing standards for the exams, it decided to review those standards when enough examinees had taken the exams.
- Last fall, Proposition 8 was pending. If it had passed, all teaching credential candidates would have been required to pass subject matter exams. This change would have increased the number of examinees taking these exams.
- Recent changes in the K-12 curriculum (e.g., new student content standards and curriculum frameworks) were expected to affect the level of subject matter knowledge and skills needed by teachers.
- The passing rates in some of the subject areas have been very low.
- The standard setting studies would allow subject matter experts to consider passing standards for both the Praxis and SSAT exams concurrently. Passing standards for these examination programs were originally recommended by separate committees.

Current Passing Standards and Passing Score Models

The current passing standards in the twelve subject areas are presented in [Table 2](#) beginning on the next page. During the standard setting studies, the Standards Recommendation Committees were not informed of the extant passing standards. The passing standards shown in [Table 2](#) involve two distinct passing score models: a partially-compensatory passing score model and a separate passing score model. Each is described below, as is a third model: a fully-compensatory passing score model.

The Partially-Compensatory Passing Score Model

A partially-compensatory passing score model is in place for the exams in eight of the twelve subject areas: art, biology, chemistry, mathematics, music, physical education, physics, and social science. In this model, passing standards are based on the scores of two exams of like type (e.g., two Praxis exams or two SSAT exams) combined. For each pair of Praxis or SSAT exams, there is a "minimum score" for each exam, a "passing score" for each exam, and a "passing score" for the two exams combined. For example, to satisfy the Praxis examination requirement in art, candidates must either (a) earn at least the passing score on each Praxis exam or (b) earn at least the minimum score on each Praxis exam and at least the passing score for the two exams combined. (The candidate would also have to pass separately the SSAT art exam.) With this passing score model, a high score on one exam in a pair can compensate for a lower score on the other exam, as long as neither score is below the minimum score. Examinees may combine passing and minimum scores from different administrations of the exams in a subject area.

Table 2: Current Passing Standards

Subject Area	Exams	Min. Score	Passing Score
Art	SSAT Art		220 (57)
	Praxis Art Making	163	171
	Praxis Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, & Aesthetics	150	160
	<i>Praxis Combined</i>		331
Biology	SSAT Biology	208	220 (50)
	SSAT General Science	208	220 (57)
	<i>SSAT Combined</i>		440
	Praxis Biology: Content Essays	150	157
	Praxis General Science: Content Essays	140	150
	<i>Praxis Combined</i>		307
Chemistry	SSAT Chemistry	208	220 (55)
	SSAT General Science	208	220 (57)
	<i>SSAT Combined</i>		440
	Praxis Chemistry: Content Essays	145	155
	Praxis General Science: Content Essays	140	150
	<i>Praxis Combined</i>		305
English	SSAT Literature and English Language		220 (53)

	Praxis English: Language, Literature, and Composition: Essays		160
French	SSAT French		220 (56)
	Praxis French: Productive Language Skills		172
	Praxis French: Linguistic, Literary, & Cultural Analysis		171
Geoscience	SSAT Geoscience		220 (60)
	SSAT General Science		220 (57)
	Praxis General Science: Content Essays		150
Math	SSAT Mathematics		220 (56)
	Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 1	165	170
	Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 2	152	159
	<i>Praxis Combined</i>		329
Music	SSAT Music		220 (56)
	Praxis Music: Concepts & Processes	155	165
	Praxis Music: Analysis	164	169
	<i>Praxis Combined</i>		334
Physical Education	SSAT Physical Education		220 (61)
	Praxis PE: Movement Forms - Analysis & Design	152	158
	Praxis PE: Movement Forms - Video Evaluation	160	170
	<i>Praxis Combined</i>		328
Physics	SSAT Physics	208	220 (50)
	SSAT General Science	208	220 (57)
	<i>SSAT Combined</i>		440
	Praxis Physics: Content Essays	150	160
	Praxis General Science: Content Essays	140	150
<i>Praxis Combined</i>		310	
Social Science	SSAT Social Science		220 (48)
	Praxis Social Studies: Analytical Essays	150	160
	Praxis Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials	161	169
	<i>Praxis Combined</i>		329
Spanish	SSAT Spanish		220 (58)
	Praxis Spanish: Productive Language Skills		172
	Praxis Spanish: Linguistic, Literary, & Cultural Analysis		171

Notes: Minimum and passing scores are presented in scaled score points. For the SSAT exams, the scaled passing score is always 220. The SSAT passing scores in raw points for the forms used in the standard setting studies are in parentheses. The raw points necessary to pass different forms of an SSAT may vary somewhat. Equating is used to make exam scores comparable across exam forms.

The Separate Passing Score Model

For the exams in the subject areas of English, French, Geoscience, and Spanish, the Commission adopted a separate passing score model. In this model, each required exam has its own separate passing standard. Candidates must pass each of the two or three required exams separately by meeting the passing standard for each exam. For example, in French, candidates must meet at least the passing score on each of the SSAT exam and the two Praxis exams.

The Fully-Compensatory Passing Score Model

A third model, the fully-compensatory passing score model, is not currently in use for any of the examinations that were the subjects of the standard setting studies. It is described here, however, because staff believe that it is a more defensible model psychometrically than the partially-compensatory passing score model described above.

The fully-compensatory passing score model is similar to the partially-compensatory passing score model with a significant exception. As in the former model, passing standards in the fully-compensatory model are based on the scores of two exams of like type (e.g., two Praxis exams) combined. Unlike the partially-compensatory passing score model, however, the fully-compensatory model has no minimum scores or passing scores for each exam. There is simply a single passing score for the two exams combined. With the fully-compensatory passing score model, a high score on one exam in a pair could compensate fully (i.e., without regard to minimum scores) for a lower score on the other exam. Essentially, the two exams become one, with two equally-weighted parts.

All else equal, the fully-compensatory passing score model will yield more reliable pass/fail decisions about examinees than the partially-compensatory passing score model. With a partially-compensatory model, an examinee could fail a pair of exams by not meeting the minimum score required on one of the exams, even if the examinee scores substantially above the passing score on the other exam. In such a case, the pass/fail decision rests only on the scores on the items on one of the exams, rather than on the scores on all of the items on both exams together. As a result, the reliability of the critical pass/fail decision is likely to be lower with the partially-compensatory passing score model than it would be with the fully-compensatory passing score model. For this reason, the Standards Recommendation Panels in the standard setting studies described in this report were not given the option of recommending a partially-compensatory passing score model for pairs of like tests.

Rather, the committees were asked to recommend either a fully-compensatory passing score model or a separate passing score model for their subject areas. Staff encouraged the committees to recommend the fully-compensatory passing score model if the two exams could be reasonably considered a single exam, with a single passing standard, on which it would be acceptable for

higher scores on one part to compensate for lower scores on the other part. In contrast, committees were encouraged to recommend a separate passing score model if they believed it was important for examinees to demonstrate at least minimal competence on each of the two exams separately because each assessed one or more different domains of the subject matter for which examinees must demonstrate at least minimal competence. For example, the standard setting committees who originally recommended passing standards for the Praxis exams in French and Spanish in 1993 recommended a separate passing score model because the Productive Language Skills exams cover speaking and writing, whereas the Linguistic, Literary, and Cultural Analysis exams measure knowledge of writing, literature, and culture. These original committees believed that prospective French and Spanish teachers needed to demonstrate at least minimal competence on both exams separately. They did not want examinees who were strong in the knowledge and skills tested on the Linguistic, Literary, and Cultural Analysis exam, but who could not adequately speak the language, to pass, and *vice versa*.

Staff also believes that the current partially-compensatory scoring model for the sciences in which candidates can combine SSAT and Praxis scores in general science and the specific science (i.e., biology, chemistry, and physics) is inappropriate for two reasons. First, the content measured by the exams is not similar. The Single Subject Teaching Credentials in Science authorize candidates to teach a both a specific science and integrated (general) science. The general science examinations were developed to measure breadth of knowledge across the specific areas, whereas the biology, chemistry, and physics exams were developed to measure the content specific to those domains of science. Combining scores in a compensatory manner from the two types of tests is unlikely to increase the reliability of the pass/fail decision because they measure different domains of knowledge and skill.

Second, because the multiple-choice and constructed-response items are both contained in the SSAT Geoscience exam, these examinees do not have an opportunity to combine geoscience and general science scores in a compensatory model. It seems unfair to candidates in this science group that they do not have the same opportunity to combine scores as do candidates in physics, chemistry, or biology.

Part 2

The Standard Setting Studies

The following is a summary of the Standards Recommendation Committees that participated in the standard setting studies, the methodology employed in the studies, and the resulting recommendations.

The Standards Recommendation Committees

There was one Standards Recommendation Committee for each of the twelve subject areas, plus a committee for general science (which is not a credential subject area but candidates for the credentials in the four science subject areas must pass tests in general science as well as in their area of emphasis). Each of the twelve subject area committees recommended passing standards for the Praxis and SSAT exams in their respective subject areas. The biology, chemistry, geoscience, and physics committees recommended passing standards for each exam in their areas except for the general science exams. The general science committee made recommendations for passing standards for the Praxis and SSAT examinations in general science.

Commission staff solicited recommendations for committee members from Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program directors; the Commission's Single Subject Matter Panels, who review subject matter programs in the twelve single subject areas included in the studies; and committee members already selected to participate in the studies. California educators who have been involved with the development or scoring of the exams were also invited to participate.

Committee members were selected based on their expertise in the subject areas of the examinations. Commission staff attempted to balance the committees with respect to gender, ethnicity, teaching experience, and geographical area. Committee members were either (a) classroom teachers who had less than seven years of teaching experience or had recently worked with beginning teachers, or (b) college or university subject matter faculty. [Table 3](#) on the next page contains information about the committee members in each subject area. Between 7 and 14 individuals participated on each committee. Most participants were current high school teachers. Although the committees did represent some diversity with respect to ethnicity, most of the participants were White.

Methodology

The following activities were implemented with the Standards Recommendation Committees to obtain recommended passing standards for the examinations in each subject area. Commission staff, in conjunction with personnel from ETS and NES, led the committee meetings and facilitated participants' discussions and recommendations. Staff from the two testing contractors provided meeting materials, assured the security of the testing materials, and analyzed the results of the multiple-choice and constructed-response item judgments (described below).

The purposes of the activities described below were to obtain from the Standards Recommendation Committees (a) recommended passing standards for the tests in each subject area, (b) recommended passing score models for pairs of Praxis examinations in the same subjects (i.e., the Praxis exams in art, French, mathematics, music, physical education, social science, and Spanish). Prior to the meetings, committee members received copies of the content specifications for the Praxis and SSAT exams and were asked to review them. At no time prior to or during the standard setting studies were committee members informed of the current passing standards.

Twelve of the thirteen Standards Recommendation Committees, including the committee for general science, met for two days and developed recommendations for the SSAT and Praxis exams in their subject areas. The committee for geoscience met for one day because they only had to recommend a passing standard for one SSAT exam. Committee meetings were held in separate rooms. Each committee participated in a carefully planned set of activities, briefly summarized below, designed to yield recommended passing standards on the exams.

Table 3: Characteristics of the Standards Recommendation Committees

Characteristics	Art	Biology	Chemistry	English	French	General Science	Geoscience	Math	Music	Physical Education	Physics	Social Science	Spanish
Total Number	12	12	9	9	11	11	7	13	9	14	12	9	11
Assignment:													
Teacher (High)	11	8	8	4	8	9	6	9	8	4	10	6	7
Teacher (Middle)	1	1	0	3	1	2	0	2	1	7	1	2	1
Teacher (Elem.)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Faculty (IHE)	0	3	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	3	1	0	3
Years Teaching:													
1-7	2	1	4	2	3	3	2	7	6	5	3	1	1
8-15	3	1	2	1	3	2	1	2	2	3	3	3	5
More than 15	7	10	3	6	5	6	4	4	1	6	6	5	5
Educational Level:													
Bachelor's Degree	7	4	7	4	3	6	3	5	2	6	2	5	4
Master's Degree	5	4	2	3	6	5	4	5	7	6	7	3	5
Doctoral Degree	0	4	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	2	3	0	2
Gender:													
Female	4	4	2	7	7	7	4	9	4	9	6	4	8
Male	8	8	7	2	4	4	3	4	5	5	6	5	3
Ethnicity:													
African American	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Asian American	2	2	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0
Chicano/Mexican American	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
Latino/Other Hispanic	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	4
White	9	9	5	8	10	8	6	10	7	12	11	6	3
Other	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0

Note: Not all committee members provided requested information.

Introduction and Orientation

At the beginning of each committee meeting, following introductions, Commission staff provided background information about the Praxis and SSAT exams. Information about the following topics was presented:

- purpose and context of the meeting,
- legal basis for the subject matter exams,
- authorization of and current requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials,
- purpose of the subject matter exams, and
- selection of committee members.

Activities Related to the Praxis Exams

To develop preliminary recommended passing standards for the one or two constructed-response Praxis exams in each subject area (and for the constructed-response section of the SSAT exam in geoscience), the Standards Recommendation Committees participated in the following activities.

- Review of exam materials and processes, including:
 - the items on one form of each exam,
 - the scoring guides,
 - the scoring process, and
 - benchmark responses (examinee responses to an item that exemplify each score point on the scoring guide).
- Iterative item-based judgments focusing on the performance of "minimally-competent entry-level teachers" on each test item. This activity involved multiple individual committee member judgments and committee discussions.
- Discussion of passing score models for the Praxis exams and a committee recommendation of a model in subject areas with two Praxis exams testing the same subject.
- Discussion of measurement error, review and discussion of examinee data on the exams, and development of preliminary recommended passing standards.

Activities Related to the SSAT Exams

To develop preliminary recommended passing standards for the multiple-choice SSAT exam in each subject area (and for the multiple-choice section of the SSAT exam in geoscience), the Standards Recommendation Committees participated in the following activities:

- Item-based judgments in which committee members estimated the performance on each item of the exam of a hypothetical group of individuals who are just at the level of knowledge and skills required to perform the job of an educator receiving a single subject teaching credential in the subject area in California. The results of the item-based judgments were discussed by committee members.
- Discussion of measurement error, review and discussion of examinee data on the exam, and development of preliminary recommended passing standards.

Activities Related to the Praxis and SSAT Exams Together

After completing the above activities, the Standards Recommendation Committees reviewed additional examinee data showing passing rates for all tests in a subject area combined. The committees considered the data, as well as their earlier judgments and recommendations, and identified final recommended passing standards for the Praxis and SSAT exams.

Results

Table 4 on the next page lists the committee-recommended passing standards for the twelve subject areas and, separately, for the general science exams. Passing the general science exams, in addition to the biology, chemistry, geoscience, or physics exams, is a requirement for candidates seeking science credentials in those four areas by examination. SSAT passing scores are presented in raw score units; Praxis passing scores are presented in scaled score units. For the Praxis exams in art, mathematics, music, and social science, the committees recommended fully-compensatory scoring models; therefore, passing standards are not recommended separately for each Praxis exam in these areas. In French, physical education, and Spanish, the committees recommended a separate passing score model for the two Praxis exams in those subject areas.

The recommended passing scores reported in **Table 4** are the median of the final recommendations by the committee members. Of the 28 passing scores, all but the following five are the unanimous recommendations of the committee members:

SSAT Biology:	Median = 55 Range = 55-58
Praxis Mathematics Combined:	Median = 346 Range = 342-346
Praxis Physical Education: Analy & Design:	Median = 170 Range = 165-182
Praxis Physical Education: Video Evaluation:	Median = 170 Range = 165-175
SSAT Physics:	Median = 49 Range = 49-50

Table 4: Committee-Recommended Passing Standards

Subject Area	Exams	Passing Score
Art	SSAT Art	62
	Praxis Art Making	--
	Praxis Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, & Aesthetics	--
	<i>Praxis Art Combined</i>	313
Biology	SSAT Biology	55
	Praxis Biology: Content Essays	161
Chemistry	SSAT Chemistry	52
	Praxis Chemistry: Content Essays	150
English	SSAT Literature and English Language	50
	Praxis English: Language, Literature, and Composition: Essays	155
French	SSAT French	57
	Praxis French: Productive Language Skills	173
	Praxis French: Linguistic, Literary, & Cultural Analysis	171
General Science	SSAT General Science	49
	Praxis General Science: Content Essays	135
Geoscience	SSAT Geoscience	56
Math	SSAT Mathematics	56
	Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 1	--
	Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 2	--
	<i>Praxis Mathematics Combined</i>	346
Music	SSAT Music	60
	Praxis Music: Concepts & Processes	--
	Praxis Music: Analysis	--
	<i>Praxis Music Combined</i>	339
Physical Education	SSAT Physical Education	62
	Praxis Physical Education: Movement Forms - Analysis & Design	170
	Praxis Physical Education: Movement Forms - Video Evaluation	170
Physics	SSAT Physics	49
	Praxis Physics: Content Essays	160
Social Science	SSAT Social Science	50
	Praxis Social Studies: Analytical Essays	--
	Praxis Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials	--
	<i>Praxis Social Studies Combined</i>	333

Spanish	SSAT Spanish	61
	Praxis Spanish: Productive Language Skills	181
	Praxis Spanish: Linguistic, Literary, & Cultural Analysis	184

Note: SSAT scores are presented in raw score units. Praxis scores are presented in scaled score units.

Part 3 Staff Recommendations

This report includes four staff recommendations based on the results of the standard setting reports. Each is presented below followed by discussion.

Staff Recommendation 1:
Adopt the passing standards shown in Table 5 on the next page.

Discussion

Table 5 on the next page shows the staff-recommended passing standards for the tests that were the subjects of the standard setting studies. Table 6 presents first-time passing rates at the current passing standards and at staff-recommended passing standards for the groups of examinees who had taken all of the required examinations in a subject area between December 1995 and June 1998. The staff-recommended passing standards are the Standards Recommendation Committees' recommendations in all subject areas except mathematics and physical education. In these two subject areas, although the standard setting process was sound, the implications of raising the passing standards to the extent recommended by the committees are unacceptable.

In mathematics, a subject area where California is currently experiencing a severe shortage of credentialed teachers, the first-time passing rate for all three exams at the committee-recommended passing standards would be 13 percent assuming similar examinees continue to take the exams. It would be irresponsible to raise passing standards to such an extent at the same time California is in such desperate need of mathematics teachers. Consequently, staff recommends that the Commission adopt the fully-compensatory scoring model for the Praxis exams recommended by the committee (in place of the current partially-compensatory passing score model), but keep the current passing scores where they are and revisit the passing standards in mathematics following additional study of the validity of the mathematics examinations. A fully-compensatory passing score model with the current passing scores would result in approximately a 22 percent first-time passing rate.

In physical education, the passing scores and the separate passing score model for the Praxis exams recommended by the committee would lead to a first-time passing rate of approximately of 3 percent. Although physical education is not a shortage area for teachers, the effect of the committee's recommendations would be to essentially eliminate the examination as an option in this subject area. Candidates would waste their money taking examinations they would be highly unlikely to pass. Furthermore, the separate passing score model for the Praxis examinations is problematic because the physical education exams only contain two items each. The

Table 5: Staff-Recommended Passing Standards

Subject Area	Exams	Passing Score	Effective Date
Art	SSAT Art	62	4/16/99
	Praxis Art Making	--	
	Praxis Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, & Aesthetics	--	
	<i>Praxis Art Combined</i>	313	
Biology	SSAT Biology	55	9/01/99
	Praxis Biology: Content Essays	161	
Chemistry	SSAT Chemistry	52	9/01/99
	Praxis Chemistry: Content Essays	150	
English	SSAT Literature and English Language	50	4/16/99
	Praxis English: Language, Literature, and Composition: Essays	155	
French	SSAT French	57	9/01/99
	Praxis French: Productive Language Skills	173	
	Praxis French: Linguistic, Literary, & Cultural Analysis	171	
General Science	SSAT General Science	49	9/01/99
	Praxis General Science: Content Essays	135	
Geoscience	SSAT Geoscience	56	9/01/99
Math*	SSAT Mathematics	56	4/16/99
	Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 1	--	
	Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 2	--	
	<i>Praxis Mathematics Combined</i>	329	
Music	SSAT Music	60	

	Praxis Music: Concepts & Processes Praxis Music: Analysis <i>Praxis Mathematics Combined</i>	-- -- 339	9/01/99
Physical Education*	SSAT Physical Education Praxis Physical Education: Movement Forms - Analysis & Design Praxis Physical Education: Movement Forms - Video Evaluation <i>Praxis Physical Education Combined</i>	61 -- -- 328	4/16/99
Physics	SSAT Physics Praxis Physics: Content Essays	49 160	9/01/99
Social Science	SSAT Social Science Praxis Social Studies: Analytical Essays Praxis Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials <i>Praxis Social Studies Combined</i>	50 -- -- 333	9/01/99
Spanish	SSAT Spanish Praxis Spanish: Productive Language Skills Praxis Spanish: Linguistic, Literary, & Cultural Analysis	61 181 184	9/01/99

*Departs from the Standards Recommendation Committee's recommendation.

Table 6: Current and Recommended Passing Standards and First-Time Passing Rates

Subject Area	Exams	Current Standard	% Passing	Rec. Standard	% Passing
Art	SSAT Art Praxis Art Making Praxis Art: Content, Traditions, Criticism, & Aesthetics <i>Praxis Art Combined</i>	220 (57) 171 160 331	25%	62 -- -- 313	39%
Biology	SSAT Biology SSAT General Science <i>SSAT Combined</i> Praxis Biology: Content Essays Praxis General Science: Content Essays <i>Praxis Combined</i>	220 (50) 220 (57) 440 157 150 307	14%	55 49 -- 161 135 --	16%
Chemistry	SSAT Chemistry SSAT General Science <i>SSAT Combined</i> Praxis Chemistry: Content Essays Praxis General Science: Content Essays <i>Praxis Combined</i>	220 (55) 220 (57) 440 155 150 305	28%	52 49 -- 150 135 --	46%
English	SSAT Literature and English Language Praxis English: Language, Literature, and Composition: Essays	220 (53) 160	44%	50 155	61%
French	SSAT French Praxis French: Productive Language Skills Praxis French: Linguistic, Literary, & Cultural Analysis	220 (56) 172 171	48%	57 173 171	48%
Geoscience	SSAT Geoscience SSAT General Science Praxis General Science: Content Essays	220 (60) 220 (57) 150	29%	56 49 135	67%
Math	SSAT Mathematics Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 1 Praxis Mathematics: Proofs, Models, and Problems, Part 2 <i>Praxis Mathematics Combined</i>	220 (56) 170 159 329	18%	56 -- -- 329	22%
Music	SSAT Music Praxis Music: Concepts & Processes Praxis Music: Analysis <i>Praxis Music Combined</i>	220 (56) 165 169 334	22%	60 -- -- 339	15%
Physical Education	SSAT Physical Education Praxis PE: Movement Forms - Analysis & Design Praxis PE: Movement Forms - Video Evaluation <i>Praxis PE Combined</i>	220 (61) 158 170 328	18%	61 -- -- 328	18%
Physics	SSAT Physics SSAT General Science <i>SSAT Combined</i> Praxis Physics: Content Essays	220 (50) 220 (57) 440 160	36%	49 49 -- 160	46%

	Praxis General Science: Content Essays <i>Praxis Combined</i>	150 310		135 --	
Social Science	SSAT Social Science	220 (48)		50	
	Praxis Social Studies: Analytical Essays	160	26%	--	22%
	Praxis Social Studies: Interpretation of Materials	169		--	
	<i>Praxis Social Studies Combined</i>	329		333	
Spanish	SSAT Spanish	220 (58)		61	
	Praxis Spanish: Productive Language Skills	172	39%	181	18%
	Praxis Spanish: Linguistic, Literary, & Cultural Analysis	171		184	

Note: Praxis passing standards are presented in scaled score points. For the SSAT exams, the scaled passing score is always 220. The SSAT passing standards in raw points for the forms used in the standard setting studies are in parentheses.

reliability of the pass/fail decisions would be strengthened with the fully-compensatory model. Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the fully-compensatory passing score model, but keep the passing scores at the current level and revisit the passing standards in physical education following additional study of the validity of the physical education examinations. A fully-compensatory passing score model with the current passing scores would result in approximately a 18 percent first-time passing rate.

Staff Recommendation 2:
Adopt the effective dates for new passing standards shown in Table 5 on page 17.

Discussion

Possible timelines for implementing the new passing standards include the following:

- (1) Implement all new passing standards immediately.
- (2) Implement all new passing standards beginning with the 1999/00 testing year that begins in September 1999.
- (3) Implement lowered passing standards immediately and raised passing standards beginning with the 1999/00 testing year, with the exception of the science examinations (see effective dates in Table 5 on page 17).

Staff recommends option 3 for the following reasons:

Implementing new higher passing standards beginning immediately would give examinees very little notice about the changes in passing standards. It is good testing practice to notify candidates in advance of changes in passing standards, particularly when the new standards will be higher than the current passing standards. Additionally, in some subject areas, if the recommended passing standards are adopted, candidates will no longer be able to combine scores they have previously earned with new scores. For example, in physics, a candidate may have taken the general science SSAT examination with the intention of later taking the physics SSAT exam and combining scores on the two exams to achieve a total passing score. Immediate implementation of the recommended passing standards would give this candidate no time to take the physics SSAT exam and combine that score with the older general science SSAT score. Waiting until the 1999/00 testing year to implement the higher standards would allow the new passing standards to be published in the exam registration bulletins and other materials. Candidates could then make informed decisions and take the exams they need to meet the old compensatory standards prior to the implementation of new passing standards.

On the other hand, it seems unfair to candidates for the Commission to adopt lower passing standards in several subject areas, but wait until fall to implement them (Option 2). Candidates could well argue that the Commission is knowingly using passing standards that are too high (i.e., not valid) for that interim time period.

Option 3 addresses both of these concerns. It would allow candidates in art, English, mathematics, and physical education to immediately take advantage of lower passing standards. It would also allow candidates who want to meet the biology, chemistry, or physics requirements to use previously-attained scores between now and September. Two major changes will occur with respect to the science standards if the new passing standards are implemented: (1) the passing score model in the sciences will change significantly from a model that allows compensation across Praxis and SSAT exam scores to a separate scoring model, and (2) the passing scores in chemistry and general science will decrease. As a result, implementing new passing scores immediately would negatively affect some candidates, who plan to combine scores from exams they have already taken. Waiting until September to implement changes in the science passing standards would give candidates some time to use the current partially-compensatory passing score model for the specific science and general science examinations and meet a total passing standard for the SSAT and/or Praxis exams and the established minimums.

Staff recommends that candidates not be able to use scores from administrations prior to the administration(s) in which the passing standards are implemented to meet the new passing standards. In this sense, the passing standards would not be retroactive. Retroactively applying the new passing standards could have serious legal and monetary consequences. If candidates were allowed to use previously attained scores to meet the new passing standards, candidates might challenge the validity of the current passing standards for the time period they were in effect. Additionally, retroactively applying the new passing standards would have significant cost implications. The Commission would have to notify candidates who did not pass the exams under the current standards, but who would now pass under the new standards, of the change in their passing status. The Commission does not have current addresses for all of those candidates. Additionally, if the Commission decided to retroactively apply passing standards, the

SSAT exams for the last three and a half years would have to be rescored because the exam scores are scaled such that 220 is passing under the current standards.

Staff Recommendation 3:

Until July 2000, allow candidates in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science to pass examinations by combining (a) scores earned prior to the effective date of the new passing standards that met the minimum score in effect at the time the exams were taken, and (b) scores earned after the effective date of the new passing standards.

Discussion

For subject areas in which the Commission adopts fully-compensatory passing score models for the Praxis exams, staff recommends that candidates be allowed to combine previously-earned minimum scores with new scores to meet the new passing standards. This allowance would be in effect until the 2000-01 testing year (beginning in July 2000) when candidates would be required to take the affected Praxis exams together at the same time, as if they were a single test. One year would give candidates enough time to have the opportunity to use previously-earned scores.

Staff Recommendation 4:

Beginning in July 2000, require that candidates in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science use scores on the Praxis exams that were earned on the same administration date. Authorize staff to pursue appropriate changes in the registration procedures for these examinations.

Discussion

Staff recommends that the way examinations are offered in the future be changed such that subject areas with two Praxis examinations and a fully-compensatory passing score model be offered in California only as a package. Candidates would only be allowed to add together scores from exams taken at the same Praxis administration. Commission staff would pursue a change in the registration procedure so that candidates would be required to register for both examinations on a given administration date. The committees who recommended the fully-compensatory passing score models supported the idea that candidates would need to demonstrate that they know the content covered by both exams in the same sitting. They felt that examinees would be less able to "cram" for the exams and then forget all of the material.



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-1

Committee: Fiscal Planning and Policy

Title: Update on the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget

✓ Information

Prepared by: Helen Lam, Manager

Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

On March 16 and 17, 1999, the Commission's portion of the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget was considered in hearings before the Assembly and Senate budget subcommittees, respectively. This information item provides the Commissioners with an update concerning the status of the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget as it pertains to the Commission's budget.

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

Legislative Analyst's Review of the Commission's Budget

In mid-February 1999, the Legislative Analyst published her *Analysis of the 1999-00 Budget Bill*. In this document, the Analyst recommended that the Legislature deny the Commission's request for \$449,000, eight new positions, and the conversion of 6.5 limited-term positions to permanent status. The Analyst also recommended that the Commission be authorized to spend \$250,000 from the Teacher Credentials Fund for a comprehensive review of the Commission's structure and credential processing protocols.

Following the publication of the *Analysis*, Commission staff engaged in ongoing discussions with the staff of the Department of Finance, the Department of Personnel Administration, the Legislative Analyst, and the legislative budget committees. In addition, Commission staff responded to numerous requests for information from these oversight entities by providing additional supporting documentation for the Commission's budget request.

During these discussions, Commission staff expressed disagreement with the factual assumptions and the reasoning behind the Analyst's recommendations. Commission staff also pointed out that the Commission has improved the efficiency of its operations in many areas while at the same time coping with substantial workload growth with only modest increases in staffing levels. Finally, Commission staff argued that the denial of the Commission's budget request would likely worsen the timeliness of the Commission's credentialing activities and potentially result in the Commission failing to meet its mandated responsibilities.

While disagreeing with the Analyst's recommendation concerning the Commission's budget request, Commission staff agreed that it could be helpful to consider alternative proposals for improving the Commission's operational efficiency. In particular, Commission staff pointed out that it may now be

appropriate for the Commission to develop its own internal auditing capability to ensure that any operational issues are addressed in a cost-effective and timely manner.

Legislative Action on the Commission's Budget

Both of the legislative budget subcommittees approved the Commission's entire budget request with the exception that 5.5 limited-term positions that are assigned to credential processing will be extended on a one-year limited-term basis. The subcommittees also approved the following specific portions of the Commission's budget request:

- Conversion of one limited-term position into permanent status and the addition of one new position in the Division of Professional Practices;
- One-year extension of the equivalent of two positions related to the development of the new Teaching Performance Assessment;
- Three new positions in the Information Management Systems Section to provide improvements in workgroup computing support; and
- One new position in the Fiscal and Business Services Section and one new position in the Executive Office to address administrative workload increases.

In addition, the subcommittees approved a budget bill provision that will direct the Legislative Analyst, the Department of Finance, and the Commission to expend up to \$250,000 for a contract study of the Commission's credentialing process. The study is intended to provide the Governor and the Legislature with information that will validate the Commission's successful efforts to date and suggest potential areas for improvement. The Legislature expects to receive a report concerning the study's findings and recommendations prior to hearings on the 2000-2001 Governor's Budget.

The subcommittees also approved the Governor's proposed \$10 million augmentation for the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program. While the Senate budget subcommittee approved the Governor's proposed fee waiver for new credential applicants, the Assembly budget subcommittee decided to defer acting on this item until a later time.

Future Actions on the 1999-2000 Budget

Staff anticipates that the legislative budget subcommittees will meet once again in April to consider "Spring Finance Letter" budget change requests before each house's version of the 1999-2000 budget is moved to the respective full budget committee for final action. Following budget committee action, staff does not anticipate any further changes to the Commission budget as the process continues and ultimately ends with the Governor signing the 1999 Budget Act into law.

Staff is available to answer any questions the Commissioners may have.



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-2

Committee: Fiscal Planning and Policy

Title: Proposed Spring Finance Letter Budget Change Proposals

✓ Action/Information

Prepared by: Helen Lam, Manager

Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Budget Letter 99-01 issued by the Department of Finance on January 29, 1999, state agencies may submit Fiscal Year 1999-2000 Spring Finance Letter Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) and other technical adjustments that, if approved, would be presented to the Legislature as requested amendments to the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget.

In conjunction with past practice, staff requests that the Commissioners consider and act on the three BCPs that are described below and are attached in their entirety. Staff is also presenting as an informational item three technical adjustments that are also described below.

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

Budget Change Proposals

The three proposed BCPs (see attached copies), which request a total of 6.0 new positions and approximately \$747,000 in increased base budget expenditure authority, are summarized as follows:

BCP No. 9 Establish one (1.0) new position in the Information Management Systems (IMS) Section and augment the base budget by \$348,000 from the Teacher Credentials Fund (TCF). This BCP is for a database and application upgrade project and is in accordance with Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Commission Strategic Plan.

BCP No. 10 Establish one (1.0) new position in the IMS Section and augment the base budget by \$161,000 from the TCF. This BCP is for an agenda and web management project and is in accordance with Goals 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Commission Strategic Plan.

BCP No. 11 Establish four (4.0) new positions in a new Internal Audits Section within the Commission and augment the base budget by \$238,000 from the TCF. This BCP is for internal operations reviews and fiscal compliance audits and is in accordance with Goal 3 of the Commission Strategic Plan.

Technical Adjustments

Commission staff has requested the following technical adjustments in the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget:

Troops To Teachers

The Commission currently receives federal funds of \$158,000 annually to administer the Troops to Teachers Program. The program was initially scheduled to terminate on September 30, 1999. However, because of its effectiveness in providing new teachers, President Clinton announced that he would ask Congress to continue the program. With Congressional approval, the program's funding would continue through the next federal fiscal year ending on September 30, 2000. Congressional action on the President's request is not expected until late summer 1999.

Teaching Performance Assessment

As previously communicated to the Commission in PERF-1 in February 1999, in order for the Teaching Performance Assessment to be a valid, legally defensible testing instrument, its development would need to be undertaken using a series of contracts, with each contract necessarily building on the work of any previous contracts. This work is now planned to be accomplished in three phases:

Phase One: Job Analysis

Phase Two: Validation of Teaching Performance Expectations and Evaluation of Extant Assessments

Phase Three: Development of a Teaching Performance Assessment

Staff anticipates that the first phase will be completed by approximately December 1999. Because phases two and three depend on the work of phase one, these latter phases will not be undertaken until after January 1, 2000.

Because of the timing of phase one, only \$400,000 of the initial appropriation of \$1.35 million will be spent or encumbered by the end of fiscal year 1998-99. Since the balance of the appropriation will still be needed to complete the project, staff has requested that the balance of \$950,000 be re-appropriated in fiscal year 1999-2000.

Federal Grant Proposal

Following the presentation of PREP-3 to the Commission in February 1999, staff prepared a federal grant application and submitted it to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA). This grant application reflects a statewide partnership of the California Community Colleges, the California State University system, the nonprofit Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., the California Center for Teaching Careers, several local school districts, and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

If awarded, this grant would provide five years of funding for which the fiscal agent must be a postsecondary institution. San Joaquin Delta Community College of Stockton has agreed to serve as the recipient for these federal funds and to contract with the Commission for the administration of the program.

The proposed contract would cause the Commission to incur reimbursable expenditures of \$152,000 in fiscal year 1999-2000, \$132,000 in both fiscal years 2000-2001 and 2001-2002, and \$99,000 in both fiscal years 2002-2003 and 2003-2004. As a result, staff has requested the technical adjustments needed to reflect this activity in the Commission's 1999-2000 budget.

Staff is available to answer any questions the Commissioners may have.



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-1

Committee: Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Title: Proposed Regulations to Implement Aspects of AB 1620 Related to Experienced Teachers from Outside of California

✓ Action

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

**Proposed Additions to Title 5 Regulations,
§80048.3.1 and §80413.3,
Pertaining to Experienced Out-of-State Credentialed Teachers**

March 26, 1999

Summary

The following are the rationale and proposed text for Title 5 Regulations §80048.3.1 and §80413.3 that pertain to experienced out-of-state credentialed teachers. These additions place into regulation Education Code §44274.2 & §44274.4, added by Assembly Bill 1620 (Scott), Chaptered September 18, 1998 (Chapter 919). The proposed regulations also clarify terms used in these statutes.

Fiscal Impact Statement

AB1620 has a positive economic impact on individuals who meet the criteria and a lesser negative impact on colleges and universities, agencies that administer examinations, public school employers and the Commission. The regulations that clarify the criteria should not have an economic impact on any entity other than a minor short-term cost to the Commission related to holding a public hearing.

Policy Issues to Be Resolved

Shall the Commission clarify the credential requirements found in Education Codes §44274.2 and §44274.4 by placing them in regulations?

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the following additions to Title 5 Regulations, §80048.3.1 and §80413.3, for the purposes of beginning the rulemaking file for submission to the Office of Administrative Law and the scheduling of a public hearing.

Background

AB1620, which became effective on September 18, 1998, allows experienced, out-of-state trained teachers to qualify for California certification without completing many of the statutory requirements needed by individuals prepared in California or those inexperienced teachers from outside of California. Those qualifying for the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials based on this education code are exempt from the following requirements:

- methods of developing English language skills, including reading,
- provisions and principles of the U.S. Constitution,

- subject matter competence,
- fifth year of study,
- health education,
- special education, and
- computer education

Those qualifying for the Education Specialist Instruction Credentials based on this education code are exempt from the following requirements:

- methods of developing English language skills, including reading,
- provisions and principles of the U.S. Constitution,
- subject matter competence,
- non-special education pedagogy, and
- supervised field experience in general education

The individuals affected by this legislation must verify a specific number of years of successful, full-time teaching experience by submitting satisfactory, rigorous evaluation reports from prior employers. At the November 1998 meeting, the Commission approved policy issues and definitions for the implementation of this new law until the regulatory process could be concluded. These proposed regulations were presented as an information item at the February 1999 Commission meeting.

Proposed Additions of §80048.3.1 and §80413.3

AB1620 allows the Commission to grant preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials and Education Specialist Instruction Credentials to individuals who are trained in another state and have a specified number of years of successful, out-of-state teaching experience. It also establishes the requirements for the professional clear credentials for these individuals.

The following is an overview of the proposed regulations that describe the requirements needed and clarify the definitions used for these credentials. A copy of the proposed regulations is attached, followed by a copy of Education Codes §44274.2 and §44274.4 found in AB1620.

80413.3: Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials

80413.3(a):

This subsection pertains to individuals seeking the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential based on the following requirements. Additionally, those seeking the Single Subject Teaching Credential must have a degree major in the subject area requested.

1. Five years of full-time, out-of-state teaching experience in the subject of the credential sought.
2. Rigorous performance evaluations with a rating of satisfactory or better.
3. A valid, comparable teaching credential from another state.
4. A corresponding teacher preparation program from another state taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and approved by that state's appropriate agency.
5. A baccalaureate or higher degree completed at a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
6. Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST).

To obtain the professional clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential, these individuals must complete 150 clock hours of staff development, college course work or other related activities that address one or more of the six standards found in the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. In the proposed regulations, individuals must complete this requirement in California while holding the AB1620 preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential.

80413.3(b)

The requirements for the three-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are comparable to those just discussed for the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential except three years of full-time, out-of-state teaching experience are needed rather than the five years. Because these individuals must complete either an approved Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program or an approved alternative program of beginning teacher induction as the renewal requirement for the professional clear credential, these three-year preliminary credentials will be

restricted to an employing school district that has either program.

A revision that both clarifies and strengthens the wording has been made to the proposed regulatory text since the March Commission meeting. Previously, the text only required employment with an agency that has an approved BTSA program. It now specifies that the employer also intends to enroll the individual into this program.

80413.3(c)

This subsection defines 1) majors for the Single Subject Teaching Credential, 2) full-time teaching experience, and 3) rigorous performance evaluations.

Majors for the Single Subject Teaching Credential: AB1620 requires that individuals applying for the Single Subject Teaching Credential have a degree major in the requested subject area. Because the subject areas listed on the credential are limited to those few established in statute, the proposed regulations identify comparable degree majors. Also, the degree majors listed are limited to those with similar content because it is the only verification of the individual's subject matter competency.

Full-Time Teaching Experience: The proposed regulation clarifies that the teaching experience must be obtained from out-of-state public schools while holding that state's valid, comparable teaching credential. The experience can be gained in several states but not from outside of the United States. Full-time experience is defined as a minimum of four hours a day on a daily basis, unless the minimum statutory attendance requirement for the students served is less, and for at least 75% of the school year. The four-hour daily increment is based on the statutory student-attendance requirements for grades 4-12. The "75% of the school year" has been traditionally used to include teachers hired late by districts that underestimated the number of teachers needed at the school year. The proposed regulation also describes the type of verification letter needed.

To clarify the initial proposed wording of this definition, "Experience must be on a daily basis and for at least 75% of the school year. Less than 75% of a semester cannot be considered when accruing time." has been replaced with "Experience must be on a daily basis and for at least 75% of the school year. Experience may be accrued in increments of a minimum of one semester." This better defines the minimum acceptable period of time.

Rigorous Performance Evaluations: The proposed regulations require submission of evaluations for at least two years of the out-of-state teaching experience, with at least one evaluation within the last two years. The proposal also defines the four areas that need to be included in the evaluation and allows submission of a supplemental evaluation letter if these specific areas are not covered in the formal evaluations. These needed areas are the following:

1. The use of teaching strategies that motivates all students to engage in the learning process.
2. The ability to establish and maintain high standards for student behavior.
3. A demonstration of deep knowledge of the subject being taught and the use of appropriate instructional strategies that promote student understanding.
4. An ability to plan and implement a sequence of appropriate instructional activities.

As additional information to the March agenda item, these evaluation areas are based on the standards found in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession [listed in the proposed 80413.3(a)(2)(B)].

80413.3(d)

AB1620 does not allow individuals who have a Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential issued through reciprocity, established in Education Code §44274, to obtain a comparable credential based on experience. This proposed subsection reflects this stipulation.

80413.3(e)

Some individuals in California currently hold preliminary credentials and would qualify under AB1620. The proposed regulations allow these individuals to re-apply under the AB1620 statutes if they also submit satisfactory or better rigorous performance evaluations from their California teaching experience. This also allows the individuals at least three years to complete the professional growth requirements.

80048.3.1: Education Specialist Instruction Credential

80048.3.1(a)

The proposed requirements for the five-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential (Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/ Severe Disabilities, etc.) are the same as those for the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential mentioned in 80413.3(a), with several

exceptions. The training, out-of-state certification and experience must be in the disability area of the California credential sought. Also, as with those seeking the preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential through the more traditional method, individuals must verify an offer of California employment so they can complete the induction requirements for the professional clear Level II. If individuals meet all requirements except California employment, they may request a Certificate of Eligibility.

80048.3.1(b)

Under this proposal, individuals who obtain the preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential based on these regulations will need to complete the current requirements for the professional clear Level II.

80048.3.1(c)

This subsection defines full-time teaching experience and rigorous performance evaluations. These are the same definitions found in the proposed 80413.3(c) for the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials.

80048.3.1(d)

As with the proposed Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials regulations, Education Code §44274, established in AB1620, will not allow an individual who has obtained a preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential based on reciprocity to apply under this regulation.

80048.3.1(e)

Under this proposed subsection, an individual who holds a preliminary Specialist Instruction Credential in Special Education (Learning Handicapped, Severely Handicapped, etc.) and satisfies the AB1620 requirements may apply for a five-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential under these regulations. If they have California experience, they will need to submit the most recent rigorous performance evaluation from their California employer.

**DIVISION VIII OF TITLE 5
CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS**

**Proposed Addition of Sections 80048.3.1 and 80413.3 of Title 5, California Code of
Regulations,
Pertaining to Experienced Out-of-State Credentialed Teachers**

80413.3 Specific Requirements for Preliminary and Professional Clear Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials for Experienced Out-of-State Credentialed Teachers

- (a) The following pertains to individuals who have five years of appropriate teaching experience in a state other than California.
 - (1) The minimum requirements for the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are all of the following, (A) through (G).
 - (A) Five years of full-time teaching experience in the subject of the credential sought and in a state other than California.
 - (B) Rigorous performance evaluations.
 - (C) A valid teaching credential from another state, with a comparable authorization to the credential sought.
 - (D) Completion of a teacher preparation program taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and appropriate to the credential sought. The program must be approved by the appropriate state agency in the state where the program was completed.
 - (E) A baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (F) In the case of an applicant for a five-year preliminary Single Subject Teaching Credential, completion of an academic major in the subject area of the credential sought.
 - (G) Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) described in Education Code §44252. A one-year nonrenewable Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential may be issued to an applicant who has not passed the CBEST and has satisfied subsections (a)(1)(A) through (a)(1)(F) above and Title 5 §80071.4(c).
 - (2) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are both of the following:
 - (A) A five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential issued pursuant to subdivision (a)(1), and

- (B) Completion of 150 clock hours of activities addressing one or more of the following six standards. This may be satisfied by staff development, college course work or other activities related to the standards. When applying for the professional clear credential, a written list of the activities including a justification stating how each of the activities relates to the standard must be attached. An individual at the central office of a California school district or county office of education, or at a California school site who is responsible for curriculum and instruction in the authorization of the teacher's credential must sign the written justification agreeing that the activities relate to the standard(s) as stated. The individual must complete this requirement in California while holding the Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential issued pursuant to subdivision (a)(1).
1. Engaging and supporting all students in learning.
 2. Creating and maintaining effective environments for student learning.
 3. Understanding and organizing subject matter for student learning.
 4. Planning instruction and designing learning experiences for all students.
 5. Assessing student learning.
 6. Developing as a professional educator.
- (b) The following pertains to individuals who have three years of appropriate teaching experience in a state other than California.
- (1) The minimum requirements for the three-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are all of the following, (A) through (H).
- (A) Three years of full-time teaching experience in the subject of the credential sought and in a state other than California.
 - (B) Rigorous performance evaluations.
 - (C) A valid teaching credential from another state, with a comparable authorization to the credential sought.
 - (D) Completion of a teacher preparation program taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and appropriate to the credential sought. The program must be approved by the appropriate state agency in the state where the program was completed.
 - (E) A baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (F) In the case of an applicant for a three-year preliminary Single Subject Teaching Credential, completion of an academic major in the subject area of the credential sought.
 - (G) An offer of employment from a California school district, county office of education or school operating under the direction of a California state agency that has one of the approved programs listed in (b)(2)(B) *and a statement by the employer verifying intention to enroll the individual into the program.* The document will be restricted to the requesting employer.
 - (H) Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) described in Education Code §44252. A one-year nonrenewable Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential may be issued to an applicant who has not passed the CBEST and has satisfied subsections (b)(1)(A) through (b)(1)(G) above and Title 5 §80071.4(c).
- (2) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are both of the following:
- (A) A three-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential issued pursuant to subdivision (b)(1), and
 - (B) Completion of either of the following:
 1. A program of beginning teacher support and assessment established pursuant to Education Code, Article 4.5 (commencing with §44279.1) of Chapter 2 of Part 25, or
 2. An alternative program of beginning teacher induction that the commission determines, in collaboration with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, meets state standards for teacher induction.
- (c) The following definitions apply to terms used in this section.
- (1) Majors for the Single Subject Teaching Credential: Applicants for the Single Subject Teaching Credential must have a major in the fields identified below or in a closely related subject acceptable to the Commission.
- (A) Agriculture: agribusiness, animal science, crop science, dairy science, natural resources management, horticulture, or soil science.
 - (B) Art: art history or studio art.
 - (C) Business: accountancy, business administration, finance or marketing.
 - (D) English: composition or literature.
 - (E) Foreign Language: French, German, Spanish, or another language other than English.
 - (F) Health Science: health science or public health.
 - (G) Home Economics: foods, nutrition, child development, interior design, or clothing.

- (H) Industrial and Technology Education: industrial technology.
 - (I) Mathematics: mathematics.
 - (J) Music: instrumental or vocal.
 - (K) Physical Education: kinesiology or physical education.
 - (L) Science: Biological Sciences: biology, marine biology, anatomy, or botany.
 - (M) Science: Chemistry: chemistry or biochemistry.
 - (N) Science: Geoscience: astronomy, earth science, ecology, or geology.
 - (O) Science: Physics: physics.
 - (P) Social Science: geography, government, political science, or history. An applicant with a major in one of the disciplines of anthropology, economics, psychology or sociology may receive the credential in social science if he or she also has a minor in geography, government, political science, or history. A minor is defined as 20 semester units obtained within the degree.
- (2) Full-Time Teaching Experience: This is defined as teaching a minimum of 4 hours a day, unless the minimum statutory attendance requirement for the students served is less. Experience must be on a daily basis and for at least 75% of the school year. *Experience may be accrued in increments of a minimum of one semester.* No part-time or combination of teaching with other school employment will be accepted. All experience must be gained in public schools in states other than California while serving on that state's valid teaching credential that is comparable to the authorization sought. Experience may be gained in more than one state other than California. This experience must be verified on the official letterhead of the district or districts by the superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of personnel, or director of human resources in which the teacher was employed. Experience from outside of the United States will not be considered.
- (3) Rigorous Performance Evaluations:
- (A) The teaching effectiveness areas on the performance evaluations must include, but are not be limited to, all of the areas, 1. through 4., below. If these areas are not included in the evaluations, the individual may submit a supplemental letter, on district letterhead, signed by the individual's principal or personnel officer in the district in which the evaluations took place. If an evaluation or supplemental letter cannot be obtained that includes all of the four areas, then the individual would not qualify under this section. Verification of the authenticity of the evaluation letters must be given in writing by a personnel officer in the district in which the evaluations took place.
 1. The use of teaching strategies that motivates all students to engage in the learning process.
 2. The ability to establish and maintain high standards for student behavior.
 3. A demonstration of deep knowledge of the subject being taught and the use of appropriate instructional strategies that promote student understanding.
 4. An ability to plan and implement a sequence of appropriate instructional activities.
 - (B) Evaluations of the teacher's performance for at least two of the years of teaching experience from a state other than California must be submitted with at least one evaluation within the last two years of the experience.
 - (C) Evaluation ratings must be satisfactory or better.
- (d) An individual who has previously been issued a California Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential based on Education Code §44274 is not eligible for a credential issued under this section.
- (e) An individual who has previously been issued a California Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential, based on other than Education Code §44274, is eligible for a credential issued under this section provided that the following (1) and (2) are met.
- (1) Verification of all provisions of (a)(1) or (b)(1), and
 - (2) If the individual has California public school teaching experience in the authorization of the credential sought, submission of the most recent rigorous performance evaluation.
 - (3) If qualifying under (a)(1), the credential will be valid either five years from the issuance date of the original preliminary credential or three years from the date of application under (a)(1), which ever expires later.
 - (4) If qualifying under (b)(1), the credential will be valid three years from the date of application.

NOTE: Authority Cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44274.2, 44274.4, 44279.1 and 44252, Education Code

80048.3.1 Specific Requirements for Preliminary Level I and Professional Clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential for Experienced Out-of-State Credentialed Teachers

- (a) The minimum requirements for the five-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential are all of the following, (1) through (7).

- (1) Five years of full-time teaching experience in the disability area of the credential sought and in a state other than California.
 - (2) Rigorous performance evaluations.
 - (3) A valid special education teaching credential from another state, with a comparable authorization to the credential sought.
 - (4) Completion of a teacher preparation program taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and appropriate to the disability area of the credential sought. The program must be approved by the appropriate state agency in the state where the program was completed.
 - (5) A baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (6) An offer of employment as specified in 80048.3(a)(8). An individual who has completed all other requirements (1) through (7) but does not have an offer of employment may apply for a Certificate of Eligibility as specified in 80048.3(a)(9).
 - (7) Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) administered pursuant to Education Code §44252. A one-year nonrenewable Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential may be issued to an applicant who has not passed the CBEST and has satisfied subsections (a)(1) through (a)(6) above and Title 5 §80071.4(c).
- (b) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential are both of the following:
- (1) A five-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential issued pursuant to subdivision (a)(1), and
 - (2) Completion of all requirements for the professional clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential, as specified in Title 5 §80048.4.
- (c) The following definitions apply to terms used in this section.
- (1) Full-Time Teaching Experience: This is defined as teaching a minimum of 4 hours a day, unless the minimum statutory attendance requirement for the students served is less. Experience must be on a daily basis and for at least 75% of the school year. *Experience may be accrued in increments of a minimum of one semester.* No part-time or combination of teaching with other school employment will be accepted. All experience must be gained in public schools in states other than California while serving on that state's valid teaching credential that is comparable to the authorization sought. Experience may be gained in more than one state other than California. This experience must be verified on the official letterhead of the district or districts by the superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of personnel, or director of human resources in which the teacher was employed. Experience from outside of the United States will not be considered.
 - 2) Rigorous Performance Evaluations:
 - (A) The teaching effectiveness areas on the performance evaluations must include, but are not be limited to, all of the areas, 1. through 4., below. If these areas are not included in the evaluations, the individual may submit a supplemental letter, on district letterhead, signed by the individual's principal or personnel officer in the district in which the evaluations took place. If an evaluation or supplemental letter cannot be obtained that includes all of the four areas, then the individual would not qualify under this section. Verification of the authenticity of the evaluation letters must be given in writing by a personnel officer in the district in which the evaluations took place.
 1. The use of teaching strategies that motivates all students to engage in the learning process.
 2. The ability to establish and maintain high standards for student behavior.
 3. A demonstration of deep knowledge of the subject being taught and the use of appropriate instructional strategies that promote student understanding.
 4. An ability to plan and implement a sequence of appropriate instructional activities.
 - (B) Evaluations of the teacher's performance for at least two of the years of teaching experience from a state other than California must be submitted with at least one evaluation within the last two years of the experience.
 - (C) Evaluation ratings must be satisfactory or better.
- (d) An individual who has previously been issued a preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential based on Education Code §44274 is not eligible for a credential issued under this section.
- (e) An individual who has previously been issued a California preliminary Specialist Instruction Credential in Special Education is eligible for a credential issued under this section provided the following (1) and (2) are met.
- (1) Verification of all provisions of (a), and
 - (2) If the individual has California public school teaching experience in the authorization of the credential sought, submission of the most recent rigorous performance evaluation.
 - (3) The credential will be valid five years from the date of application.

44274.2

- (a) Notwithstanding Section 44227, Section 44259, or any other provision of this chapter, the commission shall issue a five-year preliminary multiple subject teaching credential authorizing instruction in a self-contained classroom or a five-year preliminary single subject teaching credential authorizing instruction in departmentalized classes to any applicant who has not been awarded a credential pursuant to Section 44274 and who fulfills all of the following requirements:
- (1) A minimum of five years of full-time teaching experience in the subject of the credential sought.
 - (2) A valid corresponding elementary or secondary teaching credential from another state.
 - (3) A baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (4) Completion of teacher preparation at a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (5) Submission of evidence of rigorous performance evaluations on which applicant received ratings of satisfactory or better.
 - (6) In the case of an applicant for a five-year preliminary single subject teaching credential, completion of an academic major in the subject area of the credential sought as determined by the commission.
 - (7) Passage of the state basic skills proficiency test administered pursuant to Section 44252. The commission may issue a one-year nonrenewable multiple or single subject teaching credential pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 44252 prior to issuance of this preliminary credential to an applicant who has not passed the state basic skills proficiency test.
- (b) The commission shall issue a professional clear multiple or single subject teaching credential to any applicant who documents, in a manner prescribed by the commission, that he or she fulfills each of the following requirements:
- (1) The commission has issued to the applicant a preliminary five-year teaching credential pursuant to subdivision (a).
 - (2) The applicant has completed 150 clock hours of activities that contribute to his or her competence, performance, and effectiveness in the education profession, and that assist the applicant in meeting or exceeding standards for professional preparation established by the commission.
- (c) The commission shall issue a five-year preliminary specialist instruction credential authorizing instruction of pupils with disabilities to any applicant who has not been awarded a credential pursuant to Section 44274 and who fulfills all of the following requirements:
- (1) A minimum of five years of full-time teaching experience in the subject of the credential sought.
 - (2) A valid corresponding special education credential from another state.
 - (3) Completion of a professional preparation program in the requested education specialist category.
 - (4) A baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (5) Submission of evidence of rigorous performance evaluations on which the applicant received ratings of satisfactory or better.
 - (6) Passage of the state basic skills proficiency test administered pursuant to Section 44252.
- (d) The commission shall issue a professional clear instruction credential to any applicant who fulfills the requirements for the professional clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential, as established by the commission.

44274.4

- (a) Notwithstanding Section 44227, Section 44259, or any other provision of this chapter, the commission shall issue a three-year preliminary multiple subject teaching credential authorizing instruction in a self-contained classroom or a three-year preliminary single subject teaching credential authorizing instruction in departmentalized classes to any applicant who has not been awarded a credential pursuant to Section 44274 and who fulfills all of the following requirements:
- (1) A minimum of three years of full-time teaching experience in the subject of the credential sought.
 - (2) A valid corresponding elementary or secondary teaching credential from another state.
 - (3) A baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (4) Completion of teacher preparation at a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (5) Submission of evidence of rigorous performance evaluations for which the applicant received ratings of satisfactory or better.
 - (6) In the case of an applicant for a three-year preliminary single subject teaching credential, completion of an academic major in the subject area of the credential sought as determined by the commission.
 - (7) Passage of the state basic skills proficiency test administered pursuant to Section 44252. The commission may issue a one-year nonrenewable multiple or single subject teaching credential pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 44252 prior to issuance of this preliminary credential to an applicant who has not passed the state basic skills proficiency test.

- (b) The commission shall issue a professional clear multiple or single subject teaching credential to any applicant who documents, in a manner prescribed by the commission, that he or she fulfills each of the following requirements:
- (1) The commission has issued to the applicant a preliminary three-year teaching credential pursuant to subdivision (a).
 - (2) The applicant has completed either of the following:
 - (A) A program of beginning teacher support and assessment established pursuant to Article 4.5 (commencing with Section 44279.1) of Chapter 2 of Part 25.
 - (B) An alternative program of beginning teacher induction that the commission determines, in collaboration with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, meets state standards for teacher induction.
-



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-2

Committee: Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Title: Proposed Regulations Related to Single Subject Credential Authorizations

✓ Information

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

Proposed Amendments and Additions to Title 5 Regulations Concerning Single Subject Teaching Credentials and an Authorization for Subject Areas for Service in Departmentalized Classes

March 30, 1999

Summary

This item introduces proposed amendments and additions to Title 5 Regulations pertaining to the authorization for the Single Subject Teaching Credential and subject areas for service in departmentalized classes.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact in this information item.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

Are the proposed authorizations appropriate for the Single Subject Teaching Credential and subject areas for service in departmentalized classes?

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 Single Subject Teaching Credential and an authorization for subject areas for service in departmentalized classes.

At the August Commission meeting, staff was directed to meet with a group of educators to discuss proposed changes to regulations. The individuals listed below, who also met concerning the regulations for the Administrative Services Credential, participated in a meeting on January 15 to discuss the Single Subject Teaching Credential authorization.

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. Supt, Human Resources	West Contra Costa USD	Dist Administrator
Richard Pierucci	Asst. Supt, Human Resources	Woodland Joint USD	Dist 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 group did not believe there was a need for a lengthy discussion on the Single Subject Teaching Credential which authorizes service in departmentalized classes. There were two exceptions. The first was to clarify who can teach health science. Prior to 1981, the subject area of physical education authorized both physical education and health science. The health science subject area was added to statute in 1981 and for that reason physical education credentials issued after January 1, 1981 do not authorize teaching health. Clarification of which subject areas authorize teaching health science needed to be added to regulation. In the second area, there was agreement in the group that adding an authorization for holders of credentials in specified subject areas to serve in classes designated as trade, technical, and vocational would allow for easier understanding of the authorization for the Single Subject Teaching Credential by the employing school districts and county offices of education.

After achieving consensus on the authorization of the Single Subject Teaching Credential, the discussion at the January 15th meeting focussed on the authorization for subject areas for service in departmentalized classes. While the Single Subject Teaching Credential authorizes service in a broad subject area, there still remain questions in which broad subject area some classes fall within. Previously in regulation there was a list showing which subjects fell within the broader single subject areas called the subsumption list. The group discussed whether a new "subsumption" list that provides specificity yet allows flexibility at the local level should be added to regulations. There was general agreement that having this type of list would be helpful to employing school districts and county offices of education. After making suggestions for subjects to be added to the list, the group drafted an authorization statement to allow an employing agency to determine that an individual may teach a class directly related in content to one of the broad subject areas if the subject is not already listed under another subject area.

The group then turned their attention to subjects that do not fall within the broad single subject areas. They believed there was a correlation between the list of subjects that fall within the broad single subject areas and the assignment in courses such as study hall, life skills, and leadership. The group suggested wording for an authorization statement to tie the new "subsumption" list and the subjects that do not fall within the statutory single subject areas together.

In February, a draft of the proposed regulations were sent to the group of educators who attended the January 15th meeting as well as to the California Department of Education.

Proposed Amendments for the Single Subject Teaching Credential

The existing content of Title 5 Section 80004 concerning the Single Subject Teaching Credential is either out-of-date or unnecessary. Any reference in this section to the valid period of the credential or dating information is not necessary because it is contained in other sections of regulations (80553, 80413, and 80413.1). The statement currently in Section 80004 does not clearly define the authorization for the Single Subject Teaching Credential.

The proposed amendments to this section would eliminate the existing language and redefine the purpose of the section and propose appropriate content. Staff proposes that Section 80004 be amended to define the authorization of the Single Subject Teaching Credential with the addition of the subject areas authorized to teach health science and classes designated as trade, technical, and vocational.

The proposed amendments to Title 5 §80004 clarify the authorization for the Single Subject Teaching Credential with the elements summarized below:

- Subsection (a) describes the subject areas and grade level in which the holder of a Single Subject Teaching Credential may serve.
- Subsection (b) clarifies which single subject areas authorize teaching health science.

In 1980, the professional organization of health educators sponsored a bill to create a separate Single Subject Teaching Credential in Health Science. Prior to January 1, 1981, holders of a Single Subject Teaching Credential in physical education were authorized to teach health science because the credential programs and examinations in physical education included health standards. Regulations were not revised to reflect the change in the physical education credential authorization. The life science subject-matter programs and examinations also include health standards to allow for the dual authorization in life and health science. The single subject area of biological science, which was added in 1995, does not authorize teaching health science as the program and examinations do not include health standards.

- Subsection (c) states that the Single Subject Teaching Credentials in specific subject areas authorize teaching classes that are designated as trade, technical, or vocational.

The Commission issues Vocational Designated Subjects Teaching Credentials that authorize service in trade, technical, and vocational classes. These credentials require five years of work experience related to the subject listed on the

document. Holders of Single Subject Teaching Credentials in agriculture, business, home economics, and industrial and technology education must complete a teacher preparation program including student teaching, and verify subject-matter competence by completing 45 semester units of course work or passing subject-matter examinations in the subject area. There has been some confusion whether trade, technical, and vocational classes can only be taught by an individual holding a Designated Subjects Vocational Teaching Credential. Credential holders in these five trade, technical, or vocational subject areas have completed requirements beyond what is required for the Designated Subjects Teaching Credential.

The California Department of Education provides special funding for some vocational classes and specific credentials or experience may be a requirement for that funding. The Commission always advises employers to check with the Department before assigning an individual who does not hold a credential that is clearly identified as a vocational credential in a trade, technical, or vocational class. Regardless of the possible funding criteria, these single subject areas authorize serving in a trade, technical, or vocational class.

Title 5 §80004. Single Subject Teaching Credential Authorization for Service.

A Preliminary Single subject Teaching Credential shall be issued for not more than five years following completion of the requirements specified in Section 80413(a), but prior to completion of the requirements specified in Section 80413(b).

- (a) Upon completion of the requirements specified in Section 80413(b) and upon satisfying the Commission that the holder is otherwise qualified, the holder of the Preliminary Credential, or other applicant, shall be issued a Clear Single Subject Teaching Credential. The Single Subject Teaching Credential authorizes the holder to teach the subject area(s) listed on the document in grades twelve and below, including preschool, and in classes organized primarily for adults.
- (b) The Clear holder of a Single Subject Teaching Credential shall be issued for five years in the following subject areas are authorized to teach health science.:
 - (1) Health Science,
 - (2) Life Science, and
 - (3) Physical Education if the document was initially issued prior to January 1, 1981.
- (c) A teacher who is authorized for single subject instruction may be assigned to teach any subject in his/her field at any grade level; preschool, kindergarten, grades 1 to 12 or in classes organized primarily for adults. This includes all subjects taught in the authorized field and other courses of which the content and prerequisites are related to the authorized field. The holder of a Single Subject Teaching Credential in Agriculture, Business, Home Economics, Industrial Arts, or Industrial and Technology Education is authorized to teach the subject area listed on the document in classes designated as technical, trade, or vocational by the employing agency.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 44225 (b) and 44348 44225(e), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44251, 44252, 44225(q) and 44256, 44282, 44347, and 44348, Education Code.

Proposed Amendments for an Authorization for Subject Areas for Service in Departmentalized Classes

Numerous requests from school districts are received in the Assignment Unit each year asking whether the curriculum of a course falls within one of the statutory single subject areas. Prior to 1982, Title 5 Regulations included a subsumption list of subjects authorized under each single subject category. It served as a helpful guide to employers, but proved to be inadequate as it did not contain all the subjects being taught nor could it be changed to add new courses. Staff is proposing to return the list to regulations and to allow for some flexibility at the local level.

In most cases there is a direct match between the curriculum of the courses to be taught and the authorizations listed on credentials. There are, however, specific types of courses that do not fall neatly under any of the current statutory single subjects. These include courses in life skills, leadership, study skills, conflict management, teen skills, study hall, and others. While some of the courses have a defined curriculum, most are elective and non-academic. The Assignment Unit is often asked what type of credential is required for an individual to serve in such classes.

The proposed amendments to Title 5 §80005 clarify the authorization for the subject areas for service in departmentalized classes with the elements summarized below:

- Subsection (a) describes the manner in which an individual may be assigned to teach a subject that falls within the broad single subject areas. The proposed regulation allows an employing agency to determine that an individual may teach a class directly related in content to one of the broad subject areas if the subject is not already listed under another subject area.
- Subsections (a)(1) through (16) lists the broad single subject areas and the specific subject areas that may be taught by the holder of a Single Subject Teaching Credential in the broad category.
- Subsection (b) contains the authorization to teach classes that do not fall within the single subject areas. Service is restricted to the grade level of the teaching credential. Requiring a credential based on a bachelor's degree and a teacher preparation program including student teaching eliminates the holder of an emergency permit or waiver from performing this service.

Title 5 §80005. Authorization for Subject Areas for Service in Departmentalized Classes.

- (a) The holder of a Single Subject Teaching Credential may be assigned to teach the subjects which fall within the broad subject area listed on their document as found in 1 through 16. If a subject is listed below, it may only be taught by the holder of a Single Subject Teaching Credential with the broad subject area listed on their document. The holder of a Single Subject Teaching Credential may be assigned to teach a subject not listed below if the employing agency has determined its subject-matter content is directly related to the broad subject area.
- (1) Agriculture: agricultural management, agricultural mechanics, agricultural science, animal science, forestry, horticulture, landscaping, and plant science;
 - (2) Art: art appreciation, art history, arts and crafts, art theory, calligraphy, cartooning, ceramics, commercial art, costume design, crafts, design, drawing, humanities, illustration, interior decoration, jewelry, leathermaking, painting, photography, sculpture, stagecraft, and yearbook;
 - (3) Business: accounting, business communications, business English, business mathematics, business management, business marketing, computer concepts and applications, consumer education, data processing, economics, general office occupations, keyboarding, marketing, shorthand, typewriting, and word processing;
 - (4) English: composition, creative writing, debate, drama, forensics, grammar, humanities, journalism, language arts, language structure, literature, poetry, public speaking, speech, theater arts, and yearbook;
 - (5) Health: child development, family life, human sexuality, nutrition, sexually transmitted disease education, and substance abuse;
 - (6) Home Economics: child development, clothing, consumer education, family life, foods, family economics, housing, human development, interior design, nutrition, parenting, and textiles;
 - (7) Industrial and Technology Education: automotive mechanics, carpentry, computer technology, construction, drafting, electricity, electronics, industrial crafts, industrial design, metals, millwork, photography, plastics, radio and television, technical science/power mechanics, welding, and woods;
 - (8) Languages Other Than English: courses in culture, grammar, composition, language structure, and literature of the language listed on the document;
 - (9) Mathematics: basic or general mathematics, algebra, calculus, computer science, consumer mathematics, geometry, mathematical analysis, statistics and probability, and trigonometry;
 - (10) Music: instrumental music, music appreciation, music theory, and vocal music;
 - (11) Physical Education: aquatics, dance, fundamental and creative movement, gymnastics, interscholastic sports, motor development or learning, physical conditioning, sports, and weightlifting;
 - (12) Science: Biological Science: anatomy, biology, botany, ecology, environmental science, evolution, genetics, physiology, and zoology;
 - (13) Science: Chemistry: chemical reactions, qualitative analysis, quantitative analysis, and structure and stability;
 - (14) Science: Geoscience: astronomy, cosmology, earth science, forestry, geology, meteorology, oceanography, and paleontology;
 - (15) Science: Physics: energy, mechanics, and thermodynamics;
 - (16) Social Science: American government, anthropology, contemporary issues, current events, cultural studies, economics, ethnic studies, geography, government, history, humanities, international government, law, politics, psychology, sociology, United States history, and world history.
- (b) The holder of a teaching credential based on a baccalaureate degree and a teacher preparation program, including student teaching or the equivalent, may be assigned, with his or her consent, to teach subject-matter classes which do not fall within or are not directly related to the broad subject areas listed in (a) if the employing agency has determined the teacher has the requisite knowledge and skills. Verification of this decision must be kept on file in the office of the employing agency for purposes of the monitoring of certificated assignments pursuant to Education Code Section 44258.9(b). Such courses may include, but are not limited to, life skills, conflict management, study skills, leadership, teen skills, and study hall. Service in such assignments is limited to the grade level authorized by the teaching credential.

Authority cited: Section 44225(e), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(q) and 44258.9, Education Code.



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-3

Committee: Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Title: Review of the Fee Collected for Out-of-State Trained Teachers Credentialed Under AB 838 (Pacheco)

✓ Action

Prepared by: Dale A. Janssen, Manager

Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

Review of the Fee Collected for an Out-of-State Trained Teachers Credentialed Under AB 838 (Pacheco)

March 30, 1999

Summary

The "Credentialed Out-Of-State Teacher Recruitment and Retention Act of 1997," authored by Assemblymember Rod Pacheco (AB838), became effective on January 1, 1998. This statute authorized the Commission to issue a five-year preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject or Education Specialist Credentials to applicants who hold valid comparable credentials from out of state. AB 838 also authorized the Commission to collect a \$200 fee for this credential. In 1998, Assemblymember Pacheco authored AB 1852, which gave the Commission the flexibility to determine the appropriate fee for this credential up to \$200 without additional legislation. This bill also required the Commission to report to the legislature the level of revenue generated by the Pacheco credential during the 1998-99 fiscal year. This agenda item reviews these revenues and recommends a new fee for the 1999-2000 budget year.

Fiscal Impact

If the same number of applicants apply for the Pacheco credential in 1999-2000 as applied in 1998-99, the Commission would see a decrease in revenues of \$7,200 for the 1999-2000 budget year.

Policy Issues to Be Resolved

Should the Commission reduce the fee charged for applicants qualifying for the Pacheco credential?

Staff Recommendation

Reduce the fee collected for the Pacheco credential from \$200 to \$120 effective July 1, 1999.

Summary

Education Code Section 44205 (AB 858) requires the Commission to issue a five-year preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject or Education Specialist Credentials to individuals who held valid comparable credentials from out of state. As a part of this credential process the Commission is required to monitor an applicant's progress toward earning the professional clear credential. This process shifted the responsibility of monitoring a candidate's progress from the individual to the Commission. This shift in responsibility created an additional workload for the Information Management Systems Section (IMS) to make programming changes in the Credential Automation System (CAS), and additional certification staff time to develop procedures to monitor the candidate's progress and to follow through with the ongoing monitoring process.

This new procedure requires the Commission, at specific times, to determine if the candidate has made progress and, if not, to inactivate the five-year preliminary credential when specific requirements are not met. First, the Commission must inactivate the document if the holder does not pass CBEST within the first year. In addition, the Commission must inactivate the document if other requirements are not completed by the end of the fourth year. Pending regulations state that the Commission will notify both the credential holder and the employing agency one month in advance of the inactivation date for CBEST and three months in advance of inactivation for the remaining requirements.

If the credential holder fails to verify completion of requirements by the deadline and must be removed from the classroom, the pending regulations provide a way to return the holder to the assignment as soon as he or she submits verification to the employer. This way the students are not without their teacher while the paper work is being processed. The employing agency then has ten working days to submit the paperwork to the Commission. Once the verification of completion of requirements is

processed in the Commission office, the Commission will send a formal notice of reactivation. This notification and inactivation process creates an additional workload that is not associated with any other document issued by the Commission.

The initial \$200 fee for the Pacheco credential was established by the legislature to assure that the Commission would not have a negative financial impact from the workload created by this statute. Since the fee was established in statute the Commission had no flexibility in determining an appropriate fee. AB 1852 corrected this oversight and gave the Commission authority to set the fee up to \$200. From July 1, 1998 to March 1, 1999 the Commission has received 90 applications for Pacheco credentials. These applications have generated \$18,000 in revenue for the Commission. To date IMS has spent over 70 hours making programming changes to CAS that has resulted in \$2,700 in personnel expenses. IMS estimates that an additional 100 hours is needed to make the Pacheco credential review process fully operational or an additional \$4,000 in programming expenses. The Certification staff has spent over 100 hours developing procedures and regulations for this credential, an expense of \$2,500.

Staff estimates that the total one-time expenses for CAS program changes and the development of procedures and regulations will be \$9,200. The funds collected to date cover these one-time expenses; therefore the Commission no longer needs to recover these costs. Staff estimates that an ongoing evaluation and maintenance fee of \$120 will be sufficient to cover the 1999-2000 expenses of IMS and Certification.



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 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
March 23, 1999

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.

A. 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.

Mathematics

- University of California, Berkeley

Music

- Fresno Pacific University

Physical Education

- University of La Verne

Science

- California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
(Biology, Chemistry, Physics)
- Dominican College
(Biology)



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-2

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Recommended Institutional Accreditation of A Regionally-Accredited Institution Pursuant to AB 2730 and the Accreditation Framework

✓ Action

Prepared by: David Wright, Ph.D., Director
Policy and Programs

Summary of an Agenda Report

Recommended Institutional Accreditation of A Regionally-Accredited Institution Pursuant to AB 2730 and the Accreditation Framework

Office of Policy and Programs
March 29, 1999

Executive Summary

On September 17, 1998, Governor Wilson signed Assembly Bill 2730, requiring the Commission to establish an Accreditation Pilot Project to improve the accreditation of nontraditional teacher preparation programs, and requiring the Commission to include in the pilot project from three to six regionally-accredited institutions that are located outside of California. On November 5, 1998, the Commission adopted a plan for implementing this Accreditation Pilot Project. On February 20, 1999, the Executive Director received an application to participate in the Accreditation Pilot Project from a regionally-accredited institution that is headquartered outside of California: Nova Southeastern University. This agenda report summarizes the relevant requirements of law and Commission policy related to the application from this university. The report also provides descriptive information about the institution, and describes the review of their applications.

Policy Issues to be Resolved by the Commission

This agenda report is consistent with current law and policy, and does not raise new policy issues for the Commission to resolve. At the conclusion of the three-year Accreditation Pilot Project, the Commission will have opportunities to resolve significant policy issues.

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal: Promote educational excellence in California schools.

Goal: Take a leadership role in recruiting and preparing qualified teachers in response to class size reductions.

Goal: Consider options including internships, waivers, emergency permits, and apprenticeships to meet the needs of California classrooms.

Fiscal Impact Statement

Assembly Bill 2730, as enacted into law, included funding for the Accreditation Pilot Project, which supports the costs of reviewing institutional applications and preparing written reports to the Commission.

Recommendation

That the Commission award institutional accreditation to Nova Southeastern University, making this University eligible to offer programs of professional preparation at an instructional site in Los Angeles and one in the East San Francisco Bay Area

during the term of the Accreditation Pilot Project (1999-2002), subject to the initial accreditation of specific credential preparation programs by the Committee on Accreditation.

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.

This report provides background information and substantiating evidence for the recommendation to grant institutional accreditation to a regionally-accredited institution of postsecondary education that would like to offer new programs of professional preparation for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials with and without the Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) Emphasis. The report begins by summarizing the relevant provisions of California state law.

One month ago the Commission considered a similar report regarding two out-of-state institutions that were regionally accredited by accrediting bodies other than WASC. As noted below, the present report includes information that was presented previously and is repeated here for the sake of completeness in this month's agenda.

Part One: Background Information

Part One appeared before the Commission one month ago, and is repeated here because of its close relationship to the current issue on the agenda.

Relevant Provisions of California State Law

The Education Code gives the Commission authority and responsibility for the initial institutional accreditation of colleges and universities that would like to offer accredited credential programs to prospective candidates.

Education Code Section 44227 (a). The Commission may approve any institution of higher education whose teacher education program meets the standards prescribed by the Commission to recommend to the Commission the issuance of credentials to persons who have successfully completed those programs.

Education Code Section 44372. The powers and duties of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing regarding the accreditation system shall include the following:

(c) Rule on the eligibility of an applicant for accreditation when the applying institution has not previously prepared educators for state certification in California, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44227.

Prior to 1998, the Education Code required institutions to be regionally accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in order to be considered by the Commission for institutional accreditation (see Education Code Section 44227 [b]). This requirement of law remains in effect today. In 1998, however, lawmakers enacted Assembly Bill 2730 (Mazzoni), which added the following new provisions to the Education Code.

Education Code Section 44226.5. Contingent upon funding expressly for this purpose, the Commission, together with the Committee on Accreditation . . . shall establish a three-year Accreditation Pilot Project, beginning no later than June 15, 1999, to improve the accreditation review of nontraditional teacher preparation programs.

Notwithstanding subdivision (b) of Section 44227, the Commission shall include in the Accreditation Pilot Project at least three, but no more than six, institutions of higher education that are located in states other than California and that have been accredited by regional accrediting organizations other than the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, upon application from institutions that meet standards established by the Commission. Participating institutions shall meet all Commission policies and procedures governing the approval and accreditation of credential programs in addition to the requirements of any other applicable laws.

The Education Code further requires that, once the Commission has "ruled on the eligibility of an applicant for accreditation," the responsibility of the Committee on Accreditation is as follows.

Education Code Section 44373 (c). The Committee shall do, but shall not be limited to doing, all of the following:

(2) Make decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation in accordance with procedures established by the Committee.

In summary, the Education Code gives authority and responsibility to the Commission to determine the eligibility of institutions to offer credential programs by granting institutional accreditation. During a three-year accreditation pilot project, the Commission must grant institutional accreditation to three, four, five or six regionally accredited institutions that (a) are located outside of California, (b) apply for that accreditation, and (c) meet all laws, policies and procedures for institutional accreditation. Once an institution is accredited by the Commission, it is the statutory responsibility of the Committee on Accreditation to "make decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation" at those institutions. The present report and recommendation to the Commission are based on an accreditation review that complied with these requirements of the Education Code.

Relevant Provisions of the Accreditation Framework

In 1995 the Commission published its accreditation policy document entitled *Educator Preparation for California 2000: The Accreditation Framework*, which includes the following provisions related to the accreditation of postsecondary institutions.

Accreditation Framework Section 4 A 1: Initial Accreditation of Institutions. A postsecondary education institution that has not previously been declared eligible to offer credential preparation programs must submit an application to the Commission for initial professional accreditation.

This section of the Accreditation Framework (4 A 1) specifies and implements the requirements of Education Code Sections 44227 (a) and 44372 (above). To specify and implement Education Code Section 44373 (c), the Commission's policy framework describes the responsibility of the Committee on Accreditation as follows.

Accreditation Framework Section 2 A 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. If the Committee determines that a program meets all applicable standards, the Committee grants initial accreditation to the program.

These provisions of the *Accreditation Framework* were not superseded or amended by Assembly Bill 2730, so they remain in effect. To supplement the policies in the *Accreditation Framework*, on November 5, 1998, the Commission adopted the following policy to govern the institutional accreditation process for "new" institutions that have not previously offered any credential programs in California.

Initial accreditation will be considered a two-stage process:

- (a) The proposal will be reviewed for compliance with the appropriate institutional preconditions . . . and brought before the Commission for initial accreditation action. If the proposal meets the Commission's requirements, the institution will be recommended for initial accreditation.
- (b) If the Commission acts favorably on the proposal, it will be forwarded to the Committee on Accreditation for program accreditation action according to adopted procedures.

The recommendations in the present report are consistent with these policies of the Commission related to the institutional accreditation process.

Relevant Provisions of the Commission's Plan to Implement AB 2730

On November 5, 1998, the Commission adopted a detailed plan for implementing Assembly Bill 2730 (Mazzoni, 1998) and establishing the Accreditation Pilot Project. In accordance with this plan, the staff has invited institutions to participate in the pilot project. This invitation included, but is not limited to, institutions that co-sponsored Assembly Bill 2730 last year. The invitation spelled out the requirements for teaching credentials in California, described the alternative program options that institutions may use, included the Commission's adopted standards and preconditions for the accreditation of postsecondary institutions and their credential preparation programs, and set forth the other requirements that the Commission established on November 5, 1998, for participation in the Accreditation Pilot Project.

According to the Commission's implementation plan for AB 2730, the staff and the Board of Institutional Reviewers are responsible to "screen all applications to participate in the project." The plan also stipulates that "participation will be limited to regionally accredited colleges and universities that meet all of the applicable standards and preconditions of the Commission."

The present report is based on a thorough screening of two *Preapplications to Participate in the Accreditation Pilot Project*, and is consistent with the Commission's adopted plan to implement AB 2730.

Review of A Pre-Application to Participate in the Accreditation Pilot Project

On February 20, 1999, the Executive Director of the Commission, Dr. Sam W. Swofford, received a *Preapplication to Participate in the Accreditation Pilot Project* from President Ray Ferrero, Jr., of Nova Southeastern University, located in Fort Lauderdale, Florida.

Since February 20, the *Preapplication* submitted by Nova Southeastern University was subjected to thorough review and analysis according to the applicable laws of California and the policies and procedures of the Commission. Part Two of this report summarizes the analytical findings of the review.

Part Two: Recommended Institutional Accreditation of Nova Southeastern University

Nova Southeastern University has applied to the Commission for institutional accreditation to offer programs of professional preparation for the following credentials:

- Multiple Subject Teaching Credential with a Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) Emphasis;
- Multiple Subject Teaching Credential (without emphasis);
- Multiple Subject Internship Credential with a Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) Emphasis;

and

- Multiple Subject Internship Credential (without emphasis).

In California, the University would like to offer these programs at an instructional site in Los Angeles, and at a second instructional site in the East San Francisco Bay Area. This part of the report provides factual information related to the staff recommendation on page 6, which urges the Commission to grant institutional accreditation to Nova Southeastern University.

Nova Southeastern University: Regional Accreditation

Nova Southeastern University is regionally accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, one of the nation's six regional accrediting bodies. For the southeastern region of the United States, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) is the regional accrediting body that is counterpart to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) in California. The following information was established and confirmed by SACS.

Regional accreditation of Nova Southeastern University by SACS has been in effect continuously since 1971. The accrediting body's most recent comprehensive evaluation occurred in June, 1998, which led SACS to reaffirm the University's accredited status. The next comprehensive evaluation by SACS is regularly scheduled to occur in 2007.

SACS has institutionally accredited Nova Southeastern University to award Bachelor's, Master's Educational Specialists, and Doctoral degrees. According to SACS, the 1998 review "covered the main campus and all extended sites. The institution's accreditation extends to all programs offered on the institution's main campus as well as those offered at all extended program sites wherever located."

The regional accreditation of Nova Southeastern University has *no stipulations* established by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The regional accrediting body has established no restrictions on the capacity or authority of the institution to develop and offer new academic programs in California.

Nova Southeastern University: State Agency Approval

In addition to regional accreditation, Nova Southeastern University is also approved (licensed) by the State of California to offer degree programs in California, as required by law.

This approval for an out-of-state institution of postsecondary education was originally awarded by the State Department of Education in 1973. Later, when the Legislature established the California Council for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education (CPPVE), this new Council granted approval for Nova Southeastern University to offer degree programs through December 31, 2000. This most recent action by the CPPVE occurred on August 21, 1997.

Still later the Legislature transferred the approval authority to a new agency called the Bureau of Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education (BPPVE). In 1998, the BPPVE asked Nova Southeastern University to submit a reapplication for approval, which was submitted by the University in July, 1998, and is pending before the BPPVE for the period commencing on January 1, 2001.

Neither the CPPVE nor the BPPVE have established any stipulations that limit the authority of Nova Southeastern University to offer professional credential programs at instructional sites in Los Angeles or the East San Francisco Bay Area.

Nova Southeastern University: Background Information

In the past, Commissioners have asked for opportunities to get acquainted with new institutions on the basis of descriptive information about those institutions, which is provided by the institutions. This section of the report responds to that request.

Nova Southeastern University is an independent, non-sectarian, non-profit institution that awards bachelor's, master's, educational specialist, doctoral and first-professional degrees in several fields including business, counseling, computer and information sciences, education, law, psychology, social sciences, marine sciences, medicine, and a variety of health professions. For approximately 25 years, Nova Southeastern University has continuously operated graduate programs in education and business in California.

Nova Southeastern University is the largest private independent institution of postsecondary education in the southeast, and is among the 20 largest private institutions nationally. The University's main instructional center is situated on a 232-acre site in Florida, and has an annual budget of more than 200 million dollars.

Nova Southeastern University is organized in nine academic centers. One of the nine centers is the Fischler Center for Advancement of Education (FCAE). This center is the largest graduate school of education in the nation, with more than 8,000 students in masters', educational specialist and doctoral degree programs, plus additional students in non-degree programs. The degree-granting programs of the FCAE include:

- A graduate teacher education program (with 5,400 students);
- A national Ed.D. program for educational leaders (1,000 students);
- Ed.D. programs in the field of higher education (800 students);
- Programs in education and technology (650 students);
- Programs in communication sciences and disorders (450 students); and
- A master's program in life span care and administration (160 students).

The purposes of programs in the Fischler Center for Advancement of Education are to enable education practitioners (1) to become more effective in their current positions; (2) to fill emerging roles in education, and (3) to accept changing responsibilities in their own organizations. FCAE is a pioneer in distance learning, and uses a variety of advanced technologies to deliver programs to students, thus accommodating their work schedules and locations.

If the University is accredited to offer California credential preparation programs at instructional sites in Los Angeles and the East San Francisco Bay Area, these programs would be administered within the organizational structure of the Fischler Center for Advancement of Education. Overall, the Center has 240 full-time employees, including 50 full-time faculty members. The Center also employs hundreds of adjunct professors, site administrators, program facilitators, national faculty members and other part-time employees.

Nova Southeastern University: Governance and California Campuses

Nova Southeastern University is governed by a single Board of Trustees that is responsible for all policies and programs of the University. President Ray Ferrero, Jr., oversees the fiscal and administrative operations of Nova Southeastern University. Reporting to the President are the Executive Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Technology, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost for Health Professions, and the Executive Vice President for Administration.

The nine academic centers, including the Fischler Center for Advancement of Education (FCAE), are within the administrative responsibilities of the Executive Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and Technology, who is the Chief Academic Officer at Nova Southeastern University. FCAE has eleven off-campus sites that offer state approved teacher certification programs. One site is in Nevada and ten are located in various regions of Florida. Two additional sites are proposed in the State of California, one in Los Angeles and the other in the East San Francisco Bay Area. The University has provided detailed information about the structure of academic administration that will govern the proposed credential preparation programs.

Nova Southeastern University: Faculty and Students

While Nova Southeastern University has a comparatively small full-time faculty compared to the number of students served, this core faculty of the institution has tripled in size since 1987. Consistently, the majority of all University employees have been women, who have occupied positions at all levels. For example, 39 percent of the faculty and executive/ administrative positions are held by women, and two-thirds of employees in professional positions are women. Concurrently, the number of employees from minority groups has increased more than three-fold since 1989. Five percent of the full-time faculty are Hispanics, five percent are African-Americans, and four percent are other minority group members.

For more than six years, the University's graduate programs in the field of education offered through the Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education have comprised approximately 30 percent of the University's total enrollment. Prior to 1994, full-time students represented approximately one-third of the student body. Since then the proportion increased to 46 percent due in large part to the addition of students in the Health Professions Division which serves full-time students almost exclusively.

Over the last five years, there has been a gradual increase in the minority student population. Minority students were 30 percent of the total enrollment of the University in 1997, after a 76 percent increase in the number of minority students between 1992 and 1997. Twelve percent of students earning first-professional degrees are Hispanics, five percent are African-Americans, and twelve percent are members of other minority groups. Overall, approximately 60 percent of all students are females.

The majority of undergraduate and graduate students at Nova Southeastern University did not enroll in the University immediately after graduating from high school or college. Only 31 percent of undergraduates, and only nine percent of graduate students, were under age 25 during 1997. These data confirm that the primary functions of the University are to serve large numbers of working adults making mid-career transitions, including large numbers of women and minority adults.

This concludes the presentation of information that was provided to this agency by Nova Southeastern University.

Recommended Institutional Accreditation of Nova Southeastern University

Nova Southeastern University has applied to the Commission for institutional accreditation to offer programs of professional preparation for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential. If the programs are accredited, the University will offer them primarily to classroom teachers (K-6) who hold emergency permits in California public schools.

Nova Southeastern University is regionally accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, as required by law. The University is also approved (licensed) by the California Bureau of Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education, as required by law.

Nova Southeastern University has responded fully to each of the Commission's applicable preconditions for institutional accreditation. Each response to a precondition has been examined thoroughly and professionally. A written record of each response to each precondition has been established on behalf of the Commission. The University's proposed programs of professional preparation comply with all preconditions that have been established in law and by the Commission.

Additionally, Nova Southeastern University has responded to the special requirements that the Commission established for participation in the Accreditation Pilot Project pursuant to AB 2730 (Mazzoni). The President of Nova Southeastern University, Ray Ferrero, Jr., has submitted assurances to the Executive Director of the Commission that the University will, during the

Accreditation Pilot Project: (1) respond to Pilot Project Accreditation Standards as adopted by the Commission; (2) participate in on-site reviews of accredited credential programs as sponsored by the Committee on Accreditation; and (3) provide information related to the Accreditation Pilot Project when it is requested by the Executive Director of the Commission.

The staff concludes that Nova Southeastern University has met all requirements and preconditions for institutional accreditation and participation in the Accreditation Pilot Project, which is the basis for the staff recommendation on page 6. If the Commission adopts this recommendation, the University's response to all applicable Common Standards and Program Standards will be assessed by the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR) along with the University's responses to other requirements established by the Commission for participation in the pilot project. The reviewers' findings will be reported to the Committee on Accreditation for appropriate action by that Committee, as required by law.



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-3

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Pilot Study for Approval of Early Childhood Education Programs and Alternative Education Coursework for Child Development Permits - A Progress Report

✓ Information

Prepared by: Marilyn Fairgood, Assistant Consultant
Professional Services Division

**PILOT STUDY FOR APPROVAL OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
PROGRAMS AND ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION COURSEWORK FOR CHILD
DEVELOPMENT PERMITS
A PROGRESS REPORT
MARCH 29, 1999**

Executive Summary

In 1992, legislation was enacted which significantly altered the requirements for employment in state-subsidized child care and development programs. Since 1961, any individual working as an instructor or supervisor in a child care and development program supported in whole or in part with State funds has been required to hold a Children's Center Supervision Permit. Assembly Bill 2879, authored by Assemblymember Polanco, established a series of options to the Children's Center Supervision Permit. These options were intended to ease a staffing crisis characterized by large numbers of program directors working in child care and development centers on waivers issued by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The bill included a sunset date for these options, and required the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) to collaborate with the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) on an examination of the entire Children's Center Permit Structure. AB 2879 required that this collaborative effort yield recommendations to the Legislature regarding the preparation and licensing requirements for Children's Center Instructors and Supervisors no later than December 1, 1994. In November 1997, the Commission directed staff to move forward with the Pilot Study, and in November 1998 the Executive Director appointed a ten-member Evaluation and Support Team to review preliminary applications received from potential participants. This report includes background information regarding the Pilot Study and provides specific information about the sites selected to participate in the Pilot Study at the February 22-23, 1999 evaluation and site selection meeting.

Fiscal Impact Statement

The pilot study will span a two-year period. Costs for the first year include training the Evaluation and Support Team, reviewing and selecting the programs for participation in the pilot study, and reviewing program documents submitted by all Pilot Study participants. Costs for the second year include one-day site visits to all participating programs by two-member Evaluation and Support Teams, and evaluation and summary of the site visits, the program's responses to the Pilot Study Questions, and Commission staff time for support work and report preparation. Most of the pilot study costs will be contributed by the participants. In 1997, the estimated expenses of the Commission were \$7,800 in 1998 (Year One) and \$8,000 in 1999 (Year Two). Due to a delay in implementing the pilot study, most of the costs will be incurred in 1999 however, no change in actual cost to the Commission is anticipated.

Important Note

The following report includes information that could not be summarized above and is relevant to the deliberations and decisions of the Commission.

BACKGROUND

In 1992, Assembly Bill 2879 (Polanco) required the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) to consult with the early childhood education field and coordinate a review of the preparation and licensing requirements for instructors and supervisors who work in state subsidized child care and development programs. This legislation was partially in response to severe staffing shortages in child development centers and the fact that 43 percent of the Children's Center Permits issued by the Commission were Emergency Permits. Another facet of this problem was evidenced in the number of waivers issued. The Department of Education, which maintains the authority to issue waivers for supervisory permits, issued nearly as many waivers as the Commission issued supervisory permits. With these shortages in mind, the Legislature called for a review of preparation and licensing requirements to be completed no later than December 1, 1994. Accordingly, the CCTC and the SSPI established an Interagency Staff Committee to conduct a review of the Children's Center Permit structure, focusing on permit regulations that had been in effect since 1977.

Simultaneously, more than 100 members of the child development profession were confronting the issues that were addressed in AB 2879 (Polanco). Their vehicle was a statewide effort that was called *Advancing Careers in Child Development: California's Plan*. Members of this project included representatives of the Commission, Department of Education, Department of Social Services, and the Governor's Office of Child Development and Education. The *Advancing Careers* project also included school districts, private contractors that operate child care and development programs, community colleges and other post secondary institutions that offer programs in early childhood education. The project members worked together to identify barriers to the professionalization of the child development field, and they developed strategies for addressing these barriers.

During the five-year *Advancing Careers* project, its leaders held forums throughout the state aimed at including the perspectives of as many child development professionals as possible. Besides preparation and licensing issues, the project addressed many other areas including recruitment into the field, articulation between systems of higher education and other training centers, and compensation of early childhood professionals. The *Advancing Careers* project produced a blueprint for significant reforms in the licensing and preparation of early childhood professionals.

The Interagency Staff Committee, originally established to implement AB 2879, was actively involved in the *Advancing Careers* project. The Committee was able to use the work of this project in their efforts to meet the mandates of AB 2879. Thanks in part to the *Advancing Careers* effort, the Interagency Staff Committee was able to prepare a consensus report entitled *Staffing Child Care and Development Programs: An Examination of the Children's Center Permit*. In December 1994, the Commission adopted this interagency report (sometimes referred to as "the Polanco Report"), and submitted it to the Legislature and the Governor.

Part One:

Significant Reform Policies

Previously Adopted and Recommended by the Commission

In the report entitled *Staffing Child Care and Development Programs: An Examination of the Children's Center Permit* (the Polanco Report), the CCTC and the SSPI put forth four broad reform recommendations. The following paragraphs summarize the recommendations and their current status (in italics).

Recommendation One: A New Permit Structure

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing should replace the existing Children's Center Permit with a new Child Development Permit structure, which should establish a career ladder in which professionals seek increased preparation and training in order to assume broader, more complex responsibilities for the care, development and instruction of young children.

Title 5 Regulations for the new structure of Child Development Permits were developed and adopted by the Commission, and became effective on February 1, 1997.

Recommendation Two: Recognition of Alternative Training

The Commission should seek legislative authority to recognize training which occurs outside of regionally accredited institutions of postsecondary education as meeting part of the requirements for obtaining a new Child Development Permit.

Education Code Section 8363 allows the Commission to establish requirements for the issuance and renewal of permits authorizing service in the care, development, and instruction of children, as well as the supervision of child care and development programs. No further legislative authority is needed.

The Commission's new Regulations for Child Development Permits contain an option for individuals to qualify for permits by completing training that is not sponsored by regionally accredited institutions, but is approved by the Commission.

In 1995 the Commission established an Advisory Task Force to examine this issue. The present report relates to Recommendation Two by describing a Pilot Study for recognizing training that occurs outside of regionally accredited institutions of postsecondary education for individuals who want to earn Child Development Permit and the sites selected to participate in this strand of the Pilot Study.

Recommendation Three: Explore Feasibility of Standards

The Commission should explore the feasibility of developing Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness and an appropriate evaluation process for programs that prepare individuals for Child Development Permits.

Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs were addressed in a November 1997 report to the Commission. One strand of the Pilot Study focuses on Commission approval of Child Development Permit Programs at regionally accredited community colleges and four year universities that choose to pursue this option voluntarily. The present report relates to Recommendation Three by describing this strand of the Pilot Study and the sites selected to participate in this strand.

Recommendation Four: Explore Options for Creating Flexibility

A study should be initiated to explore options for easing the movement of staff between state subsidized and non-state subsidized child care and development programs. Such a study should be a collaborative effort between the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the Department of Social Services, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Governor’s Office of Child Development and Education.

The Child Development Permit Structure addressed this issue in part by establishing an Associate Teacher Permit, which is intended to facilitate the need for teachers in privately funded child development centers regulated by Title 22. Recognition of training that occurs outside of regionally accredited institutions of postsecondary education for credit toward Child Development Permits(Recommendation Two) is another aspect of easing the movement of staff between state subsidized and non-state subsidized child care and development programs, and is addressed as one strand of the Pilot Study.

Part Two:

The Commission’s Child Development Permit and Its Relation to the Pilot

Chart One gives an overview of the six levels of the current Child Development Permit and the basic requirements and authorization for each level. Under current practice, individuals who apply for a permit must send an application, transcripts, and verification of experience directly to the Commission. Certification Officers then examine the course titles and experience to determine if the individual qualifies for the permit. Under current practice, only courses taken at WASC accredited institutions are accepted.

Chart 1 Child Development Permit Requirements and Authorizations			
TITLE	EDUCATION REQUIREMENT	EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT	AUTHORIZATION
Assistant (Optional)	6 units of Early Childhood Education (ECE) or Child Development (CD)	None	Assist in the instruction of children under supervision of Assoc. Teacher or above.
Associate Teacher	12 units ECE/CD including core courses	50 days of 3+ hours per day within 2 years	May provide instruction and supervise Assistant.
Teacher	24 units ECE/CD including core courses ** + 16 GE units	175 days of 3+ hours per day within 4 years	May provide instruction and supervise all above (including Aide)
Master Teacher	24 units ECE/CD including core courses** + 16 GE units; + 6 specialization units; + 2 adult supervision units.	350 days of 3+ hours per day within 4 years	May provide instruction and supervise all above (incl. Aide) May also serve as coordinator of curriculum and staff development.
Site Supervisor	AA (or 60 units) with 24 ECE/CD units (incl. core); + 6 units administration; + 2 units adult supervision.	350 days of 3+ hours per day within 4 years, including at least 100 days of supervising adults	May supervise single site program, provide instruction; and serve as coordinator of curriculum and staff development.
Program Director	BA with 24 ECE/CD units (incl. core); + 6 units administration; + 2 units adult supervision.	Site supervisor status and one program year of site supervisor experience.	May supervise multiple-site program; provide instruction; and serve as coord. of curriculum and staff development

The intent of the Pilot Study is to ease access to Child Development Permits for qualified individuals who currently encounter barriers in the Commission’s application process. The Pilot Study does not change the requirements for Child Development Permits nor does it eliminate the current avenue for application. The Pilot Study is intended to remove two barriers to the application for Child Development Permits.

Removal of Barrier One: The Pilot Study will add the possibility of application for individuals who take high quality coursework through a non-regionally accredited program that provides training for early childhood education professionals. (Much of this training is currently accepted by the Department of Social Services for individuals who work in privately funded child development centers.)

Removal of Barrier Two: The Pilot Study will assure the acceptance of coursework taken at WASC accredited institutions offering programs for early childhood education professionals.

**Part Three:
EVALUATION AND SUPPORT TEAM
FOR APPROVAL OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND
ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION COURSEWORK FOR
CHILD DEVELOPMENT PERMITS**

The Advisory Task Force recommended that the Commission appoint an Early Childhood Education Program Evaluation and Support Team to conduct, review and evaluate the pilot study. In November 1998 after consulting with the Director of the Child Development Division of the Department of Education, the Executive Director appointed a ten-member Evaluation and Support Team. This Team is composed of professionals in the field of early childhood education and child development. It should be noted that six of the current Evaluation and Support Team members also served on the joint Advisory Task Force in Early Childhood Education. An asterisk appears before the name of each of these individuals.

Eve Marie Arce	Early Childhood Education Consultant ECE Center for Human Development Shasta Community College
*Lucy Berger	Coordinator Child Development Programs Chancellor's Office California Community Colleges
*Terry De Martini	Coordinator Center for Child and Family Studies WestEd Laboratory
Julia Hardman	Teacher Advisor Child Development Division Los Angeles Unified School District
*Norman Lorenz	Director Montessori Teacher's College
Jan Mellon	Child Development Programs San Juan Unified School District (Retired)
Irene T. Miura	Coordinator Child Development Department San Jose State University
*Peyton Nattinger	Program Director Early Childhood Mentor Program
*Sharon Neese	High Scope, and the Sacramento Employment Training Area Head Start
*Carol Sharpe	Coordinator Advancing Careers in Child Development: California's Plan

Part Four:

February 22-23, 1999 Site Selection Process

The Pilot Study was designed to include the participation of ten organizations to help examine a process for approval of coursework toward use for Child Development Permits and ten regionally accredited institutions who will help examine a process for full Child Development Permit program approval. The Pilot Study is scheduled to be implemented in two phases. Phase One of the pilot included submission of a preliminary application, submission of a response to Standards 1 and 2 and the site selection process. Eight preliminary applications were received from organizations proposing alternative education coursework for participation in Strand One of the Pilot Study, examining CCTC approval of non-WASC coursework. Following staff review of the eight applications it was determined that one organization did not meet the eligibility criteria for participation in Strand One of the Pilot Study. Therefore, only seven applications were allowed to proceed to the site selection process.

Twelve preliminary applications were received from regionally accredited institutions for participation in Strand Two, approval of WASC Child Development Permit Programs. The staff review determined that all twelve institutions met the Commission's eligibility criteria for participation in the Pilot Study and all moved forward to the site selection process.

On February 22-23, 1999 the Evaluation and Support Team met to review the nineteen preliminary applications from the organizations and institutions that met the eligibility criteria. Following a careful review of the applications, the Evaluation and Support Team selected all seven non-regionally accredited organizations as participants and all twelve regionally accredited institutions to participate in the Pilot Study.

Due to a delay in implementing Phase One, the Pilot Study is running two-months behind schedule. The original time sequence for the Pilot Study called for approved alternative education coursework and programs to be offered beginning fall 1999. On February 22-23, 1999, following the Phase One site selection process, the Evaluation and Support Team considered implementation of Phase Two of the Pilot Study. Commission staff recommended that the original timeline for alternative education coursework and approved programs be offered as identified in the original time sequence. To meet the fall 1999 date, the Team requested that all nineteen sites submit a response to all appropriate and applicable standards no later than May 21, 1999. The Team will meet on June 1-2, 1999 to conduct the Phase Two review and evaluation process.

Staff contacted Pilot Study participants by telephone shortly after the February 22-23, 1999 site selection process to advise them of the revised response time. With the exception of one community college, all participants indicated that they can meet the May 21, 1999 deadline.

The structure of the Pilot Study is illustrated on the following page in [Chart Two](#).

Pilot Study Child Development Permit Program Approval Strands One and Two		
<p style="text-align: center;">Strand One Alternative Education Program Approval for Child Development Permits</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>10 Organizations</i></p> <p>Strand One will involve the approval of course-work offered through non-regionally accredited training programs. Such coursework has not previously been accepted by the Commission. (Title 22 Regulations allow CPPVE-approved courses.)</p> <p>These programs will not be required to offer courses for all levels of the permit, but will be required to offer approved courses of at least six semester units or the equivalent.</p> <p>Candidates who take these courses will apply to the Commission on a direct application basis and may use no more than 12 alternative education coursework toward a permit.</p>	<p>Characteristics Common to Both Strands</p> <p>Both strands will be based on <i>Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs</i></p> <p>If the Pilot Study is successful and the Commission elects to continue with both strands, participation in the approval process will continue to be voluntary for both organizations and WASC accredited institutions.</p> <p>All components of the Pilot Study will be conducted, reviewed and evaluated by an ECE Program Review and Support Team appointed by the Executive Director of the Commission.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Strand Two Child Development Permit Program Approval for California's WASC Accredited Institutions</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>10 WASC Accredited Institutions</i></p> <p>Strand Two will involve the approval of programs that offer course work for all levels of the permit at accredited institutions</p> <p>While course work from these institutions has previously been accepted on a course-by-course basis by the Commission, there has not been a mechanism for program approval.</p> <p>A candidate who completes an approved program for a permit will be recommended for the permit by the institution. The Commission will issue the permit on the basis of that recommendation.</p>

Part Five:

The Pilot Study and Selected Participants

Some of the following information is reprinted to refresh your background on the eligibility criteria for participation in Strand One of the Pilot Study. Additional information included in this section of the report provides specific information on the organizations selected to participate in Strand One.

The Task Force proposed a two-strand structure for the pilot study, with *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs* as the centerpiece of both strands.

Strand One will address *Alternative Education Program Approval*. In this strand, organizations that are not regionally accredited institutions may apply voluntarily for the approval of course work in a cohesive program to be recognized by the Commission as applicable toward Child Development Permits. Up to ten organizations will be selected to participate in the Pilot Study. (Permit applicants will apply directly to the Commission and will be limited to twelve semester units of alternative education course work.)

Strand Two will address *Child Development Permit Program Approval*. In this strand, regionally accredited community

colleges and four-year universities in California may voluntarily apply for program approval and recommend candidates for Child Development Permits. Up to ten institutions will be selected to participate in the Pilot Study. (Permit applicants will be recommended for permits, and will be able to satisfy all permit requirements in the approved programs.)

Strand One

Criteria for Strand One. After much thoughtful discussion and planning, the Task Force agreed on a set of criteria to (1) assure that alternative training programs offer consistently high quality learning opportunities for individuals seeking Child Development Permits, and (2) allow those alternative programs to apply for approval. The Commission voted to pilot-test these criteria as described below.

All organizations selected for participation in Strand One of the Pilot Study must meet the following criteria.

- The organization must have successfully offered training in the area of early childhood education for at least three years prior to participation in the pilot study.
- The organization must agree to participate in the evaluation of the Pilot Study.
- The organization must meet all appropriate *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness*. Required standards vary according to the program configuration offered by the organization. An organization may choose to offer one or more program configurations. (This feature of Strand One is explained in [Chart Three](#).)
- The organization must offer a cohesive program of at least six semester units or the hourly equivalent.

Organizations that are interested in participating in the Pilot Study will be required to do all of the following.

- *Complete a Preliminary Application and Return It to the Commission.* The Preliminary Application will include: mission statement and program goals; program design (including course titles, course format, and course descriptions); target audience (including languages other than English); value of the program to the community (what needs the organization meets); geographic data (local, countywide, statewide, distance learning); and organization history.

The Commission's staff will review all Preliminary Applications to determine that they are complete and they meet the eligibility criteria for participation in the Pilot Study.

- *Complete a Full Response to Standard 1 (Governance and Accountability) and Standard 2 (Resources), and Include It with the Preliminary Application.* In relation to Standards 1 and 2, the Review and Support Team, comprised of child development professionals, will initially evaluate the quality and effectiveness of applicant programs. Only those programs that meet Standards 1 and 2 will become participants in Strand One of the Pilot Study.

Following review of the preliminary application and responses to Standards 1 and 2, the organizations selected to participate in the Pilot Study will then:

- Complete the Application Process by Responding in Detail to the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs*.

If any of the selected organizations do not meet the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs* to the satisfaction of the Evaluation and Support Team, they will not be permitted to participate in Phase Two of the Pilot Study.

- Participate in the Evaluation Stages of the Study by Assisting the Commission Staff and Members of the Evaluation and Support Team Appointed by the Executive Director of the Commission. As a participant in the Pilot Study evaluation, each organization will be required to:
 - facilitate a one-day site visit to the program by the Review and Support Team,
 - facilitate interviews with program participants by the Team,
 - compile data for an examination of course completion rates by students, and
 - facilitate student evaluations of courses, instructors and the organization.

Standards to be met by Strand One Participants

Many organizations that offer course work for Child Development Permits specialize in one or two areas. Most of these organizations also offer much smaller programs than a typical community college or four-year university. Several organizations that are potential participants in Strand One offer courses only in specialization areas or in administration. Other organizations offer only general ECE electives.

To accommodate these circumstances, the *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs* are organized differently than the Commission's *Standards* for teaching or service credential programs. The new ECE Program Standards include (a) a set of Common Organization Standards, (b) a set of Common Program Standards, and (c) four sets of Specialization Standards for specific domains of learning.

In Strand One of the Pilot Study, all organizations must meet the Common Organization Standards, which pertain to organizational viability and resources. Additionally, all organizations in Strand One must meet the Common Program

Standards, which are inherent in any good ECE Program, such as *Orientation to Equity* and *Integration of Theory and Practice*. Each organization in Strand One will be permitted to meet one or more of the sets of Specialization Standards, depending on the purposes, scope and configuration of the organization and its program. The following chart outlines the standards that must be met by all organizations and the standards that must be met according to the program content offered.

Chart 3

Standards to be Met in Strand One	
Must be Met by All Organizations	
(1)	Common Organization Standards
(2)	Common Program Standards
Needed According to Choice Configuration	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Child Development• Child Family and Community• Programs and Curriculum
(4)	Elective Course Work Standards
(5)	Administrative Course Work Standards
(6)	Specialization Course Work Standards

ORGANIZATIONS SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE IN STRAND ONE

The Task Force proposed that up to ten organizations be selected for participation in Strand One based on their responses to the Preliminary Application, responses to Standards 1 and 2, program configurations (see Chart Three), and general criteria including geographical location, student population, and size of program. Preliminary applications were received from eight non-regionally accredited organizations. Of the eight applications one organization did not meet the eligibility criteria for participation in the pilot. A summary description of the seven organizations selected to participate in Strand One of the Pilot Study is included below.

American Nanny College - Pomona The American Nanny College has provided specialized postsecondary coursework for individuals planning to work with young children since 1983. In 1988, the focus of the coursework shifted from specialized training provided strictly home-care providers to preschool education. The college serves a large geographic area in San Bernardino County with courses are limited to 18 students per class. The student population includes those just starting a career in early childhood education as well as individuals seeking a career change. The program is a short-term, intensive program that is used as a re-training program by community businesses. The organization targets students who are subsidized through private and governmental agencies such as the Job Training Partnership Act as well as through Vocational Rehabilitation Training offices. The American Nanny College is recognized by the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

California College for Health Sciences - National City California College for Health Sciences was founded in 1978 based on the concept of providing respiratory care credential eligibility using distance education. Within the past eight years California College for Health Sciences has expanded course offerings to include an Associate of Science degree program in Early Childhood Education (1991) and a Masters degree program in health-related occupations. The College recognizes the Child Development Associate Credential (CDA) awarded by the Council for Early Childhood Education Professional Recognition and grants 15 semester hours of course credit for possession of the CDA credential. All of the ECE courses offered are endorsed by the National Childcare Association. California College for Health Sciences is accredited by the California Council for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education, the National Distance Education and Training Council and the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and College of Technology.

Development Associates, Inc. - Walnut Creek Development Associates is a proprietary organization that has offered ECE coursework since 1978. It is one of the largest minority-owned management consulting firms in the United States with a record of serving local, state and national level Head Start Programs for more than 20 years. The organization serves as a California Region IX Head Start Training and Technical Assistance Center and in this capacity serves thirteen counties and more than 46 agencies servicing children in Northern and Southern California. Development Associates, Inc. plans two pilot sites, one in Walnut Creek and one in San Diego. Each site is scheduled to train 45 ECE/child development candidates. Coursework is offered on a non-traditional schedule to support the enrollment of working teachers and is designed for Head Start staff and child care teachers. The organization has a unique "tuition-free" feature and provides required texts and reading materials for its students, however, students are required to cover the cost of their supplies. In exchange for the tuition-free education and materials, employers are asked to provide support in the form of paid or unpaid release time to allow students to complete required coursework, and to provide full or partial support for students travel and lodging expenses.

Montessori Teachers College - Sacramento Montessori Teachers College has offered accredited Montessori coursework in the Sacramento area since 1979. The College shares a campus with Sacramento Montessori School which serves children ranging in age from infancy through six years old. Coursework at the college is offered in cycles ranging from 100 to 227 clock

hours per course of study. Each cycle will include between 15 and 25 candidates per course of study. Montessori Teachers College is accredited to provide training through the National Center for Montessori Education, by the Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education and the California Council for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education.

Montessori Western Teacher Training Program - Garden Grove Montessori Western Teacher Training Program (MWTTP) is a small institution which offers only two courses of study and has a relatively small student population. A private proprietary organization founded in 1970, it is one of only five Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education accredited teacher education centers in Southern California. MWTTP operates in one location. Coursework is offered in an intensive-format and they propose to train 15-30 candidates per year. MWTTP is accredited by the California Bureau of Postsecondary and Vocational Education, Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education, and American Montessori Society Review Committee.

San Francisco Bay Area Montessori Teacher Education Center - San Leandro Incorporated in 1980, San Francisco Bay Area Montessori Teacher Education Center has provided teacher education programs since its founding. The Center proposes course offerings for as many as 70 candidates for each week-long intensive. The organization has an articulation agreement in place with Pacific Oaks College which grants degree applicable credit for coursework completed. San Francisco Bay Area Montessori Teacher Education Center is affiliated with the American Montessori Society and is accredited by the Montessori Accreditation Council for Teacher Education and the California Council for Private Postsecondary and Vocational Education.

WestEd Center for Child and Family Studies - Sausalito This non-profit corporation has a state-wide Infant/Toddler Caregivers Training of Trainers program that is a nationally recognized training system developed in collaboration with the California Department of Education. The WestEd Program for Infant/Toddler Caregivers is entering its seventh year of funding from the Quality Improvement Activities budget from the California Department of Education, Child Development Division. Offering coursework since 1965, their target audience is college/university instructors and resource and referral agency staff. WestEd has satellite offices throughout California, in Arizona, Massachusetts and Washington, D.C. WestEd proposes statewide course offerings with as many as 60 candidates for each week-long module training institute. WestEd has an articulation agreement in place with Pacific Oaks college which allows participants to earn two units of extension ungraded undergraduate or graduate credit in infant/toddler development for each module completed.

STRAND ONE PROGRAM CONFIGURATIONS

Now that each of the above sites has been successful in Phase One of the Pilot Study the organizations must now satisfy Phase Two Requirements. Requirements for participation in Phase Two include a response to all appropriate Standards based upon the organization's proposed program configuration (see Chart Three). A full description of all Phase One requirements is included at the beginning of this section of the report.

In reviewing the preliminary applications received from organizations it became obvious to Evaluation and Support Team members that the number one challenge for Strand One participants may be the reorganization of coursework to meet the standard clock hour equivalent the Commission recognizes for issuance of a credential or permit. The formula used by the Commission is defined as 15 clock hours of coursework is equivalent to 1 semester hour of credit.

Although a number of organizations propose to offer courses to satisfy different types of requirements for the Child Development Permit, for example, core courses, elective courses, and administration courses, the Evaluation and Support Team believes that some organizations may have been premature in proposing multiple program configurations. Because of the short response time allowed for a full response to all appropriate and applicable standards, Team members recommended that some organizations consider program configurations to include a focus in only one or two areas of concentration. The proposed program configurations are described below.

Organization

Program Configuration

American Nanny College	Core Component Elective Component
California College for Health Sciences	Core Component Elective Component
Development Associates	Administrative Component Specializations: Infant/Toddler Development Bilingual
San Francisco Bay Area Montessori Teacher Education Center	Core Component Elective Component Administrative Component Specializations: Early Childhood Education Infant/Toddler Development Montessori Education
WestEd	Specializations:

Infant/Toddler
Development
Group Care of Infants and Toddlers

Montessori Teachers College

Core Component
Elective Component
Administrative Component
Specializations:

Montessori Education for Infant/Toddlers
Preschool Teacher Education

Montessori Western Teacher
Training Program

Core Component

Strand Two Requirements

Unlike organizations selected to participate in Strand One of the Pilot Study, the regionally accredited institutions participating in Strand Two must offer courses that comply with each level of the Child Development Permit structure. The following information detailing eligibility requirements is reprinted to refresh your background on the criteria for participation in Strand Two. Additional information included in this section of the report provides specific information on the institutions selected to participate in Strand Two of the Pilot Study.

Criteria for Strand Two. *All institutions selected for participation in Strand Two of the Pilot Study must meet the following criteria.*

- The institution must provide verification of WASC accreditation.
- The institution must have successfully offered a program in the area of early childhood education for at least three years prior to participation in the Pilot Study.
- The institution must offer courses that comply with each level of the Child Development Permit Structure as delineated in the California Code of Regulations, Title 5. (Community Colleges may offer course work for the Program Director Permit and verify a candidate's completion of a baccalaureate degree with an official transcript from the institution granting the degree.)
- The institution must agree to verify that each candidate has completed the general education requirement as delineated in the California Code of Regulations, Title 5.
- The institution must agree to participate in the evaluation of this Pilot Study.
- The institution must meet all *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs*.
- The institution must be prepared to recommend students for Child Development Permits. (This includes personnel hours needed for advising students and processing the necessary paperwork.)

Institutions that are interested in participating in the Pilot Study will be required to do all of the following.

- *Complete a Preliminary Application and Return It to the Commission.* The Preliminary Application will include: mission statement and program goals; program design (including course titles, course format, and course descriptions); target audience (including languages other than English); value of the program to the community (what needs the organization meets); geographic data (local, countywide, statewide, distance learning); and institution history.

The Commission's staff will review all Preliminary Applications to determine that they are complete and they meet the eligibility criteria for participation in the Pilot Study.

- *Complete a Full Response to Standard 1 (Governance and Accountability) and Standard 2 (Resources), and Include It with the Preliminary Application.* In relation to Standards 1 and 2, the Review and Support Team, comprised of child development professionals, will initially evaluate the quality and effectiveness of applicant programs. Only those programs that meet Standards 1 and 2 will become participants in Strand Two of the Pilot Study.

The institutions selected to participate in the Pilot Study will then:

- Complete the Application Process by Responding in Detail to the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs*. If any of the selected institutions do not meet the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs to the satisfaction of the Evaluation and Support Team, they will not be permitted to participate in Phase Two of the Pilot Study.
- Participate in the Evaluation Stages of the Study by Assisting the Commission Staff and Members of the Evaluation and Support Team Appointed by the Executive Director of the Commission. As a participant in the Pilot Study evaluation, each institution will be required to:

facilitate a on-day site visit to the program by the Evaluation and Support Team, facilitate interviews with program participants by the Team, compile data for an examination of course completion rates by students, and facilitate student evaluations of courses, instructors and institution.

Chart Four outlines the standards that must be met by all institutions.

Chart 4

Standards to be Met in Strand Two

Must be Met by All Organizations

- (1) Common Organization Standards
- (2) Common Program Standards
- (3) Core Course Work Standards
 - Child Development
 - Child Family and Community
 - Programs and Curriculum
- (4) Elective Course Work Standards
- (5) Administrative Course Work Standards
- (6) Specialization Course Work Standards

INSTITUTIONS SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE IN STRAND TWO

The Task Force proposed that up to ten California WASC-accredited institutions of postsecondary education be selected for participation in Strand Two based on their responses to the Preliminary Application, responses to Standards 1 and 2, and general criteria including geographical location, student population, and size of program. Unlike organizations participating in Strand One of the pilot Study, the regionally accredited institutions must offer coursework for each level of the Child Development Permit Matrix.

Preliminary applications were received from eight California Community Colleges and four 4-year colleges and universities. Evaluation and Support Team Members, as well as staff, were impressed with the thoroughness and quality of the responses received from the twelve WASC-accredited institutions. As previously stated, the Task Force recommended that a total of ten organizations and ten institutions be allowed to participate in Strand One and Strand Two of the Pilot Study. Bearing in mind the recommendation made by the Task Force while considering the quality of the programs represented by the institutions in their preliminary applications, staff recommended that the Evaluation and Support Team select all twelve institutions to participate in Strand Two of the Pilot Study. With the selection of the seven organizations as participants in Strand One, allowing all twelve institutions to participate in Strand Two brings the total number of Pilot Study participants to nineteen.

Since the February 22-23 site selection process we have received word from one institution that they cannot participate in the study. Citing the short response time allowed for submission of a full response to all standards, the community college advised the Commission that they must withdraw from the Pilot Study. A summary description of each of the eleven regionally accredited institutions selected to participate in Strand Two is included below.

Community College Participants

American River College - Sacramento , American River College opened its doors in 1955. One of three community colleges in the Los Rios Community College District, the college serves the northern section of the city of Sacramento, the large outlying northern and eastern suburban sections of the county of Sacramento, as well as the more rural but developing areas of northern Sacramento county. The college is one of the 10 largest community colleges in the state serving a student population of over 22,000. Students enrolled in the ECE program total 4300. The majority of ECE students are part-time students who are currently employed in the field of early childhood education. The college offers a full range of courses, certificates and degrees which prepares individuals to provide services to young children. ECE students may choose from a selection of day, evening, and Saturday courses, with over 90% of the courses offered both day and evening format each semester. Customized courses for area businesses and agencies, including the resource and referral agency Child Action, Inc., are offered through American River College's Training Source. The college also has a lab school which provides early childhood education for children from birth through five years of age.

Bakersfield College - Bakersfield Bakersfield College was established in 1913, which makes it one of the oldest two-year community colleges in the nation. One of three colleges in the Kern Community College District, Bakersfield College serves students from Kern County and parts of Imperial, Tulare and San Bernardino Counties. Located in the heart of an agricultural area in the southern end of the San Joaquin Valley, Bakersfield College offers a full range of courses, certificates and degrees which prepares candidates for the Child Development Permit. The target audience includes Family Child Care Provider Mentors, re-entry students seeking a career change, CalWorks participants, and Exempt Care providers. Coursework is offered both day and evening throughout the year. Some courses are offered on-line. Bakersfield College has an

articulation agreement with California State University, Bakersfield.

Grossmont College - El Cajon Located 30 miles from the Mexican border, Grossmont College is situated within a strong private and church-based childcare community. The college began offering child development coursework in 1965 as a nursery school training program. The college currently serves a diverse student population which includes 622 child development majors. Grossmont College has transfer and articulation agreements with the University of California system, the Child and Family Development Department, San Diego State University, and is currently negotiating articulation agreements with both National University and Point Loma Nazarene College. All ECE degree and certificate programs are based on the Child Development Permit structure. One distance learning course is available.

Modesto Junior College - Modesto Modesto Junior College is centrally located in the city of Modesto and has provided postsecondary education to the community for over 75 years. The college has two campus locations, East and West, which are approximately two miles apart. The college serves between 350 and 400 child development majors. The Child Development Program has an on-campus Child Development Preschool Lab and in fall 1998, the care and development facilities were expanded to include an Infant/Toddler Laboratory. The college has a large ESL population and provides ECE bilingual instruction for CalWorks participants. Modesto Junior College is also actively involved in the AmeriCorps program, which provides additional support services to its child development students.

Moorpark College - Moorpark Moorpark College has offered ECE and child development coursework for 32 years. The college is located in the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area and offers a wide range of ECE/child development courses in a variety of time and day patterns, including Saturday and off-campus courses. In 1998, the number of students enrolled in ECE/child development courses numbered 795. The child development majors include students with Board of Governor Grants and New Horizons support (services and funding for single parents/displaced homemakers). In addition to the main campus located in the eastern half of Ventura County, the College operates classes at off-campus sites in Simi Valley, Newbury Park and Westlake. Moorpark College has an articulation agreement with California State University Northridge. In addition to WASC accreditation, the Moorpark Child Development Center is accredited by the National Association for the Education of the Young Child.

Mt. San Antonio College - Walnut Located in the San Jose Hills, Mt. San Antonio College has offered an early childhood development program since 1969. Serving more than 32,000 students, it is the largest single-campus college district in the state. The college meets the needs of its 2,200 ECE students through innovative scheduling formats which include traditional semester scheduling of classes during the week, both day and evening, an intensive six- and nine-week short term course of study during the week and on weekends. Courses also include a late start 12-week course of study that is offered on Friday evenings and Saturdays, as well as "Certificate in a Year" scheduling on Saturdays and Sundays which is intended for those individuals who must meet the 12-unit requirement identified in Title 22 for those who work in private preschool settings. The distance learning format was added five years ago as a Child, Growth and Development telecourse. In August 1998, the college expanded the distance learning format to include an on-line Child, Growth and Development course. Twenty Early Childhood Development Faculty and Child Development Center Staff, both administrative and teaching staff, are scheduled to participate in a combined Staff Development Inservice to receive training as Professional Growth advisors for holders of a Child Development Permit. Mt. San Antonio College has a Head Start Partnership with Pomona Unified School District which includes a lab at one of the school sites.

Santa Barbara City College - Santa Barbara Serving the south coast of Santa Barbara County, Santa Barbara City College has offered ECE/child development programs since 1969. The college serves a large number of international students who range in age from 18 to 60 years old and represent a combination of interest levels, experience and knowledge in the profession of Early Childhood Education. The institution offers an array of coursework, degree and certificate programs in a variety of course offerings including distance learning. Each ECE/child development class is limited to 30-35 students per class. Santa Barbara City College has articulation agreement with Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, California State University, Northridge and Pacific Oaks College. In addition to WASC accreditation, the Santa Barbara City College Child Development Center is accredited by the National Association for the Education of the Young Child.

Four Year Colleges and Universities

Public Institutions

U. C. Riverside, Extension - Riverside The University of California, Riverside, Extension and Summer Sessions, has provided a Certificate Program in Early Childhood Studies since 1987. The Extension Center serves a total of 21,908 students from San Bernardino, Riverside, and Inyo Counties, with ECE/child development classes averaging 15-20 students per class. Students are offered the option of participating in traditional university classes of regular 10-week courses held at the Extension Center, or may choose to attend custom-designed courses presented at the workplace. The program also offers coursework through intensive 3- to 5-week sessions with classes occurring on weekends and evenings. In addition to WASC accreditation, the Child Development Center is accredited by the National Association for the Education of the Young Child.

Private Institutions

Concordia University - Irvine Offering coursework since 1976, the Early Childhood Program at Concordia University includes both a major and minor in early childhood education which is designed to be completed within the four year baccalaureate degree program. The Early Childhood Program is housed in the School of Education along with the Elementary and Secondary Education Programs. The ECE Program targets three types of students, the high school graduate with no experience or training in ECE/child development, transfer students, and non-traditional career change older students. Concordia offers courses on site in late afternoon and evening time slots with ECE programs ranging in size from five to 20 students per class.

Pacific Oaks College - Pasadena Pacific Oaks College has offered a Child Development baccalaureate degree program since 1959. The college also offers graduate degrees in ECE. The Child Development Program has been designed to function as a cohesive whole with components that are integrated into the larger Human Development Department, which includes the elementary education program. The institution targets working mature students seeking degrees and ECE educators that have met entry level requirements though field experience. Pacific Oaks currently enrolls 1000 students. Because most students work and have family responsibilities, courses are offered only in the evenings beginning at 4:00 p.m., on weekends and in accelerated formats. The accelerated formats are offered fall, spring, and summer, and include weeknight, weekend and week-long intensives. Classes are available in Pasadena, Oakland, and Visalia, as well as on-line.

University of LaVerne - LaVerne Located approximately 25 miles east of Los Angeles, the University of LaVerne serves the Eastern Region of the San Gabriel Valley. The Child Development Program is a major program within the Education Department. Over the past ten years, the program, which currently serves 100 students, has tripled in size. The university offers a baccalaureate degree and Masters degree program in Child Development and Child Life. The university has strong articulation with local community colleges and the majority of their ECE/child development students are community college transfer students seeking advanced training in child development. The University of LaVerne has a partnership with the Los Angeles County Fair Association (Fairplex) Child Development Center. With a waiting list of over 300, the Child Development Center is used as a model training site for University of LaVerne ECE/child development students.

**Part Six:
Support and Assistance Provided to Participants and
Sequence of the Pilot Study**

Support, Guidance and Assistance

In October 1998 staff presented two Standards Writing Workshops to introduce organizations and community colleges with the alternative coursework and program approval process. A total of 34 early childhood education/child development professionals attended the workshops. The workshop was well received and attendees expressed their gratitude for this initial support and assistance. Additional support and assistance will be provided in the form of two workshops to share information about the Child Development Permit formal recommendation application process. These workshops will be presented in the fall.

A Response Guide was developed and distributed to all Pilot Study participants to further guide and assist them in crafting a response to all appropriate and applicable standards. Once the Phase Two review and evaluation process is completed, Evaluation and Support Team members will make themselves available during the summer months to provide guidance and assistance via fax, telephone and e-mail to participants.

Time Sequence

The following describes the sequence of events to occur beginning with submission of full proposals on May 21, 1999. The timeline has been revised to accommodate delivery of approved alternative education coursework and approved programs beginning fall 1999.

Full Proposals due	May 21, 1999
Team meeting to review full proposals	June 1-2, 1999
Team members and CCTC staff work with participants on standards responses	June - Sept. 1999
Coursework offered beginning	September 1999
Site visits to training programs	Spring 2000
Organizations/Institutions respond to Pilot Questions	June 2000
Evaluation Team meeting to evaluate the pilot	July 2000
Analysis of pilot with recommendations to CCTC	August 2000
If Pilot Study is recommended for full implementation, circulate Standards for field review	September 2000
CCTC reviews revised standards for implementation	November 2000



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-4

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Second Progress Report and Additional Recommendations Regarding Implementation of AB 1620 (Scott)

✓ Action

Prepared by: Philip Fitch, Ed.D., Consultant Jim Alford, Associate Governmental Program Analyst Sara Swan, Staff Services Analyst
Professional Services Division Certification, Assignments and Waivers Division Professional Services Division

Summary of an Agenda Report

Progress Report and Initial Recommendations Regarding Implementation of AB 1620 (Scott Bill)

Professional Services Division
March 29, 1999

Executive Summary - Overview

This AB 1620 agenda item provides the Commissioners with a second report regarding activities and recommendations of the AB 1620 Task Force which last met on March 8th and 9th, 1999. At its March meeting, the Task Force reviewed standards and guidelines for twelve (12) additional states in the areas of preparation of special education teachers, elementary and secondary teachers and for the accreditation and program approval of institutions in each state. A recommendation for action by the Commission is included in this agenda item on [page 3](#) and [page 4](#).

AB 1620, sponsored by the Commission in the 1998-99 Legislative Year, was passed by the legislature without a single "no" vote and signed by then Governor Wilson as urgency legislation in August 1998. This agenda item refers to only two sections of the eight sections of AB 1620, specifically Sections 1 and 8. Plans for implementing Sections 2 through 7 were presented to the Commission at its November 1998 meeting.

Section 1 of AB 1620 (ECS44274) requires the Commission to conduct periodic reviews, beginning in 1998, to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, and to initiate negotiations with these states to provide reciprocity in teacher credentialing. If this determination is made, Section 1 of the bill requires the Commission to issue an equivalent teaching credential, permit or certificate to an applicant holding or qualifying for a teaching credential, permit or certificate awarded by a state that has entered into a reciprocity agreement with the Commission. Section 1 of AB 1620 requires the Commission to grant an appropriate credential to any applicant from another state who has completed teacher preparation equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, whether a reciprocity agreement with other states is pending completion or the other state has declined to enter into a reciprocity agreement with California. The bill also requires the Commission to issue a five-year preliminary specialist instruction credential authorizing instruction of pupils with disabilities to an applicant who holds or qualifies for a valid special education credential from another state that has special education standards determined by the Commission to be equivalent and comparable to California's standards.

During September and October, members of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) reciprocity management team met to determine ways to obtain standards and procedural documents from other states and to determine the extent to which other states' standards and procedures were both comparable and equivalent. In November, letters of request for information were sent to the other forty-nine states by the Executive Director. Also, letters were sent to select out-of-state universities that were identified by other state Departments of Education, Commissions or Professional Boards. To date material has been received from twenty-three other states and from several out-of-state universities and colleges. A nineteen-member Reciprocity Task Force was formed in November 1998 to identify procedures for determining equivalency and comparability of other states' standards, guidelines and procedures for preparing elementary, secondary and special education teachers. The Task Force met for two days in January, 1999, two days in February, 1999 and two days in March, 1999 to develop and implement procedures for determining comparability.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

The following policy questions are addressed in this agenda item:

- Are there other states that have equivalent and comparable standards and procedures for the preparation, credentialing and licensing of elementary, secondary and special education teachers?
- Are there other states that have program approval, accreditation or quality assurance procedures and policies that are comparable and equivalent to those of California?
- Are there other states that have developed and require basic skills tests and subject-matter requirements that are equivalent

and comparable to those of California?

- Are there other states that wish to enter into a reciprocity agreement with California?

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goals:

- Promote educational excellence in California schools.
- Take a leadership role in recruiting and preparing qualified teachers in response to class size reductions.
- Consider options including internships, waivers, emergency permits, apprenticeships, and certifications to meet the needs of California classrooms.

Fiscal Impact Statement

AB 1620 appropriated \$90,000 from the Teacher Credentials Fund for the 1998-99 fiscal year for expenditure by the Commission for the purpose of conducting a review to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that meet or exceed California standards. Staff believes that these funds are sufficient to complete the initial reciprocity study but will not be sufficient to cover the on-going activities necessary to maintain reciprocity agreements with other states.

Recommendations

That the Commission approve the initial recommendations of the AB 1620 Reciprocity Task Force related to findings of comparability in accreditation and program standards for teacher preparation and preparation of special educators in selected states reviewed at the March 8th and 9th, 1999 Task Force meeting.

Important Note

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

The Commission Staff and the AB 1620 Task Force recommend that the Commission approve the following decisions of the Task Force related to program accreditation procedures, elementary and secondary teacher preparation programs, and special education teacher preparation programs in states reviewed to date:

State	Task Force Decision
1. Kentucky	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
2. Kansas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of Language, Speech, and Hearing, and Audiology were found to be equivalent and comparable.
3. Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate (with endorsements in moderate and affective disabilities), Moderate to Severe (with endorsements in moderate and affective or severe and affective), Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Orientation and Mobility were found to be comparable and equivalent for the Preliminary Level I credential. • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing, Audiology, and Special Class Authorization were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.
4. Alabama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed. Were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential. • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing with proof of Masters Degree were found to be comparable and equivalent for the clear credential.
5. Nebraska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing (pre K-12) or (K-9) or (pre K-3 and 7-12), Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Speech Language Pathology (not Speech Language Technician) were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level credential.
6. Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed. Were found to be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level I credential. • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.
7. Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special education areas of Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visually Impaired, Early Childhood Ed (comparable with Early Childhood and Special Ed authorization) were found to

	<p>be equivalent and comparable for the Preliminary Level credential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The special education areas of Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology were found to be equivalent and comparable for the clear credential.
8. Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
9. Missouri	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
10. Montana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
11. Illinois	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
12. Arizona	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
13. Georgia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
14. Oregon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
15. Wyoming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.

As the Task Force continues to meet, staff and representatives of the Task Force will bring updates and further recommendations to the Commission for its consideration and action.

Previous Action of the Commission

At its March 3rd and 4th, 1999 meeting the Commission approved the following states as having comparable standards and accreditation procedures on the recommendation of the AB 1620 Task Force.

State Task Force Decision

1. Maryland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. _ Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
2. Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. _ Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. _ The special education areas of audiology, speech pathology, orientation and mobility, deaf and hard of hearing were found to be comparable.
3. Nebraska	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. _ Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. _ The special education areas of audiology and speech pathology were found to be comparable.
4. Tennessee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.

5. Rhode Island	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. _ Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
6. North Carolina	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. _ Elementary and secondary standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.
7. Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable. _ The special education areas of audiology and speech pathology were found to be comparable.
8. Utah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> _ Accreditation-program review procedures and eight common standards were found to be equivalent and comparable.

Background

For more than two decades the Commission has considered the issue of credential reciprocity. To this end it has participated in a variety of activities to interact with other states to develop agreements that might allow the Commission to accept candidates prepared by accredited out-of-state institutions approved by their state's department of education, commission or board. However, specific requirements in various states have created difficulties for teachers prepared in one state who seek certification in another state. Interstate agreements in past years have been limited in scope, and have ensured little, if any, credential reciprocity between the participating states. For instance, the Commission has signed with 39 other states as a member of the NASDTEC Interstate Compact. For many states this compact is primarily an agreement to work together and does not provide for specific reciprocal agreements for teacher credentialing and licensure. In fact, credential reciprocity has not been reachable in California under any prior or current interstate agreement.

In sponsoring AB 1620, the Commission has taken a major step in establishing reciprocity with other states. This legislation permits the Commission to enter into reciprocal agreements with those states that are determined to have comparable and equivalent teacher preparation standards to those required for teachers prepared in California. The law provides:

- (a) *The commission shall conduct periodic reviews, beginning in 1998, to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California.*
- (b) *When the commission determines, pursuant to subdivision (a), that the teacher preparation standards established by any state are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, the commission shall initiate negotiations with that state to provide reciprocity in teacher credentialing.*

California Education Code, Section 44274

AB 1620 established Sections 44274, 44274.2, 44274.4, and 44274.5, introducing several provisions related to the California certification of teachers prepared in other states. At its November 1998 meeting, staff presented a plan for implementing elements of the law that apply to teachers with three to five years of teaching experience. The Commissioners approved this plan, staff has implemented the plan, and the Commission is now able to grant credentials to those teachers able to verify they meet the requirements established for experienced teachers in these sections.

Section 44274 relates to the pursuit of credential reciprocity agreements with those states determined by the Commission to have comparable teacher preparation standards to those in California. Specifically, ECS44274(a) and (b) require the Commission to conduct periodic reviews of other states' teacher preparation standards. Subsection (c) requires the commission to grant to a teacher prepared in another state with comparable standards an equivalent California credential. The California credential is to be issued regardless of whether a credential reciprocity agreement is established or pending, or the other state declines to enter into a credential reciprocity agreement with California.

In November 1998, letters were sent to the other 49 states from the Executive Director to inform them of the Scott legislation and to request their assistance in the reciprocity study. The following materials were requested:

- _ materials relating to the specific certification requirements for teaching in early childhood education, elementary education, middle school or junior high school education, high school and special education;
- _ materials relating to their state's requirements for verifying knowledge of the subject curricula to be taught at elementary and secondary levels;
- _ materials relating to the state standards or guidelines that are required by their state for universities and colleges to develop

professional preparation programs for elementary, secondary and special education teachers; and

- _ materials that are used by their state agency for conducting program reviews on accreditation visits, such as materials relating to procedures for site visits, team member composition, and frequency of visits.

To date, twenty-three states have responded to this request and the Reciprocity Task Force has been able to review and analyze materials from twelve of the states at the January and February meetings of the Task Force. In a number of cases, Commission staff has needed to follow up with specific requests for other material or to obtain clarification on the material that was under review by the Task Force.

AB 1620 - Reciprocity Task Force

In November, a nineteen-member Reciprocity Task Force was created to develop processes for determining the equivalency and comparability of other state's standards and program review or accreditation procedures. Task Force members were identified by Commission consultants who have responsibility for the special education panel, accreditation teams, and standard-setting panels. Individuals were identified who have extensive professional experience and expertise in the standards areas being analyzed and reviewed. The Commission's procedures, as stated in the Policy Manual, were followed to ensure gender, ethnic, racial and geographic balance in K-12 schools and in higher education. Most importantly, the individuals involved needed to have a professional reputation for being able to make holistic, qualitative professional judgments regarding the comparability of standards.

The task force identified herein was charged with conducting the review of other states' teacher preparation standards, and recommending states for recognition as having comparable standards based upon this review.

Further, given that Section 44274(c) calls for granting an equivalent California credential to the credential earned in the other state, the Task Force will recommend the appropriate level of credential (preliminary or professional clear) to be granted to an individual from an approved state based upon the level of preparation they are required to complete by that state's standards.

The Task Force has been divided into three working groups or teams:

- _ Accreditation and Common Standards Team,
- _ Elementary and Secondary Standards Team,
- _ Special Education Standards Team.

The membership of the three teams is listed below.

Accreditation and Common Standards Team

- Dr. Phyllis Fernlund, Dean, School of Education, Sonoma State University
- Dr. Irving Hendrick, Former Dean, School of Education, UC Riverside
- Dr. Jim Scott, Superintendent of Schools, Eureka Public Schools
- Ms. Judy Silver, Principal, Barnard-White Middle School, Union City
- Dr. Alice Watkins, Dean, School of Education, Azusa Pacific University
- Dr. Lamar Mayer, Past Associate Dean, School of Education, CSU Los Angeles

Elementary and Secondary Standards Team

- Dr. Linda Childress, BTSA Director, Inland Empire, Riverside County Office of Education
- Dr. Jacob Perea, Dean, College of Education, San Francisco State University
- Mr. Hank Richardson, Assistant Superintendent Personnel, Hesperia Unified School District
- Dr. Joan Rossi, Department of Education, College of Notre Dame
- Ms. Linda Strom, Director, Certified Personnel, Elk Grove Unified School District
- Ms. Kathy Walker, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Bakersfield City Schools

Special Education Standards Team

- Dr. Tory Courtney, School of Education, Saint Mary's College
- Ms. Sue Craig, Resource Specialist, Mild/Moderate, Red Bluff Union High School
- Dr. Robert Jordan, Director, Special Education, San Diego County Office of Education
- Dr. Noma LeMoine, Director, Specialized Programs, Los Angeles Unified School District
- Dr. Terry Saenz, Department of Speech Communication, CSU Fullerton
- Dr. Karl Skindrud, School of Education, Department of Special Education, California State University, Dominguez Hills

The following individuals will be present at the March Commission meeting as representatives of their specialized team to answer Commission questions.

- Ms. Sue Craig Special Education Standards Team
- Dr. Alice Watkins Accreditation and Common Standards Team
- Ms. Linda Strom Elementary and Secondary Standards Team

Examples of the various matrices used by the teams are presented in Appendix A of this agenda item. Team members are prepared to discuss the procedures used to analyze each set of state standards, standard by standard, to determine qualitatively and holistically that other states' standards are equivalent and comparable.

Following are some of the operational procedures that were agreed to by the members of the Task Force.

Task Force Norms/Agreed Upon Procedures

Norms:

- _ Task Force will make recommendations either for preliminary or professional clear credentials based on each state's standards.
- _ Task Force will recommend or deny elementary or secondary or special education comparability independently.
- _ Special Education Authorizations will be recommended individually specifically by credential area.
- _ Task Force will review state documents first to determine comparability, then use institutional documents if necessary.
- _ Task Force members will identify other information needed for making comparability decisions.
- _ Task Force teams will provide CCTC Staff with a final statement of decisions they reach.
- _ The Accreditation Team will review state documents for the eight Common Standards as well as accreditation process comparability and report their findings to other teams.
- _ The decisions of the Accreditation and Common Standards Team are prerequisites to determining comparability in special education, elementary and secondary teaching.
- _ The Accreditation and Common Standards Team will determine which states the other teams will review.

As stated earlier in this item, the Reciprocity Task Force has met for two days in January 1999, two days in February 1999 and two days in March 1999. The Task Force met on Monday and Tuesday, January 11th and 12th, and on Monday and Tuesday, February 8th and 9th. Their meeting schedule for the Spring of 1999 is as follows;

- April 19-20 1999 Country Suites, Ontario*
- May 19-20 1999 Country Suites, Ontario*

Anyone interested in observing the work of the Task Force is welcome to attend all or any part of the two-day meetings.

To date, twenty one (21) sets of other standards have been reviewed by members of the Task Force. Following is a chart that provides the Commission with the status of each state review.

Accreditation/Common Standards Team	
21 States Reviewed	18-Comparable
	3-Need More Information
Elementary and Secondary Standards Team	
16 States Reviewed	7-Comparable
	7-Need More Information
	2-Needs Further Review
5 States Yet to be Reviewed	
Special Education Standards Team	
11 States Reviewed	7-Comparable in Select Areas
	4-Need More Information
10 States Yet to be Reviewed	

State	Standards for Elementary & Secondary Teacher Preparation	Comparable or not Comparable	Standards for Special Education	Comparable or not Comparable	Standards for Program Review or Accreditation	Comparable or not Comparable
1. Maryland	UM - Elementary and Secondary Program NCATE Standards INTASC Standards Professional Development School	Elementary Standards Comparable Secondary Standards Comparable	National Council for Exceptional Children Standards	Need more information	Program Approval Manual NCATE - Initial and Continuing Professional Development School	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
2. Kentucky	NCATE INTASC State Standards	Need more information	Yet to be reviewed	Yet to be reviewed	NCATE INTASC Education Professional Standards Board	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
3. Kansas	NCATE Standards State Standards for Elementary and Secondary Teachers	Need more information	Special Education Standards	Comparable in the following credential areas: Language, Speech, and Hearing, and Audiology	Accredited Institutions NCATE Standards Instructional Handbook for Program Approval Accreditation	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
4. Colorado	Knowledge of Content and Learning INTASC Standards	Elementary Standards Comparable Secondary Standards Comparable	Special Education Endorsements	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate (with endorsements in moderate and affective disabilities), Moderate to Severe (with endorsements in moderate and affective or severe and affective), Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Orientation and Mobility. Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing, Audiology, and Special Class Authorization	Professional Education Approval NCATE Standards INTASC Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
5. Alabama	Teacher Education Standards INTASC Standards NCATE Standards	Need further review	Special Education	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed. Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing with proof of Masters Degree.	NCATE and State Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
6. Nebraska	Elementary Standards Secondary Standards NCATE Standards	Elementary Standards Comparable Secondary Standards Comparable	Special Education Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing (pre K-12) or (K-9) or (pre K-3 and 7-12), Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Speech Language Pathology (not Speech Language Technician).	NCATE Standards University of Nebraska Approved Colleges Council On Teacher Education Policies	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
7. Tennessee	General Education Elementary Professional Education General Education Secondary Professional Education	Elementary Standards Comparable Secondary Standards Comparable	General Education Professional Education Elementary Secondary	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed. Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential:	Professional Education Program Approval Standards NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

	Program Approval Standards NCATE Standards		Education Standards	Language, Speech and Hearing		
8. Rhode Island	Requirements for Early Childhood, Elementary Middle School, Secondary Beginning Teacher Standards Commissioner's Standards NCATE Standards	Elementary Standards Comparable Secondary Standards Comparable	Requirements for Early Childhood Special Ed. Elementary and Middle School Special Ed. Secondary Special Ed., Severe and Profound Commissioner's Standards	Comparable in the following areas for the Preliminary Level I credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Visually Impaired, Early Childhood Ed (comparable with Early Childhood and Special Ed authorization) Comparable in the following areas for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology	Program Approval Standards Commissioner's Standards for the Approval of Teacher Education Programs NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
9. North Carolina	Teacher Education Program Professional Studies Licensure for Public Schools NCATE Standards	Elementary Standards Comparable Secondary Standards Comparable	Teacher Education Program Exceptional children and Youth Licensure for Public Schools NCATE Standards	Need more information	Teacher Education Program Professional Studies Standards for the Approval of Teacher Education Institute NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
10. Washington	Approval Standards for Performance Board NCATE Standards INTASC Standards Approved Program and Certification Guidelines Endorsements for Teacher Certificates Guidelines for Approval of Professional Education Programs Approved Program Directory	Elementary Standards Comparable Secondary Standards Comparable	Approval Standards for Performance Board NCATE Standards Approved Program and Certification Guidelines Endorsements for Teacher Certificates Guidelines for Approval of Professional Education Programs Approved Program Directory	Comparable in the following credential areas: Language, Speech and Hearing, and Audiology	Approval Standards for Performance Board NCATE Standards Approved Program and Certification Guidelines Endorsements for Teacher Certificates Guidelines for Approval of Professional Education Programs Approved Program Directory	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
11. New Jersey	Standards for Teacher Education Programs Indicators of Compliance and Quality NASDTEC Standards	Need more information	Standards for Teacher Education Programs Indicators of Compliance and Quality NASDTEC Standards	Yet to be reviewed	Standards for Teacher Education Programs Indicators of Compliance and Quality NASDTEC Standards	Need more information
12. Utah	Teacher Education Programs Certification Requirements Certification Standards Utah State Core Reading - Grades	Need further review	Certification Requirements Certification Standards	Need more information	Teacher Education Programs Certification Requirements Certification Standards NCATE Standards NASDTEC Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable

	4-6 NCATE Standards NASDTEC Standards Multicultural Education Guidelines					
13. Missouri	Standards for Teacher Education Programs Design of Professional Education Standards for School Leaders Standards for Teacher Education Procedures for Program Review Professional Education Programs Annual Report Form	Yet to be reviewed	Standards for Teacher Education Programs Design of Professional Education Standards for School Leaders Standards for Teacher Education Procedures for Program Review Professional Education Programs Annual Report Form Need Special Education Standards	Yet to be reviewed	Standards for Teacher Education Programs Design of Professional Education Standards for School Leaders Standards for Teacher Education Procedures for Program Review Professional Education Programs Annual Report Form	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
14. Delaware	Professional Teaching Standards	Yet to be reviewed	Professional Teaching Standards	Yet to be reviewed	Professional Teaching Standards	Need more information
15. Montana	Teacher Education Program Standards Procedures Manual for Montana Teacher Education Standards	Yet to be reviewed	Teacher Education Program Standards Procedures Manual for Montana Teacher Education Standards	Yet to be reviewed	Teacher Education Program Standards Procedures Manual for Montana Teacher Education Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
16. Illinois	Minimum Requirements for State Certificates Preparing Educators for the 21st Century - Draft Recommendations Directory of Approved Teacher Preparation Programs NCATE Standards	Yet to be reviewed	Minimum Requirements for State Certificates Preparing Educators for the 21st Century - Draft Recommendations Directory of Approved Teacher Preparation Programs Special Education Certification and Approval Requirements and Procedures	Yet to be reviewed	Minimum Requirements for State Certificates Preparing Educators for the 21st Century - Draft Recommendations Directory of Approved Teacher Preparation Programs Draft Regulations for Approval of Teacher Preparation Programs NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
17. Arizona	Professional Development Title 7. Education	Need more information	Professional Development Title 7. Education (pg. 12-17)	Yet to be reviewed	Professional Development Title 7. Education Professional Preparation Programs (pg. 7-8)	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
18. Minnesota	Proposed Rules Governing Teacher Licensing	Need more information	Proposed Rules Governing Teacher Licensing	Yet to be reviewed	Proposed Rules Governing Teacher Licensing	Need more information
19. Georgia	Standards for Professional Education Units and Programs Handbook for Board of Examiners Teams NCATE Standards	Yet to be reviewed	Standards for Professional Education Units and Programs Handbook for Board of Examiners Teams	Yet to be reviewed	Standards for Professional Education Units and Programs Handbook for Board of Examiners Teams NCATE Standards	Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable
20. Oregon	Administrative Rules for On-Site Visits	Need more information	Administrative Rules for On-Site Visits	Need more information	Administrative Rules for On-Site Visits	Accreditation Procedures and

	<p>Approved Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Continuing Professional Development for Licensure Renewal</p> <p>Teacher Licensure for 21st Century Schools</p> <p>Preparing Quality Educators for 21st Century Schools</p>		<p>Approved Teacher Education Programs</p> <p>Continuing Professional Development for Licensure Renewal</p> <p>Teacher Licensure for 21st Century Schools</p> <p>Preparing Quality Educators for 21st Century Schools</p> <p>Program Approval Site Visit Handbook</p>	Comparable		
<p>21. Wyoming</p>	<p>Professional Teaching Standards Board - General Provisions</p> <p>Bilingual Education (pg. 49-50)</p> <p>Program Standards (pg. 7-38)</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p>	Need more information	<p>Professional Teaching Standards Board - General Provisions</p> <p>Program Standards (pg. 38-44 and pg. 70-71)</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p>	<p>Yet to be reviewed</p>	<p>Professional Teaching Standards Board - General Provisions</p> <p>Program Standards (pg. 71-73)</p> <p>NCATE Standards</p> <p>Handbook for Professional Teaching Standards Board</p>	<p>Accreditation Procedures and Standards Comparable</p>



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PUB-1

Title: Proposed Amendments to Section 80003 Pertaining to the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential

✓ Action

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

PUBLIC HEARING

April 15, 1999

Proposed Amendments to Section 80003 Pertaining to the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential

Introduction

The proposed amendments to Section 80003 pertaining to the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is being presented for public hearing. Included in this item are the background of the proposed regulations, a brief discussion of the proposed changes, and the financial impact. Also included are the responses to the notification of the public hearing and a copy of the notification distributed in Coded Correspondence 99-9904 dated February 16, 1999.

Background of the Proposed Regulations

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, Commission staff has found that some sections of the Education Code pertaining to assignment are sufficiently vague to create confusion or allow questionable interpretation among educational employers.

The existing content of Title 5 Section 80003 concerning the Multiple Subject Credential is either out-of-date or unnecessary. Any reference in this section to the valid period of the credential or dating information is redundant to that contained in other sections of regulations (80553, 80413, and 80413.1). The proposed amendments to this section would eliminate the existing language and redefine the purpose of the section and propose appropriate content.

Proposed Changes

The proposed amendments to the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential authorization will bring the regulations into conformity with appropriate sections of the Education Code and allow for easier understanding of the authorization for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential by employers.

- Subsection (a) includes the information found in Education Code Section 44256 for assignment in a self-contained classroom.
- Subsection (b) contains the authorization for team teaching and regrouping that is found in EC §44258.15.
- Subsection (c) describes an assignment to teach two or more subjects to the same group of students in a core setting at the middle school level according to EC §44258.1.
- Subsection (d) has been added to describe the additional classes that may be taught by an individual teaching in a core setting as found in EC §44258.1.

Financial Impact

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: None

State Colleges and Universities: None

Private Person: None

Mandated Costs: None

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Mailing List and Responses

Mailing List

- 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 and Directors at the California Institutions of Higher Education with Commission-approved programs
- Credential Analysts at the California Institutions of Higher Education with Commission-approved program
- Presidents of Selected Professional Educational Associations

Also placed on the Internet at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov>.

As of Tuesday, March 30, 1999, the Commission had received the following nineteen written responses to the public announcement:

In Support

In Opposition

16 organizational opinions 0 organizational opinion

16 personal opinions 2 personal opinion

Responses Representing Organizations in Support

1. ABC Unified School District: Arvo Toukonen, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources
2. Alameda Unified School District: Dennis K. Chaconas, Superintendent
3. Calaveras County Office of Education: Kathy Bettger, Personnel/ Credentials Technician
4. California Lutheran University: Don Bielkie, Acting Chair
5. Ceres Academy: Mark Heikkila, Principal
6. Compton Unified School District: Larry Marquand, Associate Superintendent
7. Department of the Youth Authority: Robert Brown, Deputy Superintendent/Assistant Deputy Director
8. Folsom Cordova Unified School District: Mark Rickabaugh, Director of Certificated Personnel
9. Fountain Valley School District: Carl D. Dane, Assistant Superintendent of Personnel
10. Hollister School District: Lennis Hampton-Dearing, Acting Director of Personnel
11. Huntington Beach City School District: Kathy Kessler, Assistant Superintendent of Personnel
12. Las Lomitas Elementary School District: Mary Ann Somerville, Superintendent
13. Ontario-Montclair School District: Carolyn Wootten, Personnel Credentials Technician
14. Paso Robles Joint Unified School District: Linda Putnam, Administrative Assistant
15. Scotia Union School District: Richard Barsanti, Superintendent
16. Somerset Educational Services: Mary Ann Salem, Director of Student Services

Responses Representing Individuals in Support

1. Janice Carlson, Human Resources Specialist, Oakley Union Elementary School District
2. Sallie C. Carter, Assistant Superintendent, Ceres Unified School District
3. Michael Chimente, Superintendent, Vallecito Union School District
4. Patricia Diven, Director/Principal, Valley Oaks School
5. Michael J. Dutra, Director of Educational Services, Children's Home of Stockton
6. Byron King, Chief Educational Officer, O'Farrell Community School

Comment: These regulations would provide additional flexibility to the assignment of teachers in middle schools having interdisciplinary teaching teams.

7. Russ Kusama, Administrator, Progress Ranch School

8. Carolyn Lindstrom, Director, Futures High School
9. H. Stephen Maddox, Assistant Superintendent of Personnel Services, Carlsbad Unified School District
10. Shirley Mongini, Superintendent/Principal, Richfield Elementary School District
11. Edward Potter, Assistant Superintendent of Personnel Services, Downey Unified School District
12. Wes Poutsma, Director of Human Resources, Orange Unified School District
13. Ann Pullano, Human Resources Manager, Long Beach Unified School District

Comment: Helpful that authorization will be easier to read and understand. Thank you!

14. Dwight A. Sykes, Principal, San Diego City Schools - Nubia Center
15. Mary Williams, Certificated Personnel Assistant, San Lorenzo Unified School District
16. Jason Winburn, Director of Education, The Linden Center Schools

Responses Representing Individuals in Opposition

1. Timothy Evanson, New Haven Non Public School, Principal

Comment: Teachers should be required to maintain their education as well. My fear is that, by allowing teachers to have a credential that need not be renewed every five years with coursework, will result in poorer quality teachers. My experience now is that those with life credentials are already exempt from taking courses for renewal. In effect, this means we (California) can have a credentialed teacher who knows nothing about computers. This is my own opinion, and remains my view as long as I understand the request to delete the five-year renewal clause. If this is the case, please reconsider times changes, especially in this age.

Commission Response: These proposed regulations are to add an authorization for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential. The regulations governing the valid period of the credential appear in Title 5 Section 80553. The professional clear Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is issued for a five-year period and requires 150 clock hours of professional growth and one-half year of teaching experience for renewal. The Commission has not issued life Multiple Subject Teaching Credential since 1987.

2. Pamela Sharp El Shayeb, San Jose State University, Professor of Art Education

Comment:

1. As I read paragraph (d) it looks as if simply teaching a subject, regardless of an individual's preparation for teaching that subject, as one of two or more subjects to the same group of students in a core setting at the middle school level would qualify an individual to teach that subject in additional classes. That could mean, for example, that a teacher without a background in art could be asked to teach art in conjunction with other subject areas as a member of a team and then permitted to round out a teaching assignment by teaching classes in art. This negates present credentialing requirements for teaching single subjects. It would be a little more acceptable if the individual was required to hold a supplementary authorization in the additional single subject classes. It would be best if all teachers teaching a single subject held a Single Subject Credential in that subject area.

2. I understand the need for team teaching in core classes, but there ought to be some basic requirements for teaching specialized subjects such as the arts. We have a process and standards for supplementary authorizations. Perhaps these could be required across the board of people taking responsibilities for special subjects in a core or team teaching situation at the secondary level. If individuals taking responsibility for teaching multiple subjects in a secondary school were required to hold at least supplementary authorization in those subjects, then the problems arising from paragraph (d) would be less troublesome.

Commission Response:

1. These proposed amendments put into regulations three sections of the Education Code (§44256, §44258.1, and §44258.15). EC §44258.1 allows an individual who holds an elementary credential to teach two or more subjects to the same group of students in a core setting which is limited to grades five through eight. EC §44258.1 also allows the individual to teach a separate class in a subject area that he or she is teaching in a core setting. The separate class must be at the same grade level as the core class. The intent of this section of the code is to allow the individual to teach a subject area in which he or she has already prepared to teach in the core setting by having developed the lesson plans, curriculum, and materials for the subject area.

The holder of a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential has completed either 84 semester units of subject matter course work or the appropriate examinations covering ten subjects areas which includes: language studies, literature, math, science, social science, history, humanities, the arts, physical education, and human development.

2. Service on the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential in a core class is limited to grades five through eight. An individual may not serve at the secondary level in a core setting.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed amendments of Section 80003 concerning the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential.



(916) 445-0234

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

99-9904

DATE: February 16, 1999

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

FROM: Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director

SUBJECT: Proposed Amendments to Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Concerning the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential Authorization

Notice of Public Hearing is Hereby Given

In accordance with Commission policy, the following Title 5 Regulation is being distributed prior to the public hearing. A copy of the proposed regulations is attached:

Proposed Amendments to Section 80003

The public hearing is scheduled for:

April 15, 1999
1:30 p.m.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California

Statement of Reasons

Purpose /Effect of Proposed Action

The proposed amendments to the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential authorization will bring the regulations into conformity with appropriate sections of the Education Code and allow for easier understanding of the authorization for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential by employers.

The existing content of Title 5 Section 80003 concerning the Multiple Subject Credential is either out-of-date or unnecessary. Any reference in this section to the valid period of the credential or dating information is redundant to that contained in other sections of regulations (80053, 80413, and 80413.1). The proposed amendments to this section would eliminate the existing language and redefine the purpose of the section and propose appropriate content.

Subsection (a) includes the information found in Education Code Section 44256 for assignment in a self-contained classroom. Subsection (b) contains the authorization for team teaching and regrouping that is found in EC §44258.15. Subsection (c) describes an assignment to teach two or more subjects to the same group of students in a core setting at the middle school level according to EC §44258.1. Subsection (d) has been added to describe the additional classes that may be taught by an individual teaching in a core setting as found in EC §44258.1.

Documents Relied Upon in Preparing Regulations

No documents were relied upon in preparing the regulations.

Documents Incorporated by Reference

No documents were incorporated by reference.

Written Comment Period

Any interested person, or his or her authorized representative, may submit written comments on the proposed action. The written comment period closes at 5:00 p.m. on April 14, 1999. Comments must be received by that time at the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, attn. Executive Director, 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California 95814-4213.

Response to the Attached Title 5 Regulations

So that the California 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 office, attention Executive Office, at the above address by 5:00 pm on April 14, 1999 in order that the material can be presented at the April 15, 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 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: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Route to THF



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





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 14-15, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PUB-2

Title: Proposed Amendments to Section 80053 of Title 5, Pertaining to Authorization for Service as a Library Media Teacher

✓ Action

Prepared by: Jim Alford, Program Analyst

Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

PUBLIC HEARING

Proposed Amendment of Section 80053 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations Pertaining to Library Media Teacher Services Credential Authorizations

Introduction

The proposed amendments to section 80053 of Title 5, pertaining to authorization for service as a library media teacher are being presented for public hearing. Included in this item are the background of the proposed regulations, a brief discussion of the proposed amendments and the financial impact. Also included are the responses to the notification of the public hearing and a copy of that notification distributed in coded correspondence #99-9903, dated February 24, 1999.

Background of the Proposed Regulations

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 some sections of the Education Code and Title 5 regulations pertaining to assignment require clarification in order to eliminate confusion or questionable interpretation among employers. At its August 1998 meeting, the Commission approved a plan to amend in regulations those areas concerning assignment that require clarification. At its December 1998 meeting, the Commission approved amendments to Title 5 pertaining to authorization for service as a Library Media Teacher for the purpose of establishing a rulemaking file and scheduling this public hearing.

Proposed Changes

Staff proposes four specific amendments to Section 80053 of Title 5 regulations. First, the authorization statement for the Library Media Teacher Services Credential [§80053(b)] contains minor amendments that clarify the holder's role in school library programs. The words "assist and" are recommended for removal in order to differentiate the duties of the certificated employee from those of non-certificated staff who may assist in the implementation of school library programs. The authorization statement is also being amended to state that the holder may coordinate or supervise library programs at the school, district or county level. Language is also being amended to clarify that the holder may plan, as well as conduct, a course of instruction for pupils who assist in the operation of school libraries.

The second amendment to this section is the addition of subsection 80053(b)(1), which establishes the option of employing a credentialed teacher as a library media teacher for a specified time period, provided that they are trained in their duties by a credentialed library media teacher. This subsection stipulates that teachers serving under this provision must obtain an emergency library media teacher services permit within a one- to two-year time period.

The third amendment to this section is the addition of subsection 80053(b)(2), which clarifies that the current common practice of utilizing non-credentialed staff in the provision of school library services is permissible. This amendment includes a statement that the use of library staff should not supersede the requirement to include certificated library media teachers in the design and implementation of library programs. While this subsection does not indicate the specific duties to which non-certificated staff may be assigned, it excludes them from undertaking the duties identified in §80053(b) which require possession of the Library Media Teacher Services Credential.

The final amendment to this section pertains to the term of validity of library media teacher services credentials. Specifically it refers to Title 5 §80553, which provides dating specifications for all professional clear credentials. This change is necessary in

order to align the regulation describing the dating of this credential to that for all types of professional clear credentials.

Fiscal Impact

Cost or savings to any state agency: None. These proposed regulations clarify current appropriate assignment practices for certificated library media teacher 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 Commission on Teacher Credentialing
- California County Superintendents of Schools
- Credential Analysts at the Office of the California County Superintendents of Schools
- 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 Select Professional Education Associations

This notification was also placed on the Internet at "www.ctc.ca.gov".

Tally of Written Responses Received prior to March 29, 1999:

Type of Response	IN SUPPORT	IN OPPOSITION
Organizational	17	8
Personal	10	6
TOTAL	27	14

Organizational Opinions in Support

- Fountain Valley School District; Carl D. Dane, Assistant Superintendent, Personnel
- Hollister School District; Lennis Hampton-Dearing, Ed.D., Acting Director of Personnel
- California Lutheran University; Donald Bielke, Acting Department Chair, Kinesiology Department
- Fresno Pacific University; Norma Dick, Director, Library Media Teacher Credential Program
- Los Angeles School Librarians Association; Sandy Schuckett, President
- Alisal Union School District; Traci Hart, Manager of Personnel Services
- Progress Ranch Non-Public School; Russ Kusama, Administrator
- Alameda Unified School District; Dennis C. Chaconas, Superintendent
- Paso Robles Unified School District; Linda N. Putnam, Administrative Assistant
- Scotia Union School District; Richard L. Barsanti, Superintendent
- Compton Unified School District; Larry Marquand, Associate Superintendent
- Department of the Youth Authority; Robert Brown, Deputy Superintendent/Assistant Deputy Director
- Full Circle Non-Public School; Mandy W. Hoffman, Administrator

- Kern High School District; Thomas W. Good, Director of Personnel
- California School Library Association; Betty D. Silva, President
- Downey Unified School District; Edward Potter, Ed.D., Assistant Superintendent, Personnel Services
- Somerset Educational Services (Non-Public School); Mary Ann Salem, Director of Student Services

Personal Opinions in Support

- Lorri L. Perkins, Counselor, East Nicolaus High School
- Michael J. Dutra, Director, Educational Services, Children's Home of Stockton
- Timothy M. Evanson, Principal, New Haven Non-Public School
- Henry W. Page, Principal, Adult School, Palo Alto Unified School District
- H. Stephen Maddox, Assistant Superintendent, Personnel Services, Carlsbad Unified School District
- Jo Avery, Library Media Teacher, El Dorado High School
- Patricia Diven, Director/Principal, Valley Oaks School
- Sallie J. Carter, Assistant Superintendent, Personnel, Ceres Unified School District
- Judy L. Hughes, District Library Media Specialist, Long Beach Unified School District
- Janet Minami, Library Media Teacher, Los Angeles Unified School District

Organizational Opinions in Opposition

- California School Employees Association; Richard W. Pratt, Senior Governmental Relations Representative
- Susanville School District; Mark W. Evans, Superintendent
- Penryn Elementary School District; Ken Gammelgard, Superintendent/Principal
- Wheatland School District; Debra M. Pearson, Superintendent
- Fallbrook Union Elementary School District; James C. Whitlock, Assistant Superintendent, Employer-Employee Relations
- Creekside Oaks Elementary School; Cheryl Biagi, Principal
- West Sonoma County Union High School District; Susan Panas, Personnel Manager
- San Dieguito Union High School District; Terry King Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources

Personal Opinions in Opposition

- Jim Ochs, Superintendent, Pacheco Union School District
- Kym Woolston, Librarian, Oak Ridge High School, El Dorado Union High School District
- Jim Abbott, Assistant Superintendent, Tahoe Truckee Unified School District
- Bobbie Xuereb, Librarian, Kroc Middle School, San Diego Unified School District
- Christine M. Allen, District Librarian K-12, Riverside Unified School District
- Judith E. Marlin, Library Media Teacher, San Jose Unified School District

Responses Representing Organizational Opinions in Opposition

Comments made by organizations in opposition expressed concerns on a number of subjects in common. Staff is presenting those common concerns with a list of the organizations that expressed each given concern.

1. Non-credentialed staff are currently performing a number of the functions that these regulations would allow only credentialed library media teachers to perform. These amendments are unnecessary and would require disruptive changes in staffing library programs.

- Wheatland School District; Debra M. Pearson, Superintendent
- Fallbrook Union Elementary School District; James C. Whitlock, Assistant Superintendent, Employer-Employee Relations
- Creekside Oaks Elementary School; Cheryl Biagi, Principal
- Penryn Elementary School District; Ken Gammelgard, Superintendent/Principal
- California School Employees Association; Richard W. Pratt, Senior Governmental Relations Representative

Commission Staff Response

In reviewing pertinent Title 5 Regulations it is staff's opinion that employers currently assigning classified staff any of the duties identified in Title 5 §80053(b) are misassigning those individuals by assigning them duties requiring possession of a library media teacher services credential. The proposed regulations clarify appropriate staffing practices already established by Commission policy. It should be noted that a majority of the day-to-day on-site library duties may be performed by non-credentialed staff under the proposed regulations as long as the program is designed and coordinated by a credentialed library media teacher. These regulations in fact recognize the necessary role played by non-credentialed staff in library programs and only limit that role by excluding those specific duties requiring certification.

2. These regulations interfere with local school districts' right to determine the kinds and levels of services to be offered.

- Fallbrook Union Elementary School District; James C. Whitlock, Assistant Superintendent, Employer-Employee Relations
- San Dieguito Union High School District; Terry King Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources

Commission Staff Response

The proposed regulations were an attempt to balance the concerns of employers with a need for appropriately trained individuals in advisory and coordinating positions in school library programs. The regulations recognize the necessity of using non-credentialed staff in the implementation of such programs while supporting the Commission's long-established opinion that credentialed library media teachers are critical to the success of school library programs.

3. These regulations ignore the financial constraints faced by many school districts and the current difficulty finding credentialed library media teachers to employ to provide these services.

- Susanville School District; Mark W. Evans, Superintendent
- California School Employees Association; Richard W. Pratt, Senior Governmental Relations Representative
- San Dieguito Union High School District; Terry King Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources
- West Sonoma County Union High School District; Susan Panas, Personnel Manager

Commission Staff Response

These regulations allow for a majority of the day-to-day on-site library duties to be performed by non-credentialed staff. While this design would limit the library media teacher's opportunities to interact with students it would ensure that program design and coordination and staff training would be directed by an appropriately prepared individual. Further, the regulations allow for a credentialed teacher interested in becoming a fully prepared library media teacher to serve as a library media for a sufficient period of time to enroll in a library media teacher credential program and begin service on a library media emergency permit.

Responses Representing Personal Opinions in Opposition

Comments made by persons in opposition expressed concerns on a number of subjects in common. Staff is presenting those common concerns with a list of the organizations that expressed each given concern.

1. These proposed regulations allow for non-credentialed staff to continue to serve in functions that require a higher level of training than most non-credentialed staff are given. Credentialed library staff are needed in every library.

- Judith E. Marlin, Library Media Teacher, San Jose Unified School District
- Bobbie Xuereb, Librarian, Kroc Middle School, San Diego Unified School District
- Christine M. Allen, District Librarian K-12, Riverside Unified School District

Commission Staff Response

The Commission has accepted the necessity of many districts to employ non-credentialed staff in the provision of library services. Budgetary constraints and the current shortage of credentialed library media teachers do not allow for the possibility of staffing every school library with a library media teacher. However, by employing a library media teacher to design the library program and train and assign staff to those duties which reasonably can be fulfilled by non-credentialed staff, a reasonable level of quality both in program design and implementation is ensured without creating unreasonable hardships for districts.

2. These regulations would adversely affect districts' ability to provide library services with funds currently available for that purpose.

- Jim Ochs, Superintendent, Pacheco Union School District
- Jim Abbott, Assistant Superintendent, Tahoe Truckee Unified School District

Commission Staff Response

These regulations allow for a majority of the day-to-day on-site library duties to be performed by non-credentialed staff. This option would at least ensure that program design and coordination and staff training would be directed by an appropriately prepared individual.

3. Current library programs do not develop enough library media teachers to meet the demand created by these regulations.

- Kym Woolston, Librarian, Oak Ridge High School, El Dorado Union High School District

Commission Staff Response

These regulations allow for credentialed teachers interested in completing a library media teacher services credential program to serve as a library media teacher for up to two years prior to enrolling in such a program. Once enrolled, such an individual may serve up to five years on a library media emergency permit while completing program requirements. Staff believes that this level of flexibility provides a reasonable time period during which a teacher may identify and select a credential program and complete requirements for the library media credential.

Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed regulations.



(916) 445-0234

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

99-9903

DATE: February 19, 1999

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

FROM: Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director

SUBJECT: Proposed Amendments to Section 80053 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to Credentials Authorizing Service as a Library Media Services Teacher

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:

April 15, 1999
1:30 p.m.
Commission on Teacher Credentialing Office
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California

Statement of Reasons

Purpose/Effect of Proposed Action

The proposed amendments to Title 5 Section 80053 are intended to provide clarification of the library duties that require possession of a library media teacher services credential and those duties that may be performed by staff not holding that credential. Within the amendments is a provision for credentialed teachers who intend to obtain a library media teacher services credential to serve as a school library media teacher for a limited time period during which time they must begin to complete credential requirements. This provision is intended to encourage teachers to pursue the library media teacher services credential by easing their transition into the library services field. Specific changes to Title 5 Section 80053, Subsections (b) and (c) are proposed as follows:

- Subsection (b) is amended to establish that the holder of the Library Media Teacher Services Credential is authorized to coordinate or supervise library programs at the school district or county level, and may plan the course of instruction for students who assist in the operation of school libraries;
- Subsection (b)(1) has been added to allow for employers to place a credentialed classroom teacher in the role of the library media teacher, provided the classroom teacher is trained in those duties by a credentialed library media teacher, makes progress toward completing a Library Media Teacher Services credential program and obtains the emergency permit authorizing this service within the first two years of service under this subsection, and obtains the full credential within five years from the beginning of this service;
- Subsection (b)(2) has been added to clarify that non-credentialed personnel may be assigned to assist in the provision of library services, provided that they are trained in their duties by a credentialed library media teacher and that their duties are limited to include only basic services and exclude those services specifically requiring the Library Media Teacher Services authorization; and,
- Subsection (c) has been amended to refer to Title 5 Section 80553 for the dating of library media teacher services credentials.

Documents Relied Upon in Preparing Regulations

None.

Incorporated by Reference

None.

Written Comment Period

Any interested person, or his or her authorized representative, may submit written comments on the proposed actions. The written comment period closes at 5:00 p.m. on April 14, 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 Certification Division office at (916) 445-0234 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 modifications) will be made available for public comment for at least 15 days before they are adopted.

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 80053. Services Credential Authorizing Service as a Library Media Service Teacher.

- (a) The minimum requirements for the Library Media Teacher Services Credential shall include all of the following:
 - (1) a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university;
 - (2) a valid basic California teaching credential that requires a program of professional preparation including student teaching, or equivalent;
 - (3) completion of either A or B;
 - (A) A Commission-approved Library Media Teacher Services program; or
 - (B) Completion of an out-of-state Library Services Program of at least 30 graduate semester units, approved by the appropriate state agency.
 - (4) passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test as specified in Education Code Section 44252(b).
- (b) Authorization. The Library Media Teacher Services Credential authorizes the holder to assist and instruct pupils in the choice and use of library materials; to plan and coordinate school library programs with the instructional programs of a school district; to select materials for school and district libraries; to coordinate or supervise library programs at the school district or county level; to plan and conduct a planned course of instruction for those pupils who assist in the operation of school libraries; to supervise classified personnel assigned school library duties; and to develop procedures for and management of the school and district libraries.
 - (1) Holders of valid California teaching credentials based upon a baccalaureate degree who do not hold a credential authorizing service as a librarian may assist in providing library services in public schools, provided that they are trained in their duties by a credentialed school librarian and supervised by an individual holding certification authorizing such supervision. Teachers employed to provide library services under this provision must, during the first year of service, either apply for the Library Media Teacher Services Emergency Permit and pursue enrollment in a Commission-accredited regional or distance-learning library media teacher services credential program, or submit to the county office of education a description of the factors that made it impossible to enroll in such a program. All teachers must obtain the Library Media Teacher Services Emergency Permit before the end of the second year of service under this provision.

- (2) Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude local governing boards from employing non-credentialed individuals to assist in the provision of library services, provided that the employment of non-credentialed personnel is not intended to supersede the requirement to include holders of the Library Media Teacher Services Credential in the coordination and implementation of public school library programs. Services provided by non-credentialed personnel shall not include those activities requiring possession of a valid Library Media Teacher Services Credential, as specified in Subsection (b) of this section.
- (c) The school library media teacher services credential shall be issued for five years. 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 (d) and 44269, Education Code.



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

