



[Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[Home](#) | [CA Home Page](#) | [Governor's Home Page](#) | [About the Commission](#) | [Credential Information](#) | [Examination Information](#)
[Coded Correspondence](#) | [Credential Alerts](#) | [Educational Standards](#) | [Reports-on-Line](#) | [Committee on Accreditation](#)
[Troops to Teachers](#) | [Other Sites of Interest](#)

Agenda

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

March 1-2, 2000 • Commission Offices • 1900 Capitol Avenue • Sacramento, CA 96814

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

Click on the  to view the items that are available.

WEDNESDAY, March 1, 2000 Commission Office

1. Executive Committee 11:00 a.m.

- EXEC-1** Approval of the December 1, 1999 Executive Committee Minutes
- EXEC-2** Proposed Contract for Strategic Planning Assistance
- EXEC-3** Appeals and Waivers Committee Procedures Regarding Precedential Decision

2. 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)

3. Appeals and Waivers (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: Denial Calendar
- A&W-6** Precedential Decisions

THURSDAY, March 2, 2000 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 February 2000 Minutes
- GS-4** Approval of the March Agenda
- GS-5** Approval of the March 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 Veneman)

-  **LEG-1** Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission
-  **LEG-2** Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission
-  **LEG-3** Additional Legislative Concepts for Consideration by the Commission for Sponsorship in 2000

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

-  **PERF-1** Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA): Proposed 2000-01 Test Fees and Contract Amendment
-  **PERF-2** Proposed Change in Policy Relating to Praxis Exam Scores

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

-  **PREP-1** Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities
-  **PREP-2** Recommendations Related to the Reciprocity Study Under AB 1620
-  **PREP-3** Proposed Adoption of Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics
-  **PREP-4** Recommended Submission of State Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership Grant Proposal to the United States Department of Education

5. Fiscal Planning & Policy Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Miner)

-  **FPPC-1** Update on the Management Study Mandated by the 1999 Budget Act
-  **FPPC-2** Update on the 2000-2001 Governor's Budget
-  **FPPC-3** Overview of the Legislative Analyst's Review of the 2000-2001 Governor's Budget

6. Certificated Assignments Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Harvey)

-  **C&CA-1** Proposed Addition of Title 5 Section 80016, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to Certificates of Completion of Staff Development to Teach English Language Development and/or Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English to Limited-English-Proficient Students

7. Public Hearing

1:30 p.m.

-  **Public Hearing** Proposed Addition of §80071.5 Pertaining to the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment

8. Reconvene General Session

- GS-10** Report of the Appeals and Waivers Committee
- GS-11** Report of Executive Committee
- GS-12** Report of Closed Session Items
- GS-13** Commissioners Reports
- GS-14** Audience Presentations
- GS-15** Old Business
 - Quarterly Agenda for March, April & May 2000
- GS-16** New Business

All Times Are Approximate and Are Provided for Convenience Only**Except Time Specific Items Identified Herein (i.e. Public Hearing)****The Order of Business May be Changed Without Notice**

Persons wishing to address the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing on a subject to be considered at this meeting are asked to complete a Request Card and give it to the Recording Secretary prior to the discussion of the item.

Reasonable Accommodation for Any Individual with a Disability

Any individual with a disability who requires reasonable accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or function of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing may request assistance by contacting the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814; telephone, (916) 445-0184.

NEXT MEETING**April 13, 2000****California Commission on Teacher Credentialing****1900 Capitol Avenue****Sacramento, CA 95814**

[Top](#) | [CA Home Page](#) | [Governor's Home Page](#) | [About the Commission](#) | [Credential Information](#) | [Examination Information](#)

[Coded Correspondence](#) | [Credential Alerts](#) | [Educational Standards](#) | [Reports-on-Line](#) | [Committee on Accreditation](#)

[Troops to Teachers](#) | [Other Sites of Interest](#) | [Home](#)



California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: LEG-1

Committee: Legislative

Title: Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action

✓ Information

Prepared by: Rod Santiago, Legislative Liaison
Office of Governmental Relations

BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING February 15, 2000

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)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 457 — Scott Would add internet-based sex offenses to the list of specified mandatory revocation offenses	Sponsor (3/99)	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 466 — Mazzoni Omnibus clean-up bill	Sponsor (3/99)	Signed by the Governor&endash;- Chaptered
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)	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 1067 — Margett Would bring Education Code provisions related to lewd and lascivious Penal Code violations into conformity	Sponsor (4/99)	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 1282 — Jackson Would require CCTC to make improvements needed to enhance CBEST	Sponsor (4/99)	Signed by the Governor&endash;- Chaptered
Clean-up Bill — Mazzoni, et. al. Would clean-up various provisions of the Education Code	Sponsor (2/99)	Not yet Introduced

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
SB 151 - Haynes Would allow a person who meets prescribed requirements to qualify for a Professional Clear teaching credential	Seek Amendments (2/99) Oppose Unless Amended (4/99) Oppose (7/99)	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
SB 179 - Alpert Would require the Commission to ensure that expanded teacher internship programs are fully integrated and cooperatively taught (Last amended 1/12/00)	Support if Amended (2/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 395 — Hughes Would remove the sunset date on SDAIE staff development training	Seek Amendments (4/99) Support (7/99)	Signed by the Governor&endash;- Chaptered
SB 472 — Pochigian Would establish a pilot program to provide grants to school districts using a mathematics specialist to teach mathematics aligned to the statewide content standards in grades 4, 5, and 6 (Last Amended 1/26/00)	Support (4/99)	To Assembly
SB 573 — Alarcon Would state the intent of the Legislature to establish a pilot program that will enhance the retention rate of experienced teachers, enhance the opportunities for candidates to complete credentialing programs, and train teachers for more effective service in hard to staff schools. (Last Amended 1/26/00)	Watch (4/99) Support if Amended (5/99)	To Assembly

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) CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 2X - Mazzoni and Cunneen Would establish various programs related to reading and teacher recruitment	Support (2/99) Seek Amendments (3/99) CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 27X - Leach Would require CCTC to conduct a validity study of the CBEST	Oppose Unless Amended (2/99) CTC amendments adopted Watch (3/99)	Signed by the Governor&endash;- Chaptered
AB 31 - Reyes Extends APLE Program to applicants who agree to provide classroom instruction in school districts serving rural areas	Support (2/99)	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 108 - Mazzoni Subject Matter Projects	Support (2/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 192 — Scott Would create the California Teacher Cadet Program	Support (3/99)	Vetoed by the Governor
AB 578 — Honda Would require SPI, in consultation with CCTC and IHES, to develop training requirements for teachers to ensure sufficient training on domestic violence recognition	Watch (4/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 707 — House Would set forth requirements for a services credential with a specialization in school psychology	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 752 — Davis	Watch (4/99)	Senate Education

Would create two new single subject teaching credentials in dance and in theatre (Last amended 1/20/00)		Committee
AB 899 ‐ Alquist Would make changes to the APLE program related to allowing applicants to be enrolled on a half-time basis and redistribution of unused warrants (Last amended 1/3/00)	Support (5/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 908 ‐ Alquist Would require CCTC to adopt or revise standards to address gender equity	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 961 ‐ Steinberg Would create the Challenged School Teacher Attraction and Retention Act of 1999	Support (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1006 ‐ Ducheny Would establish a two-year pilot project to provide peer support and mentoring for school counselors	Support (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1059 ‐ Ducheny Would make various provisions in law related to CLAD training	Seek Amendments (4/99) Support (9/99)	Signed by the Governor‐; - Chaptered
AB 1242 ‐ Lempert Would require CCTC to issue a California Preliminary (CAP) Credential to persons meeting certain requirements	Seek Amendments (4/99) Oppose (6/99) Watch (9/99)	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 1296 ‐ Firebaugh Would also establish a hard-to-staff schools program	Watch (4/99) Seek Amendments (5/99) Disapprove (1/00)	Assembly Education Committee
AB 1324 ‐ Zettel Would allow holders of Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credentials who have ten years of experience teaching in a mild/moderate classroom to continue in this assignment	Oppose unless amended (2/00)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1529 ‐ Baldwin and Runner Would allow institutions of higher education who have received accreditation from any regional or national accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education to operate a teacher preparation program for purposes of California credentialing	Oppose (12/99)	Dropped by the author



[Back to the Top](#) |
[Back to March 2000 Agenda](#) |
[Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
[Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: LEG-2

Committee: Legislative

Title: Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action

✓ Information

Prepared by: Rod Santiago, Legislative Liaison
Office of Governmental Relations

Bill Analysis California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number: Assembly Bill 1900
Author(s): Assemblymember Darrell Steinberg
Sponsor: Assemblymember Darrell Steinberg
Subject of Bill: Mentoring and Support for Teachers
Date Introduced: February 11, 2000
Status in Leg. Process: Introduced
Current CTC Position: None
Recommended Position: Watch
Date of Analysis: February 15, 2000
Analyst(s): Rod Santiago and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Current law establishes the Marian Bergeson Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment System (BTSA). BTSA is designed to provide an effective transition into the teaching profession for first- and second-year teachers.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

AB 1900 would state that it is the intent of the Legislature to appropriate an unspecified amount of funds to schools in the lowest performance quartile to hire one full-time, onsite staff person who would provide intensive mentoring and support to all of the schools' first- and second-year teachers.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

Because the bill is only in the form of intent language, this bill would have no fiscal impact on the Commission.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative policies by the Commission

The following guidelines may 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.**
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.

Reasons for Suggested Position

The current version of this bill is in intent language. When the bill is amended to include more specific language, staff will bring it to the Commission for their review.

Bill Analysis California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Senate Bill 1431
Author(s):	Senators Ray Haynes, Dick Monteith, Bill Morrow, and Steve Peace
Sponsor:	Authors
Subject of Bill:	Subject Matter Programs
Date Introduced:	February 3, 2000
Status in Leg. Process:	Introduced
Current CTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Oppose
Date of Analysis:	February 15, 2000
Analyst(s):	Rod Santiago and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Current law allows teacher credential candidates to meet the subject matter competence credential requirement by successfully passing an examination approved by the Commission or completing approved course work that meets Commission standards.

Senate Bill 2042 (Alpert, Mazzoni, 1998) amended teacher preparation statutes by requiring that all aspects of teacher preparation, including demonstration of subject matter competence, meet Commission standards. SB 2042 also requires that subject matter examinations and program standards be revised to provide for alignment with the standards of student performance established by the State Board of Education in each subject matter area.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

Senate Bill 1431 would amend statutes governing the demonstration of subject matter competence to:

1. Repeal the course work option for credential candidates prepared in California.

2. Repeal the authority of the Commission to issue a credential based upon completion of a commission-approved subject matter preparation program.
3. Repeal the authority of the Commission to evaluate any subject matter program offered by an accredited institution of higher education.
4. Repeal the authority of the Commission to waive the subject matter examination requirement.

The subject matter program option would remain for out-of-state trained credential candidates.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

This bill could result in an increase in both exam revenue and expenditures.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative policies by the Commission

The following guideline may apply 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.**
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.**

Organizational Positions on the Bill

None known at this time.

Reasons for Suggested Position

With the amendments to law provided by SB 2042, all aspects of teacher preparation are standards-based. The new statute insures that subject matter programs meet Commission standards, and align with standards set by the state for students. At a time when California is experiencing a teacher shortage, it would not appear wise to eliminate an option that allows candidates to demonstrate competence.

Candidates who opt for the subject matter examination option may take course work to prepare for the exam. Such course work should be evaluated to determine whether it provides candidates an opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills tested. It would not appear wise to eliminate the state's ability to evaluate subject matter course work, especially when there is concern about the alignment between teacher preparation and student standards.

It is for these reasons that staff is recommending a position of **Oppose**.



[| Back to the Top |](#)
[| Back to March 2000 Agenda |](#)
[| Return to "Agenda Archives" |](#)
[| Return to "About CTC" |](#)





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: LEG-3

Committee: Legislative

Title: Additional Legislative Concepts for Consideration by the Commission for Sponsorship in 2000

✓ Action

✓ Information

Prepared by: Rod Santiago, Legislative Liaison

Office of Governmental Relations

Additional Legislative Concepts for Consideration by the Commission for Sponsorship in 2000

Staff will present additional concepts for Commissioners to consider as sponsored items for the 2000 Session.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to March 2000 Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: PERF-1

Committee: Performance Standards

Title: Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA): Proposed 2000-01 Test Fees and Contract Amendments

✓ Action

Prepared by: Linda M. Hooper, Ph.D., Assistant Consultant
Professional Services Division

Summary of an Agenda Report

Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA): Proposed 2000-01 Test Fees and Contract Amendments

Professional Services Division
February 14, 2000

Overview of this Report

California Education Code §44283 requires that most candidates for initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA). Pursuant to Education Code §44283.2, most applicants for initial Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credentials are required to pass the RICA effective January 1, 2000. Candidates can satisfy this requirement by passing either the RICA Written Examination or the RICA Video Performance Assessment. Education Code §44298 requires that, in the absence of designated appropriations by the Legislature from the Teacher Credentials fund, fees charged for an assessment be sufficient to cover the full cost of the assessment program. Because RICA registration bulletins are developed and published annually, the Commission has an annual opportunity to consider and adopt test fees for the following year. This report describes the costs of the RICA program, provides estimates of examinee volumes for 2000-01, proposes test fees for 2000-01 based on those estimates, and describes two proposed contract amendments related to the Video Performance Assessment.

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.

Policy Issue to be Resolved

What test fees should candidates be charged in 2000-01 for the RICA Written Examination and the RICA Video Performance Assessment?

Fiscal Impact Statement

The ongoing administration and development costs of the RICA must, by law, be recovered from candidates through test fees. The staff is recommending test fees for 2000-01 that are estimated to be sufficient to cover the Commission's costs for that year.

Recommendations

1. That the Commission adopt the following RICA test fees for administrations in 2000-01: \$122 for the Written Examination; \$220 for the Video Performance Assessment.
2. That the Commission adopt an amendment to the NES contract reducing the number of Video Performance Assessment submission deadlines from four a year to three.
3. That the Commission adopt an amendment to the NES contract removing the provision for a late submission deadline for the Video Performance Assessment.

Background

California Education Code §44283 requires that most candidates for initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials pass the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)¹. Pursuant to Education Code §44283.2, most applicants for initial Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credentials are required to pass the RICA effective January 1, 2000². Candidates can satisfy this requirement by passing either the RICA Written Examination or the RICA Video Performance Assessment. Education Code §44298 requires that, in the absence of designated appropriations by the Legislature from the Teacher Credentials fund, fees charged for an assessment be sufficient to cover the full cost of the assessment program. Because RICA registration bulletins are developed and published annually, the Commission has an annual opportunity to consider and adopt test fees for the following year. This report describes the costs of the RICA program, provides estimates of examinee volumes for 2000-01, proposes test fees for 2000-01 based on those estimates, and describes two proposed contract amendments related to the Video Performance Assessment.

The contract with National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) for the administration and ongoing development of the RICA allows the Commission to set new test fees yearly at no cost to the Commission. This is because the registration bulletins are updated and reprinted annually. The Commission reserves the right to change fees at other times, but the Commission will bear the cost of notifying the field of such a change. The contract requires that, to be included in the subsequent year's RICA Registration Bulletin, the test fees must be set no later than March 9.

¹Exceptions are (a) candidates who hold a valid California teaching credential based on a teacher education program including student teaching and (b) candidates who hold a valid teaching credential that authorizes teaching in an elementary classroom setting issued by a jurisdiction in the United States other than California.

²Exceptions are (a) candidates who hold a valid California teaching credential based on a teacher education program including student teaching, (b) candidates who hold a valid teaching credential that authorizes teaching in a comparable special education setting to the document sought issued by a jurisdiction in the United States other than California, and (c) candidates who are applying for an Early Childhood Special Education Certificate or Early Childhood Special Education Credential.

The current RICA fees for 1999-00 are:

Written Examination \$127

Video Performance Assessment \$220

Costs of the RICA Program

In operating the RICA program, the Commission bears costs in two major categories. The contracted costs category is the largest and is for test administration and ongoing development performed by NES. The other cost category includes the Commission's other RICA-related expenses, primarily personnel. Details about each of these two cost categories are described below.

Contract Costs

The Commission's contract with NES specifies per-examinee costs for RICA administration and development that vary based on the annual volume of examinees. These costs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Contract Cost Per Examinee
Based on Annual Examinee Volume

Component	Annual Examinee Volume	Contract Cost Per Examinee
Written Examination	9,000-9,999	\$160
	10,000-13,999	130
	14,000-19,999	110
	20,000-24,999	95
Video Performance Assessment	1-499	\$345
	500-999	295
	1,000-1,999	245
	2,000-2,499	240

The costs shown in Table 1 cover both (a) the administration of the RICA Written Examination six times per year and the Video Performance Assessment four times per year and (b) the continued development of assessment materials. Administration costs include, but are not limited to, the following:

- test security measures
- program communications and materials production
- registration bulletin and system
- site identification
- hiring and training of test administrators
- test administration
- provision of alternative testing arrangements for eligible examinees
- hiring and training of scorers
- scoring and score reporting

Ongoing RICA development costs include, but are not limited to, the following:

- drafting test items
- facilitating review of the draft items by the Bias Review Committee and the RICA Advisory Panel
- field-testing the draft items
- scoring field-test responses and analyzing field-test results
- facilitating review of the field-test results by the Bias Review Committee and the RICA Advisory Panel
- finalizing test items for use on operational test forms
- facilitating the selection of marker responses by the RICA Advisory Panel

Pursuant to the Commission's contract with NES, after each administration in a testing year, the Commission pays NES a per-examinee cost that is based on the estimated

annual number of examinees of the prior year. Following the last administration in a year, when the actual number of examinees for the year is known, the Commission and NES reconcile the amount paid to NES. If the number of examinees in the year falls in a volume range *lower* than expected, the cost per examinee will be higher than what the Commission had been paying, and the Commission will pay NES the difference. If the number of examinees in the year falls in a volume range *higher* than expected, the cost per examinee will be lower than what the Commission had been paying, and NES will reimburse the Commission the difference. For the subsequent year, the per-examinee payment to NES for each administration will be set based on the annual number of examinees in the year that just ended. So that the test fees charged candidates are sufficient to pay NES for its costs of administration and development, the Commission has the opportunity on a yearly basis to change the fees, if necessary.

Non-Contract Costs

The Commission incurs additional costs associated with the overall management and administration of the RICA beyond the contract costs described above. Unlike the contract costs, these other costs are not related to examinee volume. These non-contract costs include staff time for managing the program, monitoring the contract, and completing other Commission responsibilities related to the program. In addition, the Commission is responsible for the travel and meeting expenses of the RICA Advisory Panel.

As required by law, the Commission will continue to solicit the expert advice of the RICA Advisory Panel in 2000-01. The final phase of RICA development in the NES contract will be completed during that year. Panel members will play an essential role in reviewing and revising new assessment materials.

The estimated 2000-01 costs for these Commission responsibilities are shown in Table 2.

Table 2
Estimated Non-Contract Costs for 2000-01

Category	Annual Cost
Personnel Costs	\$160,000
Advisory Panel Costs	22,000
Operating Expenses*	26,000
TOTAL	\$208,000

* Supplies, communications, travel, materials, postage, printing, etc.

Estimated RICA Examinee Volumes For 2000-01

An important variable in determining test fees for the upcoming year is the number of anticipated examinees. The RICA costs each year should be prorated over the number of examinees so that the test fees are sufficient to cover the Commission's contract and non-contract costs described above. The two types of information used to estimate the number of RICA examinees in 2000-01 are credential volume and prior and current years' examinee volume. Each is reviewed below.

Credential Volume

Education Code §44283 requires that most candidates for initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials pass the RICA. In 1997-98, the Commission issued approximately 12,000 Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials to candidates who would have had to pass the RICA had it been in effect at that time. Staff estimates that the Commission will award approximately 13,000 Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials in 1998-99, 15,600 Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials in 1999-00, and 16,600 Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials in 2000-01 to candidates who will have to pass the RICA.

Pursuant to Education Code §44283.2, most applicants for initial Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credentials will be required to pass the RICA effective January 1, 2000 (halfway through the 1999-00 year). In 1997-98, the Commission issued approximately 2,400 of these credentials to candidates who, if they had applied after January 1, 2000, would have had to pass the RICA. Staff estimates that the Commission will award approximately 2,400 Education Specialist Instruction Credentials in 1998-99 and does not expect this number to change much this year (1999-00) or next year (2000-01). Staff expects that the Commission will award approximately 2,400 such credentials in 2000-01 to candidates who will have to pass the RICA.

Using these figures, it appears that in 2000-01 there will be at least 19,000 credential candidates (at least 16,600 Multiple Subject Teaching Credential candidates and approximately 2,400 Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential candidates) who will have to pass the RICA.

Prior and Current Years' Examinee Volume

Another source of information for projecting examinee volumes for 2000-01 is prior (1998-99) and current year-to-date (1999-00) examinee volumes. For the Written Examination, there were 16,769 examinees in 1998-99, the first full year of administration. For the first four (of six) administrations in 1999-00, there were approximately 9,200 examinees. Based on these numbers, staff estimates that 19,000 examinees will take the Written Examination in 1999-00.

For the Video Performance Assessment, there were 135 examinees in 1998-99. For the first two (of four) submission deadlines in the current year (1999-00), there were 12 examinees. Staff estimates a total of 50 Video Performance Assessment examinees in 1999-00.

Estimated Examinee Volumes For 2000-01

Using the credential and examinee volume information described above, staff estimates the following examinee volumes for 2000-01:

Written Examination:	19,000 examinees
Video Performance Assessment:	50 examinees
Total:	19,050 examinees

Recommended RICA Fees for 2000-01

The information provided above can be used to develop recommended test fees for 2000-01. It is anticipated that 19,000 examinees will take the Written Examination and 50 examinees will take the Video Performance Assessment. According to these anticipated examinee volumes, the Commission will owe NES \$110 for each Written Examination and \$345 for each Video Performance Assessment administered (from Table 1). As displayed in Table 2, the Commission's estimated 2000-01 non-contract cost is \$208,000. The Commission could recover this non-contract cost by charging each candidate an additional \$11.00 (down from \$15.00 in the current year).

Combining both the contractor costs at the estimated examinee volumes and the Commission's costs would result in the following RICA fees for 2000-01.

RICA Written Examination:	\$121 (110 + 11)
	(down from \$127 in the current year)

RICA Video Performance Assessment:	\$356 (345 + 11)
	(up from \$220 in the current year)

Staff does not recommend adoption of these fees, however, for the following reasons. Education Code §44283, which established the RICA, requires the Commission to administer the following two RICA components:

- (1) A comprehensive examination of the knowledge and skill pertaining to effective reading instruction of the credential candidate. (The Commission has developed and administers the RICA Written

Component	Annual Examinee Volume	Contract Cost Per Examinee
Video Performance Assessment	250 1-499	\$345
	500-999	295
	1,000-1,999	245
	2,000-2,499	240

In accepting this amendment, NES agreed not to charge the Commission more than \$345 per Video Performance Assessment examinee regardless of examinee volume, even though the per examinee costs are greater with lower volumes. Staff recommends that the Commission adopt two additional amendments that, given the prior contract amendment, will assist the contractor in keeping costs in line with revenue. These amendments, which, if adopted, would be implemented in 2000-01 (the last year of the contract) would not increase Commission or candidate costs.

Reduction of the Video Performance Assessment Submission Deadlines

Staff recommends that the Commission amend the contract by reducing the number of Video Performance Assessment submission deadlines from four to three per year. Current submission deadlines occur four times throughout the year, twice in the summer/fall and twice in the winter/spring. Most candidates take either component of the RICA in the spring months. If the Commission adopts this amendment, NES would schedule three submission deadlines for 2000-01: one in the fall and two in the spring. Reducing the number of submission deadlines to three per year should increase the number of candidate submissions per event and make the scoring of the Video Performance Assessment more cost effective for NES.

One Submission Deadline Per Video Performance Assessment Event

Staff also recommends that the Commission amend the contract by having a single submission deadline for each Video Performance Assessment event, rather than a regular and a late submission deadline. The current regular and late submission deadlines for each administration are one week apart. This amendment would allow NES more time to plan for scoring sessions.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
 | [Back to March 2000 Agenda](#) |
 | [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
 | [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: PERF-2

Committee: Performance Standards

Title: Proposed Change in Policy Relating to Praxis Exam Scores

✓ Action

Prepared by: Darya Callihan, Assistant Consultant
Professional Services Division

Summary of an Agenda Report

Proposed Change in Policy Relating to Praxis Exam Scores

Professional Services Division
February 15, 2000

Overview of this Report

Prospective teachers can satisfy the subject matter competence requirement for Single Subject Teaching Credentials by either (a) completing a Commission-approved subject matter program or (b) passing Commission-approved subject matter examinations. For this purpose, the Commission uses the *Praxis Series* administered by Educational Testing Service, and the *Single Subject Assessments for Teaching* (SSAT) administered by National Evaluation Systems, Inc.

At the Commission's April 14-15, 1999, meeting, staff presented a report summarizing the results of standard setting studies conducted in December 1998 on the SSAT and Praxis Series exams for twelve single subject credential areas. On the basis of this report, the Commission approved extensive changes to the examination passing scores, to the passing score model used for many of the pairs of required Praxis examinations, and approved plans for implementing the changes. The implementation plan included a provision that would require candidates in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science to take both required Praxis exams at the same test administration beginning in July 2000. In this report, staff recommends that the Commission rescind this policy, and allow candidates in these subject areas to continue to combine scores from different test administrations in meeting the overall passing scores.

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.

Policy Issue to be Resolved

Should the Commission allow candidates in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science to continue after July 2000 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?

Fiscal Impact Statement

There are no costs associated with this agenda report.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission revise the policies adopted in April 1999 to allow candidates in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science to continue after July 2000 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.

Background

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: (a) completion of a Commission-approved program of subject matter preparation for teaching in the subject area, or (b) passage of the Commission-approved subject matter examinations. The Commission-approved subject matter examinations for Single Subject Teaching Credentials are the Praxis II subject assessments in *The Praxis Series*, administered by Educational Testing Service, and the *Single Subject Assessments for Teaching* (SSAT), administered by National Evaluation Systems, Inc.

The Commission's April 14-15, 1999, agenda included a report entitled "Reestablishing Passing Standards for SSAT and Praxis Exams as a Requirement for Twelve Single Subject Teaching Credentials." This report summarized the results of standard setting studies conducted in December 1998 on the single subject exams in art, biology, chemistry, English, French, general science, geoscience, mathematics, music, physical education, physics, social science, and Spanish. In April 1999, the Commission adopted recommended passing standards and associated implementation dates. The Commission also adopted the following two policies related to the exams in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science:

- (1) 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 scores in effect at the time the exams were taken, and (b) scores earned after the effective date of the new passing standards.
- (2) 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.

Staff has since had the opportunity to consider the full effect of recommendation (2) above, and believes that the anticipated negative impact of this requirement on candidates and the implications of current Title 5 regulations pertaining to the validity period of exam scores justify rescinding this action.

Proposal to Rescind Commission Action Requiring Candidates to Take Both Required Praxis Exams at the Same Test Administration

It is important to understand the reasons for the original recommendation that would require examinees to take both required Praxis exams on the same administration date before

considering this proposal to rescind the action. Prior to April 1999, a partially-compensatory passing score model was in place for the pairs of Praxis exams in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science. For each pair of exams, there was 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 had to 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 could combine passing and minimum scores from different administrations of the exams in a subject area.

In April 1999, for the Praxis exams in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science, the Commission adopted the recommendations of the standard setting committees and staff to replace the partially-compensatory passing score model with the more psychometrically sound fully-compensatory passing score model. 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 combined scores on the two Praxis exams in a subject area. 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 can 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.

To fully realize the benefits of the fully-compensatory passing score model, staff was authorized to pursue changes to the administration of the Praxis exams in these subject areas with Educational Testing Service (ETS). The changes sought would have resulted in (a) one registration test code for the two exams, (b) one test fee for the two exams, and (c) one overall test score given for the two exams. Unfortunately, staff was unable to make these changes with ETS, largely because the Praxis exams are nationally administered exams and policies for the administration of exams in one state affect the administration of the exams in other states.

Because staff was unable to secure the necessary changes in the administration of the Praxis exams, candidates will continue to receive separate scores for each Praxis test. Given this, implementation of the policy adopted in April 1999 requiring that, to meet the exam requirement, candidates use scores on Praxis exams that were earned on the same administration date would violate Title 5 regulations. Pursuant to Title 5 §80071, exam scores used to apply for credentials are valid for a period of five years. Therefore, a candidate with scores on the two Praxis exams that are less than five years old and whose sum equals or exceeds the passing standard has met the Praxis exam requirement. The Commission would have no legal basis for not accepting those scores and requiring the candidate to earn the overall passing score by taking both exams on the same administration date.

For this reason, staff recommends that the Commission revise the policies adopted in April 1999 to allow candidates in art, mathematics, music, physical education, and social science to continue after July 2000 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.



[| Back to the Top |](#)
[| Back to March 2000 Agenda |](#)
[| Return to "Agenda Archives" |](#)
[| Return to "About CTC" |](#)





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

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
February 14, 2000

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 program, the institution has responded fully to the Commission's standards and preconditions for subject matter preparation for Single Subject Teaching Credentials. The program has been reviewed thoroughly by the Commission's Subject Matter Program Review Panel, and has met all applicable standards and preconditions established by the Commission and is recommended for approval by that

panel.

Recommendation

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

Languages Other Than English

- San Diego State University (Spanish)

B. Summary Information on Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs Awaiting Commission Approval

For the following proposed preparation program, the institution has responded fully to the Commission's standards and preconditions for subject matter preparation for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials. The program has been reviewed thoroughly by the Commission's Elementary Subject Matter Program Review Panel, and has met all applicable standards and preconditions established by the Commission and is recommended for approval by that panel.

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the following program of elementary subject matter preparation for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials.

Liberal Studies Program

- Sonoma State University



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to March 2000 Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: PREP-2

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Recommendations Related to the AB 1620 Reciprocity Study

✓ Action

Prepared by: Philip A. Fitch, Ph.D., Consultant; Darya Callihan, Assistant Consultant; and Sara Swan, Staff Analyst
Professional Services Division

Recommendations Related to the AB 1620 Reciprocity Study

Professional Services Division
February 15, 2000

Executive Summary

The periodic review of teacher preparation outside of California required by Section 1 of Assembly Bill 1620 is a multi-step process that includes a review of each state's accreditation procedures, elementary and secondary pedagogical standards, special education teacher preparation standards, and subject matter knowledge requirements in thirteen teaching credential areas. This agenda report provides Commissioners with an eighth report regarding the AB 1620 Reciprocity Study. Included are recommendations of comparability based on the decisions of the AB 1620 Task Force at its January 2000 meeting, and the initial recommendations of state comparability in subject matter requirements for beginning teachers of art, music, and physical education.

Fiscal Impact Summary

AB 1620 appropriated \$90,000 from the Teachers 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 and to initiate reciprocity agreements, but will not be sufficient to cover the ongoing activities necessary to maintain reciprocity agreements with other states. Future budget enhancements would be necessary if the process is to be ongoing.

Recommendations

There are two recommendations in this agenda item. The AB 1620 Task Force recommends that the Commission approve the findings from its January meeting, that several states have comparable preparation in the clear credential requirements of Health Education, Computer Education, and Special Education. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the initial twenty-five subject matter recommendations in three of the Phase III subjects: art, music, and physical education.

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 with 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. Education Code Section 44274 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.

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. In addition to Section 44274, AB 1620 authorizes the Commission to grant credentials to out-of-state teachers with three to five years of teaching experience who verify that they meet the specified requirements. In November 1998, the Commission approved a plan for implementing the provisions related to experienced teachers, and the Commission is now able to grant credentials to experienced teachers from other states who meet the requirements.

During September and October 1998, members of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing 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 of that year, letters of request for information were sent to the other forty-nine states and the District of Columbia by the Executive Director. To date material has been received from forty-eight 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. 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 met ten times for two days in January, February, March, April, May, June, September, October, November 1999, and in January 2000, to develop and implement procedures for determining comparability. To date the Reciprocity Task Force has reviewed accreditation and program standards from forty-eight states. In addition to the comparability of standards, the Task Force reviewed out-of-state requirements in Computer Education, Health Education and Mainstreaming for the professional clear Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials. This report includes recommendations for those states determined to be comparable in accreditation procedures and elementary and secondary standards.

A third component of the review of other states' teacher preparation requirements is the review of the subject matter (or content knowledge) requirements. The review of subject matter requirements commenced in March 1999, with the approval of a contract with Linda Wurzbach of Resources for Learning. Ms. Wurzbach is conducting the subject matter comparability studies in three phases: Phase I includes the English, mathematics, multiple subjects (elementary education), and social science credential areas; Phase II covers the subjects required for the four science credential areas: biological science, chemistry, geoscience, and physics; and Phase III comprises the art, French, music, physical education, and Spanish credential subject areas. In November 1999 and January and February 2000, Commission staff presented recommendations based on the completed subject matter analyses in the Phase I and II subject areas. In this report, recommendations of comparability in three of the five subject areas included in Phase III (art, music, and physical education) are presented. Staff expect to present recommendations of comparability in French and Spanish, and additional recommendations of comparability in the Phase I, II, and III subject areas in May 2000.

Recommendations

Following are two recommended actions for this agenda report.

- (1) That the Commission approve the recommendations of comparability for out-of state requirements in Health Education, Computer Education, and Special Education:
- Health Education:** Florida, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming
- Computer Education:** Alabama, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming
- Special Education:** Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming
- (2) That the Commission approve the recommendations of subject-matter comparability in the following Phase III subject areas:
- Art:** Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Michigan, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee
- Music:** Colorado, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Virginia
- Physical Education:** Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Tennessee

AB 1620 Task Force Recommendations Related to Health Education, Computer Education, and Special Education

At its January 13 and 14, 2000 meeting, the Reciprocity Task Force reviewed the twenty-seven states found comparable in accreditation and elementary and secondary preparation standards for requirements in Health Education, Computer Education, and Special Education. Title 5 Regulations (Sections 80421, 80422, and 80032.2) define these requirements for the California Professional Clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential, which are summarized below:

- (1) Health Education: Completion of a unit requirement in health education, including, but not limited to, nutrition, the physiological and sociological effects of abuse of alcohol, narcotics, and drugs, and the use of tobacco. This requirement must include verification of training in cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR).
- (2) Computer Education: Satisfactory completion of computer education coursework which includes general and specialized skills in the use of computers in educational settings.
- (3) Special Education: Completion of course work in the laws, methods and requirements for providing educational opportunities to individuals with exceptional needs in the regular classroom.

Of the twenty-seven states reviewed, the Task Force found evidence of coverage of one or more of these subject areas in the pre-service stage of teacher preparation either integrated across the required curriculum or in stand-alone courses in twenty-six states.

Based on their review, the Task Force recommends that the Commission approve the findings of comparability in Health Education, Computer Education, and Special Education requirements shown in [Table 1](#) below.

Table 1: Reciprocity Task Force Recommendations Related to Professional Clear Credential Requirements

Comparable States in Elementary/Secondary Education	Health Education	Computer Education	Special Education
Alabama		X	X
Arizona			X
Colorado		X	X
Delaware		X	X
Florida	X	X	X
Georgia		X	X

Illinois		X	X
Iowa		X	X
Kansas		X	X
Maine		X	X
Maryland		X	X
Michigan		X	
Missouri		X	X
Nebraska	X		X
North Carolina		X	X
North Dakota		X	X
Pennsylvania	X	X	X
Rhode Island	X	X	X
South Carolina	X	X	X
South Dakota	X	X	X
Tennessee	X	X	
Utah	X	X	X
Virginia		X	X
Washington	X	X	X
Wisconsin	X	X	X
Wyoming	X	X	X

Subject Matter Comparability Recommendations

Ms. Linda Wurzbach of Resources for Learning is conducting the comparability studies of the subject matter preparation requirements in other states. To date, the Commission has approved ninety-seven total recommendations of subject matter comparability in the Phase I (English, mathematics, multiple subjects, and social science) and Phase II (science: biological science, science: chemistry, science: geoscience, and science: physics) credential subject areas. The twenty-three current recommendations of state comparability for the preparation of teachers of art, music, and physical education are indicated in [Table 2](#) below. In May 2000, staff expects to present recommendations in the two remaining Phase III subject areas of French and Spanish, and a comprehensive report of the subject matter comparability recommendations in all thirteen subject areas.

**Table 2: Phase III Subject Matter Comparability
Art, Music, and Physical Education**

States Recommended or Approved as Comparable in Accreditation & Preparation Standards	Single Subject Art	Single Subject Music	Single Subject Physical Education
Colorado		X	X
Florida	X		X
Georgia	X		X
Illinois			X
Indiana			X
Maryland	X	X	X
Michigan	X		X

Missouri		X	X
North Carolina	X	X	X
Pennsylvania	X	X	X
South Carolina			X
Tennessee	X		X
Virginia		X	

Status of Comparability Studies

The total Findings of Comparability for Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education Teacher Preparation Programs Completed Between 1-1-97 and 1-1-2003, as of February 3, 2000 Commission action, are provided in [Tables 3 and 4](#) on the following pages. The Executive Director recently distributed the information in these tables to the field with correspondence on the addition of Title 5 Regulations Pertaining to Reciprocity. Similar state-specific information was simultaneously sent by the Executive Director to all states for which determinations of comparability have been made by the Commission, initiating negotiations towards establishing reciprocity agreements.

Table 3: Findings of Comparability for Elementary and Secondary Teacher Education Programs Completed Between 1-1-97 and 1-1-2003

The following table identifies the specific teacher preparation programs in other states that have been determined by the Commission to be comparable for the purposes of applying for the California five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential indicated.

State	Multiple Subject (Elementary/Self-Contained) Teacher Education Programs	Single Subject (Secondary/Departmentalized) Teacher Education Programs						
		English	Mathematics	Science: Biological Science	Science: Chemistry	Science: Geoscience	Science: Physics	Social Science
Alabama		English 6-12						
Arizona		Secondary English						
Colorado	Middle Childhood Education: Ages 6-12 Years	English Language Arts, Ages 11-15 or Ages 14-18	Mathematics, Ages 11-15 or Ages 14-18			Science Education, Ages 11-15 or Ages 14-18	Science Education, Physics Concentration, Ages 11-15 or Ages 14-18	Social Studies, Ages 11-15 or Ages 14-18
Delaware	Elementary K-4	English, Middle Level or 7-12	Mathematics 7-12					*Social Studies, Middle Level or 7-12
Florida		English, Middle Grades 5-9 or 6-12	Mathematics 6-12					Social Studies 6-12
Georgia	Elementary Education	English	Mathematics	Biology	Chemistry	Earth/Space Science	Physics	*Social Studies
Illinois	Elementary K-9	English	Mathematics	Biology	Chemistry	Earth/Space Science	Physics or Physical Science	*Social Studies
Indiana	Elementary Education	English	Mathematics	Biology	Chemistry	Earth/Space Science	Physics	*Social Studies
Kansas		English, Middle Level or Secondary						
Maryland	Elementary Education	English Language and Literature	Mathematics	Biology	Chemistry	Earth/Space Science	Physics or Physical Science	*Social Studies
Michigan		English	Mathematics					

Missouri		English	Mathematics	Biology	Unified Science-Chemistry	Geosciences	Physics	Social Studies
North Carolina		Language Arts, Middle Grades or English 9-12	Mathematics, Middle Grades or 9-12	Biology 9-12	Chemistry 9-12	Earth Science 9-12	Physics 9-12	Social Studies 9-12
Pennsylvania		English	Mathematics	Biology		Earth Science	Physics	Social Studies
Rhode Island	Elementary	English	Mathematics					*Social Studies
South Carolina	Elementary Education	English	General Mathematics	Biology	Chemistry		Physics	*Social Studies
Tennessee	Elementary Education	English	Mathematics	Biology	Chemistry	Earth Science	Physics	*Social Studies
Virginia	Early/Primary Education, PreK-3 or PreK-6	English	Mathematics	Biology	Chemistry	Earth Science	Physics	*Social Studies

* Programs in All the Social Science Disciplines are Comparable (i.e., Civics or Government, Economics, Geography, History, Psychology, or Social Studies)

Table 4: Findings of Comparability for Out-of-State Special Education Preparation Programs Completed Between 1-1-97 and 1-1-2003

The following table identifies the special education teacher preparation programs in other states that have been determined by the Commission to be comparable for the purposes of applying for the California preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential in the categorical areas indicated. In general, the categorical areas include the Federal disability categories listed in the [legend below](#). When the Commission determined that comparability requires the completion of a specific document(s) or level(s) by name or grade, or an additional requirement, it is noted on the chart.

State	M/M	M/S	DHH	PHI	VI	ECSE	CRS: AUD	CRS: LSH	CRS: SCA	CRS: O&M
Alabama	X	X	X	X	X	X		Master's Degree also Required ¹		
Arkansas			X		X	X		X		
Colorado	Moderate Needs	Requires both Severe Needs: Cognitive & Severe Needs: Affective	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Delaware	X				X		X	X		
Florida	Requires both Specific Learning Disabilities & Emotionally Handicapped		X	X	X			X		
Georgia	Requires both Learning Disabilities and Behavior Disorders		X	X	X					
Hawaii	X	X								
Indiana	X		X		X			X		

Iowa	Mild/ Moderate K-6 Only	Moderate/ Severe/ Profound K-12 Only	Hearing Impaired K-6 Only	Physically Handicapped K-6 Only	Visually Impaired K-6 Only	X				
Kansas							X	X		
Kentucky	X	X	X		X					
Louisiana	Requires both Mild/ Moderate & Add-On Mild Moderate	Requires both Severe/ Profound & Add-On Severe/ Profound	Requires both Hearing Impaired & Add-On Hearing Impaired		Requires both Visually Impaired & Add-On Visually Impaired	Requires both Early Interventionist & Add-On Early Interventionist				
Maine						X		X		
Maryland	X	X	X		X	X				
Massachusetts	X	X	Requires both Provisional Certificate Advanced Standing in ASL/TC ² & Oral/Aural		X					
Michigan	X	Requires both Mentally Impaired & Emotionally Impaired	X	X	X	X		X	X	
Missouri	X	X	X	X	X			X		
Montana	X									
Nebraska	X	X	Hearing Impaired Pre K-12 or K-9 or both Pre K-3 and 7-12		X	X		Speech-Language Pathologist Only		
New Hampshire	Requires both Emotionally Disturbed/ Behaviorally Disordered & Learning Disabled		X							
New Mexico	X									
North Carolina	Specific Learning Disabilities or Cross-Categorical ³	X	X		X	X	X	X		
North Dakota	X	Requires both Mentally Retarded & Emotionally Disturbed	X	X	X	X		X		
Oklahoma	X	X	X		X			X		
Oregon	X	X	X		X			X		
Pennsylvania	X	X	X		X			Master's Degree also Required ¹		

Rhode Island	X	X	X		X	Requires both Special Needs and Early Childhood Education	X	X		
South Carolina	X	X	X		X			X		
South Dakota	X		X			Birth through Preschool Special Education		X		
Tennessee	Requires Special Ed Modified Program Endorsement	Requires Special Ed Comprehensive Program Endorsement	X	X	X	X		X		
Utah	X	X	X		X	X				
Virginia	Requires both Emotional Disturbance & Learning Disabilities	Requires both Mental Retardation & Severe Disabilities	X		X	X		Master's Degree also Required ¹		
Washington							X	X		
Wisconsin	Requires both Learning Disabilities & Emotional Disturbance	Requires both Cognitive Disabilities & Emotional Disturbance	X			X		X		
Wyoming	X		X		X	X	X	X		

¹To meet the California standards, the applicant must hold a master's degree in the requested area in addition to having completed the comparable program.

²American Sign Language/Total Communication

³Mild/Moderate (with master's degree and license in Specific Learning Disabilities and license in Behaviorally-Emotionally Handicapped) was found to be comparable for the professional clear level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential.

Legend

Code	California Title	Federal Disability Categories
M/M	Mild/Moderate Disabilities	specific learning disability, mental retardation (mild/moderate), serious emotional disturbance
M/S	Moderate/Severe Disabilities	mental retardation (moderate/severe), serious emotional disturbance, multiple disabilities, autism, deaf-blindness
DHH	Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing	deafness or hearing impairment, deaf-blindness
PHI	Physical and Health Impairments	multiple disabilities, orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, traumatic brain injury
VI	Visual Impairments	deaf-blindness, visual impairment including blindness
ECSE	Early Childhood Special Education	birth through pre-kindergarten: mental retardation, serious emotional disturbance, multiple disabilities, autism, deaf-blindness
CRS:AUD	Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Audiology	audiology
CRS:LSH	Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Language, Speech and Hearing	language, speech and hearing therapy
CRS: SCA	Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Language, Speech and Hearing including the Special Class Authorization	language, speech and hearing therapy, plus authorization to teach classes for students with aphasia and other speech and language disabilities
CRS: O&M	Clinical or Rehabilitative Services: Orientation and Mobility	orientation and mobility





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



Home



California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number:PREP-3

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Proposed Adoption of Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics

✓ Action

Prepared by: Suzanne Tyson, Ed.D., Consultant
Professional Services Division

Proposed Adoption of Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics

Professional Services Division
February 10, 2000

Executive Summary

In December, 1999, the Commission reviewed the draft standards for the supplementary authorization in mathematics. The standards were drafted by an advisory panel of teachers and other experts. The Commission authorized the release and distribution of the draft standards for public comment and professional advice. On March 3, 2000, representatives of the advisory panel will present the proposed standards that have been amended on the basis of recommendations by teachers and teacher educators throughout California. In this report, the standards are now being recommended for adoption. (see [Attachment A](#)). Included in this report are details of the process used for field review of the draft program standards conducted by the Commission's staff in December 1999 and January 2000. The responses to the field review are summarized in this report, which also describes the tasks completed by the advisory panel during their final meeting on February 1, 2000.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

Should the Commission adopt the Proposed Standards for the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics recommended by the AB 496 Panel?

Fiscal Impact Summary

The standard adoption is funded through an allocation from the State of California's General Fund as specified in AB 496 (Alpert).

Recommendations

That the Commission adopt the recommended Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics that have been developed in final form by the Commission's Advisory Panel, and that appear in [Attachment A](#).

That the Commission change the authorization of the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics to be based upon content level rather than grade level.

Background Information

For at least a decade the Commission has been aware of the need to increase the number of qualified mathematics teachers in California classrooms. To this end the Commission has participated in a variety of activities and in 1997 conducted the study, entitled *Recruitment and Preparation of Teachers for Mathematics Instruction: Issues of Quantity and Quality in California*. AB 496 was an outgrowth of this report issued by the Commission.

In sponsoring AB 496, the Commission addresses the need of preparing more qualified mathematics teachers by establishing alternate paths to become a fully qualified math teacher and by targeting a grade level span that has the most need for qualified mathematics teachers. The law provides that the Commission

- establish standards for the award of supplementary authorizations, including those in mathematics, as another option in addition to the "unit and course work" option provided in regulation; and
- open an alternative, standards-based route to meeting requirements for the supplementary authorization through highly intensive professional development or local subject matter programs.

Currently, teachers earn a supplementary authorization in mathematics by taking a specified number of units and course work at an institution of higher education. This option remains in effect under AB 496. In addition to the course work option, AB 496 requires the Commission to establish standards for the award of supplementary authorizations and to establish a standards-based route to meet requirements for the supplementary authorization through highly intensive professional development programs that are not necessarily offered at post-secondary institutions. The standards-based approach is intended to more clearly specify the content for the supplementary authorizations and to provide a non-university option for teachers to learn the content required to earn a supplementary authorization in Mathematics. Panel members have developed the Standards for a Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics that are based on the new *Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools K-12* and the new *Mathematics Content Standards for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve, 1997* and *Mathematics Teacher Preparation in California: Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs, 1992*.

Distribution of the Draft Standards for Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics to Professional Educators

In correspondence to approximately 1,000 practicing teachers, teacher educators, and educational leaders throughout the state, the Executive Director invited comments about the Draft Standards for the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics. The draft standards were accompanied by (1) a cover letter explaining the purpose of the field review and (2) a response form with directions for completion and return to the Commission. During the week of December 10 the materials were sent to the following:

Deans of Education, California Colleges and Universities
Directors of Teacher Education, California Colleges and Universities
University Coordinators of Mathematics Education Programs
University Instructors of Mathematics Courses
County Superintendents of Schools
District Superintendents of Schools
Directors of California Mathematics Projects
Mathematics Professional Organizations

Principals of ninety randomly selected high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools. (Each principal was asked to respond to the standards and to forward a copy of the materials to a practicing teacher of mathematics.)

Request for Information that was Given to Each Review Participant

The Executive Director asked these practitioners, teacher educators, and leaders of California education to express their: (1) support for each standard, (2) support for each standard with suggested changes, or (3) lack of support for each standard. Respondents were also encouraged to comment on the rationale statements and the factors to consider.

Each respondent received a Response Form designed to facilitate the process of reviewing the materials and organizing their comment about the proposed standards. The Response Form also requested information pertaining to each individual respondent's professional position and employing organization. Table 1 provides data on the total responses received and a summary of respondent information:

Table 1

Number of Respondents

Total responses received	Respondents Representing Postsecondary Education	Respondents Representing Public Schools
40	13	27

Table 2

Text of Each Draft Standard for Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics

	Column 1 Support	Column 2 Support Changes	Column 3 Don't Support
<p>Standard 1: Program Philosophy and Purpose</p> <p>The program is based on an explicit statement of philosophy that expresses the program purpose and desired outcomes. The desired outcomes include a definition of a teacher who is well prepared to teach the mathematics content through Algebra 1 or Integrated Course 1</p>	31	5	4
<p>Standard 2: Program Design</p> <p>The program has a cohesive design that is consistent with the program philosophy and is grounded in research and effective practices on the mathematical education of teachers. The program balances opportunities for participants to gain knowledge in mathematics, reflect on the teaching of mathematics in light of this knowledge, and grow professionally through connections to the mathematics education community. The design is responsive to the variety of mathematical preparations and needs of the participants. The program curriculum reflects and builds on the Mathematics <i>Content Standards</i> and the major themes of the California Mathematics <i>Framework</i>.</p>	30	6	4
<p>Standard 3: Number Sense</p> <p>Each program requires participants to demonstrate an understanding of number sense. This should include, but is not limited to, the study of the real number system, estimation, relative magnitude, multiple representations of numbers, and the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic</p>	26	10	4
<p>Standard 4: Algebra and Functions</p> <p>Each program requires participants to demonstrate an understanding of the development of functions and algebra through an intuitive understanding of the underpinnings of calculus. This should include the study of algebra as language, algebra as process,</p>	21	15	4

<p>algebra as structure, and algebra as modeling. Participants should be able to analyze by direct calculation, and through the use of graphing technology, standard functions and how transformations change the graphs of those functions.</p>			
<p>Standard 5: Measurement and Geometry</p> <p>Each program requires participants to demonstrate an understanding of the elements of geometry. This should include analysis of geometric figures using methods and results from transformational, coordinate, and synthetic geometry; study of the process and systems of measurement; properties and relationships of shape, size, and symmetry in two-and three-dimensional space.</p>	25	11	4
<p>Standard 6: Statistics, Data Analysis, and Probability</p> <p>Each program requires participants to demonstrate an understanding of the processes of gathering and analyzing data and the theoretical constructs that underlie both statistics and probability. This should include emphasis on the following essential components: collection, representation, analysis, and interpretation of data; modeling univariate and bivariate data; and applications of chance and probability.</p>	27	9	4
<p>Standard 7: Mathematical Reasoning</p> <p>Each program requires participants to demonstrate a variety of reasoning skills in all of the content areas addressed in this document. This should include, but is not limited to, the ability to make conjectures based on an analysis of examples, construct and critique both informal and formal proofs, deconstruct and use formulas and theorems, use multiple approaches to solve a given problem, and differentiate between inductive and deductive reasoning.</p>	25	10	4
<p>Standard 8: Mathematical Content Pedagogy</p> <p>Each program requires participants to connect mathematical content knowledge to the practice of teaching school mathematics.</p>	28	8	4
<p>Standard 9: Program Coordination</p> <p>The program is sponsored by one or more organizations that demonstrate a commitment to the mathematical and professional growth of the participants. The program has strong leadership and an administrative structure organized, governed and coordinated with the active involvement of mathematics and mathematics education experts. Program leaders have appropriate authority over the details of program design and implementation.</p>	29	7	4
<p>Standard 10: Program Resources</p> <p>The sponsoring agencies consistently allocate sufficient personnel time, including support personnel, fiscal resources and space to administer and conduct the program and fulfill standards 3 through 8. Sufficient resources are allocated for</p>	31	3	4

program curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Sufficient resources are also allocated for faculty development.

<p align="center">Standard 11: Faculty</p> <p>The persons providing instruction in this program are qualified by experience and formal education to deliver the necessary mathematical content, work with adult learners, model a variety of pedagogical approaches, engage participants in reflective practices regarding the teaching and learning of mathematics, and demonstrate a variety of assessment practices</p>	28	8	4
<p align="center">Standard 12: Program Evaluation</p> <p>The agencies that sponsor the program operate a comprehensive, ongoing system of program evaluation that leads to continuous improvement of the program.</p>	30	6	4
<p align="center">Standard 13: Admissions, Advice, and Assistance</p> <p>The program has a fair and equitable selection process based upon well-defined criteria. Participants will be admitted whose personal qualities and professional experiences suggest the highest potential for success as a mathematics teacher. The provider makes available to each teacher in the program all requirements, standards, and procedures that affect their progress toward attaining the supplemental authorization in mathematics. Qualified members of the program staff are available to advise teachers about their academic and professional development as the need arises. The program assists candidates who need special assistance and recommends only those candidates who satisfy the requirements of the programs.</p>	32	4	4
<p align="center">Standard 14: Equity</p> <p>The program promotes educational equity through its instructional, advisement and curricular practices. Each participant in the program acquires knowledge and appreciation of the perspectives and contributions of diverse cultural, ethnic and gender groups related to mathematics. Participants experience classroom practices and use instructional materials that promote educational equity among diverse learners.</p>	31	3	4
<p align="center">Standard 15: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence</p> <p>The program uses multiple measures to assess the subject matter competence of each participant formatively and summatively in relation to the content of standards 3 to 8 and the K-7 Academic Content Standards. The scope and content of each participant's assessment is congruent with the studies the participant has completed in the program. The assessment information is also used to inform the scope, focus and content of the program.</p>	32	4	4

Consideration of Field Responses by the Advisory Panel

The members of the AB 496 Advisory Panel listed below met on February 1, 2000 to

review the field responses.

Richie Berman, Faculty Teacher Education Program, University of California, Santa Barbara

Diana Herrington, Teacher, Clovis High School, Clovis Unified School District

Don Houser, Teacher, Fullerton Joint Unified High School District, Fullerton, Adjunct Faculty California State University at Fullerton

Jeff Hruby, Center for Educational Partnership/Science Outreach Center, University of California, Irvine

Judith Jacobs, Director, Center for Education & Equity in Mathematics, Science & Technology

Roberta Koss, Mathematics Department Chair, Redwood High School; Adjunct Faculty, Dominican College

Carolyn Krohn, Assistant Professor, Department of Education, St.Mary's College

Carol Langbort, Professor of Elementary Education, San Francisco State University

Brinet Mullen Lee, Teacher on Special Assignment, Salinas City Elementary School District

Tom Lester, California Department of Education, Model Program and Networks Office

Sara Munshin, Mathematics Resource Teacher, Los angeles unified School District

Dale Oliver, Associate Professor mathematics, Humboldt State University

Dennis Parker, Chair of Mathematics, University of the Pacific

Sherry Skipper Spurgeon, Administrative Coordinator, Students Using Mathematics Successful (SUMS) Project

David Sul, Mathematics Department, Santa Clara University

Viji Sundar, Professor of Mathematics, California State University at Stanislaus

Cheryl Vincent, Mathematics Resource Manager, Santee School District

During the panel meeting panel members considered all responses to the draft standards and reached consensus on possible modifications to the Standards, Rationale Statements, and Factors to Consider. Thirty-six the field responses had been collated and recorded by the Commission's staff. The remaining four responses arrived the day before the panel meeting and were copied and distributed to panel members along with the collated comments. The verbatim comments, copies of the 4 responses that were not collated, and [Tables 1](#) and [2](#) were examined by the panel members. The meeting began with a brief presentation by the Commission Staff on the results of the field review. The Commission's staff instructed panel members to consider the comments and suggestions made by the respondents, and advised the panel that they were under no obligation to accept or reject recommendations from the field. The staff emphasized the importance of reaching consensus on decisions to modify the program standards.

Panel Discussion of Suggested Changes to Standards for Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics

Each standard, rationale, and factor was carefully re-examined in light of the written comments and reactions. In general, the comments were quite positive. Ninety percent of

the respondents either approved the standards or suggested changes in language in order to strengthen or clarify the standards. Several draft standards were amended to reflect the suggestions that the panel felt were warranted.

The draft standards that were of most concern to respondents were Standards 1, 2, and 4.

Combining Standard 1: Program Philosophy and Purpose with Standard 2

Several responses included suggestions to combine Standards 1 and 2.

Original Standard 1:

The program is based on an explicit statement of philosophy that expresses the program purpose and desired outcomes. The desired outcomes include a definition of a teacher who is well prepared to teach the mathematics content through Algebra 1 or Integrated Course 1.

Original Standard 2:

The program has a cohesive design that is consistent with the program philosophy and is grounded in research and effective practices on the mathematical education of teachers. The program balances opportunities for participants to gain knowledge in mathematics, reflect on the teaching of mathematics in light of this knowledge, and grow professionally through connections to the mathematics education community. The design is responsive to the variety of mathematical preparations and needs of the participants. The program curriculum reflects and builds on the Mathematics *Content Standards* and the major themes of the California Mathematics *Framework*.

The panel discussed the suggestion of combining Standard 1 and Standard 2 and decided to make this change. ([See Standard 1 Attachment A.](#))

Standard 4:

Concerns were expressed about the depth of knowledge in geometry required by Standard 4. Some wanted more rigor.

The panel discussed these concerns and felt that if more content were added to the geometry standard, participants would need to take courses beyond the 20 units of course work which is the current requirement under the units and course work option.

The Placement of Standard 15

The panel also discussed how to arrange the standards in Category II so that they may be used efficiently by both IHEs and local education agencies. IHEs with approved programs have already responded to standards 9 through 14 in their responses to Common Standards. Therefore, standards 9 through 14 were moved to the end of the document. Standard 15; however, is a program standard that is not included in the Common Standards. Standard 15 was moved to Standard 8 in the document so that for practical purposes, IHEs will respond to Standards 1 through 8, not including Standards 9 through 14 and LEAs will respond to all 14 standards.

These program standards assume that candidates will have a mastery of the new California mathematics content standards for kindergarten through grade seven and algebra. The supplementary authorization is intended for authorization to teach up to and including algebra I and integrated course I.

Consistency of Regulations and Standards for the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics

The panel discussed how under existing regulations, the supplementary authorization in mathematics is defined by grade level. Teachers are authorized to teach through 9th grade. This regulation was written when First -Year Algebra was the common content for students in the ninth grade.

The recently adopted *Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools K-12* and the

new *Mathematics Content Standards for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*, 1997 however, are defined by course content rather than grade level. These standards have set a goal for mathematics instruction that implies that high school geometry is to be the common content of students in the 9th grade.

Given the emphasis on geometry in grade nine, the panel felt that the current practice of using grade level specifications in the regulations is inappropriate because it was never the intent of the supplementary authorization in mathematics to authorize teachers to teach geometry. Geometry courses and those that follow are best taught by single subject credential holders in mathematics. The program standards contained in this document were written for preparing teachers of mathematics through Algebra I or Integrated Course I, without regard to grade level. Using course content as a specification instead of grade level is consistent with current student content standards and frameworks and does not require more study than the traditional units and course work option that is still in effect.

To align the regulation with the standards, a change in the regulation is recommended by the panel. The panel recommends that the regulation for supplementary authorization in mathematics be changed from being grade-level specific to being course-specific to be consistent with the Academic Content Standards and the California Framework. This would mean that the regulation authorize teachers to teach course content through algebra I or integrated course I without specifying grade level.

Next Steps

The existing option of earning a Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics through units and course work will not change if the Commission adopts the proposed standards for the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics. The proposed standards will provide another option for institutions that elect to use the standards. The recommended timeframe for implementing the standards follows:

March 3, 2000	The Commission adopts the Standards for the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics. (Attachment A)
April - May 2000	The Commission's Executive Director distributes the adopted standards to colleges, universities, school districts, county offices of education, professional organizations, and subject matter programs.
July, 2000	Institutions may submit programs for review on or after July 1, 2000. The Commission will continue to review on an on-going basis program proposals based on the adopted standards

ATTACHMENT A

PROPOSED

Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Programs of Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics

Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics

Table of Contents

Introduction

Category I: Program Philosophy, Purpose, and Design

- Standard 1 Program Philosophy, Purpose, and Design.
- Standard 2 Number Sense
- Standard 3 Algebra and Functions.
- Standard 4 Measurement and Geometry
- Standard 5 Statistics, Data Analysis, and Probability
- Standard 6 Mathematical Reasoning
- Standard 7 Mathematical Content Pedagogy
- Standard 8 Assessment of Subject Matter Competence

Category II: Program Development and Implementation

- Standard 9 Program Coordination
- Standard 10 Program Resources
- Standard 11 Faculty
- Standard 12 Admissions, Advice, and Assistance
- Standard 13 Equity
- Standard 14 Program Evaluation

Introduction to the Standards

This document sets forth program standards for the design, implementation, and operation of programs that recommend the Supplementary Authorization in Mathematics. Each standard is presented in three parts: (a) a succinct statement of the standard itself; (b) a brief rationale explaining why the standard is important; and (c) factors to consider to be used by program designers in developing programs.

The supplementary authorization in mathematics is now defined by course content (through algebra I or integrated course I) rather than grade level (through 9th grade). In the past, supplementary authorizations were based on the supposition that "First-Year Algebra" was the common content for students in the 9th grade. *The Mathematics Content Standards for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* and the corresponding *Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools K-12* have set a goal for mathematics instruction that implies that high school geometry is to be the common content of students in the 9th grade. It was never the intent of the supplemental authorization in mathematics to authorize teachers to teach geometry. Geometry courses and those that follow should be taught by single subject credential holders in mathematics. Therefore, the program standards contained in this document are for preparing teachers of mathematics through Algebra I / Integrated Course I, without regard to grade level.

The standards are clustered into two broad categories. Category I addresses the program philosophy and design, subject matter content, and assessment to be covered in the program (Standards 1 through 8). Category II addresses program development and implementation (Standards 9 through 15). Institutions of higher education who have CTC-approved single subject programs in mathematics need only address Category I standards, since the Category II standards were addressed in their single subject program documents.

Standards 2 through 8 ensure that the recipients of the authorization are competent regarding the concepts, skills, and understandings of both mathematics and mathematical pedagogy through Algebra 1 or Integrated Course 1.

The mathematics for grades K-7 described in the *Mathematics Content Standards for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* forms the foundation on which standards 2 - 7 are based. The mathematical content of these standards will enable participants to develop an advanced viewpoint of school mathematics through Algebra 1 or Integrated Course 1. Building an advanced viewpoint requires engagement with the reasoning, structures, and interconnections in mathematics that unifies the Academic

content standards. This, in turn, enables participants to examine the overarching concepts of mathematics across the sub-disciplines of mathematics.

Though the mathematics of Standards 2 through 7 are listed by separate subdisciplines, both the specific mathematics detailed and good mathematical pedagogy encourage an integrated view of the connections across mathematics and its applications. In particular, the mathematical reasoning standard requires participants to demonstrate reasoning processes across all subdisciplines.

In designing a program to meet these standards, it is expected that the content will be presented in ways that model good mathematics teaching. Such teaching takes many forms. It engages the participants in examining, representing, transforming, solving, proving, and communicating mathematics. This can occur when participants learn mathematics in a variety of settings; for example, whole class, collaborative teams, and individually. Participants use the tools of mathematics to develop and enhance their understanding of the content of mathematics and how that content can be taught most effectively. Technology, including calculators and computers, should enhance instruction and active learning of mathematics.

Pedagogy is an essential component of a professional development program in mathematics. Standard 7 details the program requirements in mathematical content pedagogy. In addition to learning mathematics as their students should learn it, participants need to reflect on the instructional decisions that are made during the course of a lesson. They need to analyze why particular methodologies, models, examples, and questions were selected and how these inhibited or fostered the learning of mathematics. In addition, they need to adapt the methods modeled throughout the program to appropriate methodologies that take into account the developmental and learning needs of young adolescents. Participants also need to know how the content of Standards 2 through 7 relate to the mathematics they will teach.

The standards are intended as a guideline for program design and implementation. The sponsoring organization is expected to create a professional development program and evaluation plan based on these standards.

Participants meeting these high standards and receiving supplemental authorizations through programs based on these standards will be better able to provide high quality mathematics instruction to their students.

Category I

Program Philosophy, Design, and Subject Matter Content

Standard 1: Program Philosophy, Purpose, and Design

The program is based on an explicit statement of philosophy that expresses the program purpose and desired outcomes. The design is responsive to the variety of mathematical preparations and needs of the participants. The program curriculum reflects and builds on the Mathematics *Content Standards* and the major themes of the California Mathematics *Framework*. The desired outcome is a teacher who is well prepared to teach the mathematics content through Algebra 1 or Integrated Course 1.

Rationale

An explicit statement of philosophy and program design assists in identifying program goals and needs, direction for program design, course development, and program reviews.

Factors to Consider

- To what extent do the sponsoring organizations, program leadership, and subject matter and education experts collaboratively develop the program philosophy, purpose, and desired outcomes?
- How does the California Mathematics Framework that emphasizes a balanced approach in the teaching and learning of mathematics guide the program philosophy and design?

- How are the expected program outcomes for participants defined clearly so participant assessments and program reviews can be aligned appropriately with program goals?
 - In what ways does the organization periodically review and reconsider the program philosophy in light of local program evaluations, ongoing research on the mathematical preparation of teachers, and the changing needs of public schools in California?
 - How does the program balance opportunities for participants to gain knowledge in mathematics, reflect on the teaching of mathematics in light of this knowledge, and grow professionally through connections to the mathematics education community?
 - How does the mathematical content include and expand upon the ideas in the K-7 Mathematics Content Standards?
 - How does the program design assure that the mathematical content is delivered using a variety of instructional strategies?
 - In what ways does the program meet other criteria specified by local conditions as appropriate to this standard?
-

Standard 2: Number Sense

Each program requires participants to demonstrate an understanding of number sense. This should include, but is not limited to, properties and structure of the real number system, appropriate use of estimation and precision, and multiple representations of numbers.

Rationale

Number sense is requisite to an understanding of the algebraic structure of mathematics. It leads to an appreciation of the way different aspects of mathematics are connected and relate to real-world situations. The use of numbers to communicate ideas and information is an essential skill for everyone.

Factors to Consider

In what ways does the program require participants to:

- demonstrate mastery of the arithmetic of the real numbers?
- demonstrate conceptual understanding of the standard algorithms of arithmetic?
- create a variety of representations of a single situation (e.g., geometric, set, algebraic, symbolic, graphical)?
- solve application problems including, but not limited to, reasonableness of answer and estimation, significant number of digits, and scientific notation?
- demonstrate understanding of relative magnitude of both very large and very small quantities?
- understand and apply the structure and properties of real numbers?

These program standards assume that candidates will have a mastery of the California Academic Content Standards in Mathematics, K-7 and Algebra. The supplementary authorization is intended for authorization to teach up to and including algebra I and integrated course I.

Standard 3: Algebra and Functions

Each program requires participants to demonstrate an understanding of the development of functions and algebra up to and including the underpinnings of calculus. This should include the study of algebra as language, algebra as process, algebra as structure, and algebra as modeling. Participants should be able to analyze by direct calculation, and through the use of graphing technology, standard functions and how transformations change the graphs of those functions.

Rationale

Algebra is important as a means of mathematical communication, as generalized arithmetic, and as a tool for solving real-world problems. Teachers need to understand the continuous development of the ideas of algebra from early elementary through high school.

The process of building on students' sense of number and moving them toward the uses of variables and functions requires insight into the connections between algebra, number, and other areas of mathematics.

Factors to Consider

How does the program require participants to:

- become fluent in the symbolic language of algebra, including the use and meaning of variables, expressions, statements, and functions?
- engage in algebraic processes such as moving from specifics to generalizations, performing operations and their inverses, solving equations and inequalities, and developing algorithms?
- use a variety of mathematical tools (tables, graphs, equations, functions, matrices, vectors) to organize information and model relationships found in real world situations?
- demonstrate an understanding of families of functions (linear, polynomial, rational, exponential, logarithmic, and periodic) and ways to represent them (numeric, symbolic, graphic, verbal)?
- explore the development of functions and algebra through the underpinnings of calculus, including an informal treatment of limits, rates of change, areas under a curve, and continuity?

These program standards assume that candidates will have a mastery of the California Academic Content Standards in Mathematics, K-7 and Algebra. The supplementary authorization is intended for authorization to teach up to and including algebra I and integrated course I.

Standard 4: Measurement and Geometry

Each program requires participants to demonstrate an understanding of the elements of geometry. This should include analysis of geometric figures using methods and results from transformational, coordinate, and synthetic geometry; study of the process and systems of measurement; properties and relationships of shape, size, and symmetry in two- and three-dimensional space.

Rationale for Standard

Geometry provides a means for visualizing, analyzing, and measuring objects in the physical world, as well as a rich context for the development of mathematical reasoning. Powerful mathematical connections to other mathematical content areas can be made through the use of coordinate and transformational representations.

Factors to Consider

In what ways does the program require participants to:

- precisely describe, classify, and compare types of plane and solid figures according to their attributes?
- use the relationships of congruence and similarity?
- examine proofs of historically important theorems?
- link algebraic and geometric representations using coordinate methods?
- use ratios and proportions to solve problems involving scale factors and similar figures in two- and three-dimensions (perimeter, area, volume)?
- apply transformational techniques of reflection, rotation, translation, and dilation in coordinate and synthetic settings?
- select and use appropriate techniques and tools for measurement?
- determine the level of precision appropriate for particular situations?

These program standards assume that candidates will have a mastery of the California Academic Content Standards in Mathematics, K-7 and Algebra. The supplementary authorization is intended for authorization to teach up to and including algebra I and integrated course I.

Standard 5: Statistics, Data Analysis, and Probability

Each program requires participants to demonstrate an understanding of the processes of gathering and analyzing data and the theoretical constructs that underlie both statistics and probability. This should include emphasis on the following essential components: collection, representation, analysis, and interoperation of data; modeling univariate and bivariate data; and applications of chance and probability.

Rationale

Probability and statistics are fundamental to many disciplines and careers. There is an increasing need for all citizens to organize, analyze, and interpret data in order to make sense of the world around them.

Factors to Consider

To what extent does the program require the participants to:

- demonstrate an understanding of and applications of concepts, principles, and mechanics of data collection such as sampling techniques and measurement of quantitative and qualitative variables?
- calculate, interpret, and apply measures of central tendency, dispersion, and relative standing?
- demonstrate conceptual understanding of the properties of the normal distribution?
- demonstrate an understanding of the effects of various modifications of data sets?
- demonstrate an understanding of and be able to approximate the line of best fit and make predictions from it?
- construct, interpret, and judge the appropriateness of graphical and tabular representations of qualitative and quantitative data sets?
- discuss misleading data displays and abuses of statistics?
- plan and conduct experiments and simulations to determine experimental probabilities?
- develop counting and other techniques useful in determining theoretical probabilities including conditional probability, expected value, and odds?

These program standards assume that candidates will have a mastery of the California Academic Content Standards in Mathematics, K-7 and Algebra. The supplementary authorization is intended for authorization to teach up to and including algebra I and integrated course I.

Standard 6: Mathematical Reasoning

Each program requires participants to demonstrate a variety of reasoning skills in all of the content areas addressed in this document. This should include, but is not limited to, the ability to make conjectures based on an analysis of examples, construct and critique both informal and formal proofs, interpret and use formulas and theorems, use multiple approaches to solve a given problem, and differentiate between inductive and deductive reasoning.

Rationale

Reasoning is fundamental to knowing and doing mathematics. It is essential that an emphasis on reasoning pervade all mathematical activity in order to give individuals access to mathematics as a powerful way of making sense of the world.

Factors to Consider

To what extent does the program require participants to:

- use both inductive and deductive reasoning?
- present both informal and formal proofs in both oral and written forms?
- explore and share multiple ways of solving a given problem?
- analyze and discuss the reasoning they use?

These program standards assume that candidates will have a mastery of the California

Standard 7: Mathematical Content Pedagogy

Each program requires participants to connect mathematical content knowledge to the practice of teaching school mathematics.

Rationale

All mathematics teachers must link content knowledge with effective pedagogy. This linkage gives teachers the versatility to provide all students with access to the concepts and procedures of mathematics. This supports the development of students' mathematical reasoning.

Factors to Consider

To what extent does the program require participants to:

- reflect on the transition from being a learner of mathematics to being a teacher of mathematics?
- examine school instructional materials and analyze the connections between the mathematics of the program and the mathematics they will teach?
- reflect on the ways that their knowledge of the continuum of mathematical content can facilitate their students' conceptual understanding?
- adapt the methods modeled throughout this program to appropriate methodologies that take into account the developmental and learning needs of young adolescents?
- reflect on and discuss the following: choosing appropriate tasks, tools, and materials; employing meaningful strategies; establishing a positive and supportive environment conducive to learning mathematics; facilitating classroom discourse through effective questioning strategies?
- analyze student work as a means to refine instruction and correct student misconception

These program standards assume that candidates will have a mastery of the California Academic Content Standards in Mathematics, K-7 and Algebra. The supplementary authorization is intended for authorization to teach up to and including algebra I and integrated course I.

Standard 8: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence

The program uses multiple measures to assess the subject matter competence of each participant formatively and summatively in relation to the content of standards 2 to 7 and the K-7 Academic Content Standards. The scope and content of each participant's assessment is consistent with the studies the participant has completed in the program. The assessment information is also used to inform the scope, focus and content of the program.

Rationale

An organization that offers a program leading to a supplementary authorization in mathematics has a responsibility to verify the mathematical competence of its participants. To address the needs of all participants, it is essential that the assessment use multiple measures, have formative and summative components, and be as comprehensive as standards 2 to 7.

Factors to Consider

- How does the program provide avenues for addressing deficiencies in mathematical background or experience of the participants?
- To what extent does the assessment include a variety of approaches, such as participant presentations, projects, portfolios, observations and interviews, and oral and written examinations?

- How does the assessment encompass the content of standards 2 to 7 and the K-7 Academic Content Standards?
- How is the assessment aligned with the participant's actual studies in the program?
- How is the assessment made valid, reliable, equitable, and fair, and how does it include provisions for appeals?
- In what ways are the assessment scope, process and criteria clearly delineated and available to participants?
- How does the organization make and retain records regarding each participant's performance in the assessment?
- How does the assessment address other program qualities, as specified by local conditions, which are appropriate to this standard?

These program standards assume that candidates will have a mastery of the California Academic Content Standards in Mathematics, K-7 and Algebra. The supplementary authorization is intended for authorization to teach up to and including algebra I and integrated course I.

Category II

Program Development and Implementation

Standard 9: Program Coordination

The program is sponsored by one or more organizations that demonstrate a commitment to the mathematical and professional growth of the participants. The program has strong leadership and an administrative structure organized, governed and coordinated with the active involvement of mathematics and mathematics education experts. Program leaders have appropriate authority over the details of program design and implementation.

Rationale

The commitment of sponsoring organizations (school districts, county offices of education, professional organizations, institutions of higher education, etc.) is indispensable for the effectiveness and durability of the program. The accomplishments of participants in supplemental authorization programs depend in part on the effective coordination of the program by responsible members of these organizations. For participants to become competent in mathematics and the teaching of mathematics, all aspects of their subject matter preparation must be planned thoughtfully and implemented conscientiously.

Factors to Consider

- What is the mechanism for effective communication and coordination among the sponsoring organizations, the program leadership, and the subject matter specialists responsible for the program?
- In what ways are the responsibilities of each sponsoring organization for program oversight and implementation clearly specified, and a primary contact person designated for each?
- How are linkages made to provide opportunities for collaboration among a variety of organizations such as school districts, county offices of education, professional development centers, mathematics project sites, college or university mathematics and education departments, and professional organizations?
- Is a program director appointed to assume responsibility for overall direction of the program; are the roles, responsibilities and time commitment of the program director clearly defined and appropriate to the scope of the program?
- How does the program meet other criteria specified by local conditions as appropriate to this standard?

Standard 10: Program Resources

The sponsoring agencies consistently allocate sufficient personnel time, including support personnel, fiscal resources and space to administer and conduct the program and fulfill standards 2 through 7. Sufficient resources are allocated for

program curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Sufficient resources are also allocated for faculty development.

Rationale

A program's resources affect its quality and effectiveness. Lack of resources impedes participants from achieving high standards of quality or competence.

Factors to Consider

- How are adequate personnel resources equitably provided to maintain an effective program?
 - How do the program's personnel and participants have access to appropriate buildings, classrooms, offices, professional services, instructional materials (including print material and technology-based instructional tools), and adequate clerical support?
 - How does the program meet other criteria specified by local conditions as appropriate to this standard?
-

Standard 11: Faculty

The faculty providing instruction in this program are qualified by experience and formal education to deliver the necessary mathematical content, work with adult learners, model a variety of pedagogical approaches, engage participants in reflective practices regarding the teaching and learning of mathematics, and demonstrate a variety of assessment practices.

Rationale

Content competency is a necessary component for program faculty. It also is essential that faculty involved in providing instruction in mathematics understand the variety of ways that mathematics is learned and use a variety of strategies that will help make mathematics accessible to all learners. Consequently, the instruction in the program will combine significant mathematical content with exemplary classroom practices and promote the implementation of these practices within participants' classrooms.

Factors to Consider

- Do the instructors include some combination of fully certified mathematics teachers, professors of mathematics education, professors of mathematics, and other qualified mathematics educators?
 - To what extent are the instructors knowledgeable about the *California Mathematics Framework* and the *Mathematics Content Standards for California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*?
 - Do the instructors include people with experience teaching middle or high school students in mathematics classrooms?
 - Do the instructors include people with experience delivering professional development for mathematics teachers?
 - Do the instructors include people with experience teaching college or university mathematics or mathematics education?
 - To what extent do the instructors have experience using a variety of instructional and assessment strategies?
-

Standard 12: Admissions, Advice, and Assistance

The program has a fair and equitable selection process based upon well-defined criteria. Participants will be admitted whose professional experiences suggest the highest potential for success as a mathematics teacher. The provider makes available to each teacher in the program all requirements, standards, and procedures that affect their progress toward attaining the supplemental authorization in mathematics. Qualified members of the program staff are available to advise teachers about their academic and professional development as the need arises. The program assists candidates who need special assistance and recommends only those candidates who satisfy the requirements of the program.

Rationale

The program needs a clear application process to examine the eligibility of potential participants and to assist in the selection process. The program has the obligation to provide the teachers with accurate and relevant information and to give teachers appropriate feedback on their progress.

Factors to Consider

- How are the selection criteria and procedures clearly described and available to prospective participants?
 - In what ways does the selection process reflect a commitment to achieve a balanced representation of the population?
 - How does the program insure that all current and prospective participants receive relevant information about the program and the availability of assistance?
 - How does the program encourage participation of members of diverse populations?
-

Standard 13: Equity

The program promotes educational equity through its instructional, advisement and curricular practices. Each participant in the program acquires knowledge and appreciation of the perspectives and contributions of diverse cultural, ethnic and gender groups in the area of mathematics. Participants experience classroom practices and use instructional materials that promote educational equity among diverse learners.

Rationale

Students who attend California schools are increasingly diverse. They live in a society that has benefited from the perspectives and contributions of men, women, and many cultural, ethnic and gender groups. Teachers must understand and appreciate the cultural perspectives and intellectual contributions of these groups. They must also be aware of barriers to academic participation and success, and must encourage equitable practices of education during their preparation.

Factors to Consider

- How are both men and women, members of culturally and ethnically diverse groups, and individuals with exceptional needs encouraged to apply to the program as faculty members?
 - How are both men and women, members of culturally and ethnically diverse groups, and individuals with exceptional needs encouraged to enter and complete the program?
 - To what extent do participants learn about the contributions and perspectives of diverse cultural, ethnic and gender groups related to significant mathematical subjects?
 - To what extent do participants examine practices in mathematics education that restrict participation of many groups in mathematics or mathematics related study and careers?
 - How does coursework in the program foster understanding, respect and appreciation of human differences in the learning of mathematics?
 - Does the program have other qualities related to this standard that are brought to the reviewers' attention by the institution?
-

Standard 14: Program Evaluation

The agencies that sponsor the program operate a comprehensive, ongoing system of program evaluation that leads to continuous improvement of the program.

Rationale

To achieve high quality and effectiveness, a program should be evaluated regularly and comprehensively and refinements made based on the evaluation results. The evaluation

should be based on the Program Standards as well as local goals. The evaluation should support continued development of the program, and should recognize that both formal and informal evaluations serve useful purposes.

Factors to Consider

- In what ways the program systematically and objectively evaluated on the basis of criteria that are related to the design, rationale, goals and objectives of the program?
 - How is evaluative input collected from a variety of stakeholders, including: program participants, community members, graduates, local mathematics teachers, faculty, administrators?
 - In what ways are data collected on program participants, graduates and faculty?
 - How are adjustments and improvements in all components of the program based on the results of program evaluation, the implications of new knowledge about teaching and learning, and the identified strengths and needs of the participants?
-



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to March 2000 Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: PREP-4

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Recommended Submission of State Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership Grant Proposal to the United States Department of Education

✓ Action

Prepared by: Dr. Phyllis Jacobson, Consultant
Professional Services Division

Recommended Submission of a State Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership Grant Proposal to the United States Department of Education

Professional Services Division
Office of Policy and Programs
February 11, 2000

Executive Summary

The United States Department of Education, through its Office of Postsecondary Education, is making competitive funding available again this year under the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Program, as authorized by sections 201-205 of the Higher Education Act, 1998 Amendments. The intent of the Partnership Grant Program, for which States are eligible to apply, is to "increase collaboration between schools of arts and sciences and schools of education, strengthen the vital role of K-12 educators, particularly those in high-need local educational agencies, in the design and implementation of effective teacher preparation programs, and increase the intensity and quality of clinical experiences for prospective teachers."

This agenda report provides information about eligibility qualifications to apply for grants under the federal Title II program, outlines a funding priority concept for the Commission's consideration, and recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to participate in the preparation of a collaborative Title II Partnership grant application reflecting this concept.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

Should the Commission cosponsor a request for federal support for efforts to (1) increase collaboration between schools of arts and sciences and schools of education; (2) strengthen the vital role of K-12 educators, particularly those in high-need local educational agencies, in the design and implementation of effective teacher preparation programs; and (3) increase the intensity and quality of clinical experiences for prospective teachers?

Fiscal Impact Statement

The cost of assisting in the preparation of this grant application has been supported by the base budget of the Commission. If the staff recommendation is adopted by the

Commission, and the grant application is successful, then it is likely that the Commission would be asked to implement the grant in a similar arrangement to that of the current Title II State Grant. The grant application would be for federal funds not to exceed \$3.5 million per year, for a five-year period. If the grant is awarded, up to eight percent of the budget could be used to support the Commission's administrative costs. The federal budget request would also provide for a full-time Director who could be contracted by the Commission to carry out the project, as well provide funds for clerical assistance for the Director. The administrative costs funds would support additional business and financial office assistance for the grant.

Recommendation

That the Commission authorize the Executive Director to cosponsor an application to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, under the Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership Grant program.

I. Background

The Higher Education Amendments of 1998 were signed into law by President Clinton on October 8, 1998. In order to help states and institutions address the nation's need to ensure that new teachers enter the classroom prepared to instruct all students according to high standards, Title 2 of the Higher Education Act authorizes the "Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants for States and Partnerships." The intent of this grant program is to "provide an opportunity to effect positive change in the recruitment, preparation, licensing, and ongoing support of teachers across America. The programs are designed to increase student achievement by implementing comprehensive approaches to improving teacher quality."

The Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Programs include three distinct competitive grant opportunities:

State Grants Program: These are competitive grants to states to support the implementation of comprehensive statewide reforms to improve the quality of the state's teaching force. California was successful in this competition last year, and the Commission, along with our collaborative partners from the Governor's Office (Office of the Secretary for Education), CPEC, the CSU system, the UC system, and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, is now implementing our Title II State Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant program. The state is not eligible to apply for a second grant in this same category.

Teacher Recruitment Grants Program: The Teacher Recruitment Grants — awarded either to states or to partnerships among high-need local school districts, teacher preparation institutions, and schools of arts and sciences—are designed to reduce shortages of highly qualified teachers in high-need local school districts. These grants allow individual communities to determine their needs for teachers and to recruit and prepare teachers who meet those needs. Teacher Recruitment grants were awarded last year and will not be re-competed this year. Several recruitment grants were awarded to local partnerships within California.

Partnership Grants for Improving Teacher Preparation Program: The purpose of the Partnership Program is to bring teacher preparation programs, schools of arts and sciences, and high-need school districts and schools together to create change and improvement in traditional teacher education programs, thereby increasing teachers' capacity to help all students learn to high standards. Intended to support highly committed partnerships that will accelerate the change process in teacher education, the program should strengthen the role of K-12 educators in the design and implementation of effective teacher education programs, and should increase collaboration between departments of arts and sciences and schools of education. It is this category that our new grant application will address. States (the Governor and/or the state agency responsible for teacher licensing) are eligible applicants for a Partnership Grant.

II. Funding, Application Process and Timelines for the Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership Grants

The funding available for the Teacher Quality Enhancement Partnership Grant program in

2000 is \$6.3 million, and an estimated five new Partnership grants will be awarded.

A two-tier application process will be used. In the first phase, applicants submit a ten page Concept Paper, which will be due in May, 2000. Those pre-applicants judged to have the most promise for producing significant and comprehensive reform will be invited to submit a full application. The full application will be due in late July or early August.

III. Additional Information Regarding Grant Eligibility and Requirements

Partnership Grants Program: Eligible applicants for this program (Section 203 of the law) are partnerships that include: "a partner institution; a school of arts and sciences; and a high need local educational agency; and may include a Governor, State educational agency, the State Board of Education, the State agency for higher education, an institution of higher education not described above, a public charter school, a public or private elementary school or secondary school, a public or private nonprofit educational organization, a business, a teacher organization, or a pre-kindergarten program."

The Commission has already been involved in a successful federal Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement state grant application, submitted on behalf of the Governor of California, that included as collaborative partners the Office for the Secretary for Education, the California Department of Education, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, the California State University system, the University of California system, and the Association of Independent California College and Universities. Staff is recommending that we follow the same structure for this second grant application under Title II.

IV. Recommended Funding Priority for a Partnership Grant Application

Introduction: Title II grants under the Partnership Grants Program are one-time monies allocated over a five-year grant period. Applicants may request up to \$3.5 million per year for each of the five years of the funding period. A priority has been established to address one of the State's most urgent needs, a need which also reflects the federal competitive preference for the Partnership Grants Program. The Title II Advisory Committee for the current Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant is in agreement with this priority.

Our priority for the Partnership Grant is to improve the quality of student achievement in high-needs, low-performing schools by providing every student with fully qualified teachers and administrators through a new, unitary and integrated approach to teacher and administrator development and credentialing.

A brief description of our philosophical approach to addressing the priority follows below. Because it is now early in the grant process, and because grant ideas are typically proprietary in nature until the federal grant application has been developed and submitted, only a brief outline is being provided here, and no operational details are presented. These ideas, and the attendant operational details, will be fully developed within the ten-page Concept Paper to be submitted in May, 2000.

In concert with initiatives proposed by the Governor, this partnership will be responding to the urgent need to improve student achievement in low-performing, high-needs and hard-to-staff California public schools through improving teacher and administrator quality. We plan to:

- Design and implement a new and radically different teacher and administrator preparation and licensing system that will produce highly qualified teachers and support staff trained and motivated specifically to staff our low-performing, high needs public schools.
- Design and implement a new and radically different advanced training and support system for administrators and teachers in low-performing, high needs and hard to staff public schools.
- Design and implement a new and radically different system of hiring/assignment, promotion and tenure incentives for IHE faculty to focus their research and practice in low-performing, high needs and hard to staff public schools.
- Do each of these things *simultaneously* and *in coherence with each other*.

We have a unique convergence of factors right now in California that presages our ability to do just that. The Governor's 2000 budget proposes important new incentives for qualified

teachers to work and to remain in low-performing, high needs schools; significant expansions of alternative teacher preparation programs, as well as of California's extensive support and assessment system for every beginning teacher; and the creation of additional teacher recruitment centers across the state. There is a common focus and a sense of urgency throughout California about issues of teacher preparation and teacher quality. The people of California are looking to the state for leadership; our partnership is ready to provide it.

We will show our model works primarily through our improved student achievement results, and through increased numbers of fully qualified, certificated teachers and administrators who are successful in high needs school settings. We will demonstrate that we have created a practical partnership model for success in these high needs, low performing schools that is transferable across the state. We will provide a research basis for potential new state legislation coupled with funding to replicate these results in similar high needs schools across California.

 | [Back to the Top](#) | [Back to March 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) | [Return to "About CTC"](#) | 



California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-1

Committee: Fiscal Planning & Policy

Title: Update on the Management Study Mandated by the 1999 Budget Act

✓ Information

Prepared by: Karen Romo, Analyst
Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

The Commission's budget as contained in the 1999 Budget Act includes a provision that requires the transfer of up to \$250,000 to the Legislative Analyst's Office for the purpose of contracting for a comprehensive management study of the Commission's organizational structure and credential processing protocols. This item provides an update on the progress of this management study.

SUMMARY

In mid-February 2000, MGT of America (MGT), the management study contractor, is expected to submit a draft of the management study report to the Legislative Analyst's Office, the Department of Finance, and the Commission. Staff will have an opportunity to review the report for any factual inaccuracies, and comment on the preliminary recommendations and findings prior to the release of the final report on February 29, 2000.

Staff will continue to provide Commissioners with periodic updates regarding the status of this management study.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to March 2000 Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-2

Committee: Fiscal Planning & Policy

Title: Update on the 2000-2001 Governor's Budget

✓ Information

Prepared by: Karen Romo, Analyst
Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

On January 10, 2000, Governor Gray Davis submitted to the Legislature the State's proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2000-2001.

SUMMARY

There have been no changes made to the Commission's FY 2000-2001 proposed budget since January 10, 2000. As new developments occur during the budget hearing process, staff will continue to provide Commissioners with periodic updates regarding the status of the Commission's proposed budget.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to March 2000 Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-3

Committee: Fiscal Planning & Policy

Title: Overview of the Legislative Analyst's Review of the 2000-2001 Governor's Budget

✓ Information

Prepared by: John Wahlstrom, Analyst
Fiscal and Business Services

Background

Each year the Legislative Analyst's Office publishes its review of the Governor's Budget. This agenda item is intended to provide Commissioners with an analysis of that review.

Summary

At the time this agenda item was prepared, the Legislative Analyst had not yet published its review. Staff will present information as it becomes available.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to March 2000 Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-1

Committee: Certificated Assignments

Title: Proposed Addition of Title 5 Section 80016, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to Certificates of Completion of Staff Development to Teach English Language Development and/or Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English to Limited-English-Proficient Students

✓ Information

Prepared by: Bobbie Fite, Assistant Consultant
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

**Proposed Addition of Title 5 Section 80016, California Code of Regulations,
Pertaining to Certificates of Completion of Staff Development to Teach English
Language
Development and/or Specially Designed Academic Instruction Delivered in English to
Limited-
English-Proficient Students**

February 14, 2000

SUMMARY

Senate Bill 395 (Hughes) made a number of changes to Education Code Section 44253.10 governing Certificates of Completion of Staff Development to teach English language development and/or specially designed academic instruction delivered in English to limited-English-proficient students. In the past, completion of this training has resulted in a district- or county-issued document. This agenda item addresses the new provision of the statute that requires the Commission to issue Certificates of Completion of Staff Development and proposes Title 5 Regulations for implementation.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is minimal fiscal impact to promulgating regulations. The fee of forty-five dollars, the maximum fee allowed by statute for issuance of this document, should be sufficient to allow staff to review the standards, review and approve staff-development programs, create computer programs to issue and report on the documents, and address the additional workload. Staff will be preparing a budget change proposal to request spending authority from the additional income.

POLICY ISSUE TO BE RESOLVED

None.

RECOMMENDATION

This is an information item. Staff will return with an action item in May.

BACKGROUND

In 1994, Senate Bill 1969 (Hughes) added §44253.10 to the Education Code. This section authorizes school districts and county offices of education to issue a "Certificate of Completion of Staff Development" to experienced teachers who complete staff development programs that are consistent with standards established by the Commission. Depending on

the teacher's years of experience and the staff development completed, the Certificate authorizes the teacher to provide Specially Designed Academic Instruction Delivered in English, with the possible addition of English Language Development in a self-contained classroom.

In 1996, Assembly Bill 1041 (Alpert) amended the Education Code to require that the Commission serve as the repository for the Certificates of Completion issued by school districts and county offices of education. The purpose behind this change was to assure employers a place to contact to verify the issuance of certificates since the law states that the certificates are valid in all California public schools. The fee to provide this service is twelve dollars (\$12). The Commission has registered 17,865 Certificates of Completion of Staff Development to date.

The changes to Certificates of Completion of Staff Development required by SB 395 (Hughes) became effective January 1, 2000. They include:

- the extension of the deadline by which a teacher must have achieved permanent status, from 1995 to 1999;
- the extension of the deadline by which requirements for the Certificate must be completed, from 2000 to 2005;
- a requirement that the Commission review the standards to assure that they are aligned with the standards for the Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) Certificate;
- a requirement that the Commission review programs offered by school districts, county offices of education, institutions of higher education, and professional organizations to determine if they meet the standards (NOTE: the California Teacher's Association (CTA) program has already been approved by the Commission and does not need to be reviewed again--CTA may recommend for Commission-issued Certificates of Completion as of January 1, 2000);
- a revision of the authorization for the Certificate to include the ability to provide instruction of English language development in a departmentalized class authorized by the applicant's basic teaching credential;
- the establishment of a date (January 1, 2002) by which all programs must be approved by the Commission to continue to offer staff development for the purpose of issuing a Certificate of Completion; and
- the requirement that the Commission issue Certificates of Completion of Staff Development to teachers who complete an approved program.

PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO TITLE 5

This agenda item proposes that the Commission add Section 80016 to the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, following the sections on CLAD and BCLAD Certificates. This new section will describe the requirements for and authorizations of the Commission-issued Certificate of Completion of Staff Development.

Subsection (a)(1): repeats the statutory requirement for possession of a basic teaching credential.

Subsection (a)(2): references Education Code §44253.10(a)(1) that requires that the teacher be a "permanent employee" and includes a definition; requires that the employer verify permanent status to avoid encroaching on employer prerogatives.

Subsection (a)(3): requires completion, prior to January 1, 2005, of a staff development program that has been approved by the Commission; specifies that completion of the approved program be provided on the "Recommendation for Certificate of Completion of Staff Development" form (41-395 - rev. 1/00) provided by the Commission.

Subsection (a)(3)(A): describes the staff development that is needed to provide specially designed content instruction delivered in English.

Subsection (a)(3)(B): describes the staff development that is needed to provide instruction for English language development to students in a departmentalized class, other than a class designated as English Language Development, in the subject and grade authorized by the applicant's basic teaching credential.

Subsection (a)(3)(C): describes the staff development that is needed to provide instruction for English language development to students in a self-contained classroom, other than a

class designated as English Language Development.

Subsection (a)(4): requires submission of an application form, verification of the requirements stated above, and a forty-five dollar (\$45) fee. The fee is the maximum fee allowed by Education Code §44253.10(f)(2). It must provide funding to review the existing standards, determine if the staff-development programs meet the standards, create computer programs to issue and report on the documents, and address the additional workload.

TEXT OF PROPOSED REGULATION

80016. Certificates of Completion of Staff Development to Teach English Language Development and/or Specially Designed Academic Instruction Delivered in English to Limited-English-Proficient Students

- (a) Applicants for a Certificate of Completion of Staff Development to teach English language development and/or specially designed academic instruction delivered in English to limited-English-proficient students must meet the following requirements:
- (1) hold a basic teaching credential as defined in Education Code Section 44203(e);
 - (2) be a permanent employee by January 1, 1999, as described in Education Code Section 44253.10(a)(1) and verified by the teacher's employer(s);
 - (3) complete one of the following staff development programs in methods of specially designed content instruction delivered in English or English language development, or both, as specified, that has been determined by the Commission to meet the guidelines and standards established in Sections 80680-80690.1, prior to January 1, 2005, and submit verification by the school district, county office of education, college or university, or other approved agency on the Recommendation for Certificate of Completion of Staff Development form (41-395 1/00) provided by the Commission:
 - (A) To provide specially designed content instruction delivered in English as defined in Education Code Section 44253.2(b) to students in a class or subject authorized by the applicant's basic teaching credential: 45 clock hours in specially designed content instruction delivered in English.
 - (B) To provide instruction for English language development as defined in Education Code Section 44253.2(a) to students in a departmentalized class, other than a class designated as English Language Development, in the subject and grade authorized by the applicant's basic teaching credential: the same 45 clock hours in specially designed content instruction delivered in English taken for (A) above.
 - (C) To provide instruction for English language development as defined in Education Code Section 44253.2(a) to students in a self-contained classroom, other than a class designated as English Language Development: either (1) or (2) below:
 1. nine years of experience in California public schools verified by the teacher's employer, experience or training in teaching limited-English-proficient students as described in Title 5 Section 80689.2 verified by the teacher's employer, and the same 45 clock hours in specially designed academic instruction delivered in English completed for subsection (A) above.
 2. the same 45 clock hours in specially designed academic instruction delivered in English completed for subsection (A) above, plus, within three years of completing the staff development in subsection (A) and before January 1, 2008, an additional 45 clock hours in specially designed academic instruction delivered in English and English language development.
 - (4) Submit a completed application form (41-4 rev. 9/99), verification of completion of the above requirements, including the Recommendation for Certificate of Completion of Staff Development form (41-395 rev. 1/00) and employment verifications, and a fee of forty-five dollars.

Recommendation for a Certificate of Completion of Staff Development

NAME OF RECOMMENDING DISTRICT, COUNTY, IHE OR AGENCY:

CDS Code if Applicable _____

This is to certify that the individual identified below has completed Commission-approved staff development through this agency as indicated below.

APPLICANT:

Name

First	Middle	Last
-------	--------	------

Social Security Number

	-		-	
--	---	--	---	--

(FOR FILE IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES ONLY)

STAFF DEVELOPMENT:

- 1. The applicant has completed 45 clock hours of approved staff development or 3 semester/4 quarter units of approved course work in methods of providing specially designed academic instruction delivered in English.
- 2. Within three years after completing the requirements in 1 above, the applicant has completed an additional 45 clock hours of approved staff development or an additional 3 semester/4 quarter units of approved course work in methods of providing specially designed academic instruction delivered in English and English language development.

ENCLOSURES:

- Verification of the applicant's status as a permanent employee by January 1, 1999, provided by the applicant's employer.
- When applicable, verification of nine years of teaching experience, including experience or training in teaching limited-English-proficient students, provided by the applicant's employer.

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE:

Signature _____ Date _____

Name _____ Title _____

41-395 rev. 1/00



[| Back to the Top |](#)
[| Back to March 2000 Agenda |](#)
[| Return to "Agenda Archives" |](#)
[| Return to "About CTC" |](#)





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: March 1-2, 2000

Agenda Item Number: PUB-1

Title: Proposed Addition of §80071.5 Pertaining to the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment

✓ Action

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

PUBLIC HEARING

Section 80071.5 of Title 5 California Code of Regulations Pertaining to the RICA Requirement

Introduction

The proposed amendments to Section 80071.5 pertaining to the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) requirement is being presented for public hearing. Included in this item is 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 that notification distributed in coded correspondence #00-0001, dated January 7, 2000.

Background of the Proposed Regulations

This was presented at the June 1999 Commission Meeting as an information item and, again, at the July 1999 Commission Meeting as an action item.

Proposed Changes

The proposed §80071.5 specify the Multiple Subject and Education Specialist Instruction Credential applicants who are exempt from the RICA. These proposed regulations apply to individuals who initially apply for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential on or after October 1, 1998, and the Education Specialist Instruction Credential on or after January 1, 2000. The proposal exempts the following applicants:

- (a) Individuals applying for the Early Childhood Special Education Certificate or the Early Childhood Special Education Credential.
- (b) Individuals applying for the one-year nonrenewable and the two-year preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or Education Specialist Instruction Credential. Additionally, it clarifies that to renew the two-year preliminary, the individual must pass RICA unless exempted by one of the other sub-sections.
- (c) Individuals who hold a valid California teaching credential based on a baccalaureate degree and a teacher education program including student teaching other than the one-year nonrenewable or two-year preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or Education Specialist Instruction Credential mentioned in sub-section (b).

(d) Individuals holding a valid out-of-state credential comparable to the California credential sought.

Financial Impact

Education Codes §44283 and §44283.2, which establish the RICA requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and the Education Specialist Instruction Credential, specify those individuals who must pass the assessment for California teaching credentials. Because of this, these proposed regulations do not have an impact on cost or savings. They only add clarity so the implementation of these Education Codes will be more readily understood.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing: None.

State Colleges and Universities: None.

Private Persons: None.

Mandated costs: None.

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Mailing List and Responses

Mailing List

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

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

Tally of Responses

In Support	In Opposition
3 organizational opinions	1 organizational opinion
12 personal opinions	1 personal opinion

Responses Representing Organizational Opinions in Support

- Lodi Unified School District: Len Casanega, Director, Certification Personnel
- San Pasqual Union School District: Wendy Gonsalves, Business Clerk
- Somerset Educational Services: Mary Ann Salem, Director of Student Services

Responses Representing Personal Opinions in Support

- Christopher Bayless, Assistant Superintendent, Delhi Unified School District
- Janet L. Bernard, Director of Curriculum, Del Mar Union School District
- Nancy Brashear, Chair, Teacher Education, Azusa Pacific University
- Robert M. Dunbar, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, Sylvan Union School District
- Elena Fernandez, Credential Analyst, Teacher Education Program, Pacific Oaks College

Responses Representing Personal Opinions in Support (cont.)

- R. L. Ferrara, Assistant Superintendent Personnel, Lodi Unified School District
- David R. Freeman, Assistant Superintendent, Eureka Union School District
- Greg Kaiser, Director, Multiple Subject Program, Azusa Pacific University
- DeWayne Norris, Program Specialist, Families First Non-Public School
- Susan Pastorini, Director of Human Resources, Sunnyvale School District
- Marsha Thacher, Administrator, Cornerstone School
- Greg Thompson, Lead Instructor, Sierra Ranch School

Responses Representing Organizational Opinions in Opposition

- Hot Springs School District: Alan Wilkinson, Superintendent
Comment: (No reason given.)

Responses Representing Personal Opinions in Opposition

- Kevin A. Allen, Teacher, Regency High School
Comment: Too much red tape bureaucracy already.

Commission Staff Response: The proposed Title 5, §80071.5 implements Education Codes §44283 and §44283.2, which are very specific.

Responses Not Giving an Opinion

- Phyllis Fernlund, Dean, School of Education, Sonoma State University
Comment: Unclear - will the Level II credential include RICA test for out of state teachers as a requirement, or are they exempt from such a requirement?

Commission Staff Response: Out of state trained special education teachers may receive a two-year preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential without passing the RICA. [§80071.5(b)] To renew this preliminary level I for the remainder of the five years, the individual will need to pass the RICA. Individuals who hold a five-year preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential prior to the implementation of the RICA requirement, will not need to pass the RICA to obtain the professional clear level II credential. (§80071.5: introductory paragraph) Individuals applying for a five-year preliminary level I or professional clear level II Credential after the implementation of the RICA requirement, without first obtaining the two-year preliminary, will first need to pass the RICA. (§80071.5: introductory paragraph)

Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed regulations.

letterhead



OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
(916) 445-0184

00-0001

DATE: January 7, 2000

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 Addition of Title 5 Regulation, §80071.5 Pertaining to the RICA Requirement

Notice of Public Hearing is Hereby Given:

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

March 2, 2000
1:30 p.m.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814

Statement of Reasons

The following is a detailed discussion of the proposed §80071.5 subsections. These specify the Multiple Subject and Education Specialist Instruction Credential applicants who are exempt from the RICA.

Introductory Paragraph: The introductory paragraph reiterates the RICA requirement dates found in statutes. The requirement is only needed for those individuals who apply for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential on or after October 1, 1998, and the Education Specialist Instruction Credential on or after January 1, 2000.

§80071.5(a): This subsection refers to the RICA exemptions found in Education Code §44283.2(b). They are for individuals applying for the Early Childhood Special Education Certificate or the Early Childhood Special Education Credential.

§80071.5(b): The CBEST Education Code §44252(b)(3) allows the issuance of the one-year nonrenewable credential without verifying the RICA requirement. Education Code §44253 allows out-of-state individuals seeking a two-year preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or Education Specialist Instruction Credential to defer verifying the RICA requirement. The proposed §80071.5(b) reflects these exemptions. Additionally, it clarifies that to renew the two-year preliminary, the individual must pass RICA unless exempt by either of the two following subsections.

§80071.5(c): Education Code §44283.2 exempts individuals who are not "first time credential applicants" from the RICA requirement when applying for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential. Education Code §44283.2 also allows the same exemption for Education Specialist Instruction Credential applicants. Subsection 80071.5(c) clarifies that the exemption refers to individuals who hold a valid California teaching credential based on a baccalaureate degree and a teacher education program including student teaching, such as the Single Subject or Standard Elementary Teaching Credentials. It also clarifies that individuals who received either a one-year nonrenewable or a two-year preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or Education Specialist Instruction Credential, based on §80071.5(b), are not exempt from the RICA requirement if they apply for the three-year extension while holding only those credentials.

§80071.5(d): This proposed subsection reflects the RICA exemption, found in Education Code §44283 and §44283.2, for individuals "credentialed in any other state" and seeking either the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or the Education Specialist Instruction Credential. The wording clarifies that the out-of-state credential must be valid and comparable to the California credential sought.

Documents Relied Upon in Preparing Regulations

None.

Documents Incorporated by Reference

None.

Written Comment Period

Any interested person, or his or her authorized representative, may submit written

comments on the proposed actions. The written comment period closes at 5:00 p.m. on March 1, 2000.

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, California 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 Yvonne Novelli at (916) 445-5865 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 non-substantial 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 Yvonne Novelli, at (916) 445-5865. 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 at the Commission.

Attachments

Division VIII of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations

Proposed Addition of §80071.5 Pertaining to the RICA Requirement

INITIAL PROPOSED REGULATIONS

§80071.5. Reading Instruction Competence Assessment

Every applicant for an initial Multiple Subject Teaching Credential on or after October 1, 1998, or an initial Education Specialist Instruction Credential on or after January 1, 2000, shall be required to obtain a passing score on the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) with the following exceptions.

- (a) Applicants applying for a document exempt by Education Code 44283.2(b).
- (b) Applicants applying for a one-year nonrenewable or a two-year preliminary teaching credential based on 1) a teacher education program including student teaching obtained outside of California and 2) a baccalaureate degree. These applicants must pass RICA prior to renewing the two-year preliminary unless exempt by §80071.5 (c) or (d).
- (c) Applicants holding a valid California teaching credential, other than the credentials

described in (b), based on a baccalaureate degree and a teacher education program including student teaching.

- (d) Applicants holding a valid teaching credential from another state, with a comparable authorization to the credential sought.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44252(b)(3), 44253, 44283 and 44283.2 Education Code.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GRAY DAVIS, Governor

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Box 944270

Sacramento, California 94244-2700

(916) 445-7254 Web Site: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov>

E-Mail: credentials@ctc.ca.gov



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

Title: **RICA Requirement**
Section Nos.: **80071.5**

Response to the Attached Title 5 Regulations

So that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing can more clearly estimate the general field response to the attached Title 5 regulations, please return this response form to the Commission, attention Executive Office, at the above address by 5:00 pm on March 1, 2000, in order that the material can be presented at the March 2, 2000 public hearing.

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____ Phone: _____

Employer/Organization: _____

Mailing Address: _____

route to yn



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to March 2000 Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |

