



See Also: [Minutes of the February Commission Agenda](#)

Web-Posted January
24, 2002

February Commission Agenda

February 6-7, 2002
Commission Offices, 1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814

► NOTE: All linked agenda items are in [PDF](#) Format...

Wednesday, February 6, 2002 - Commission Office

1. General Session (Chairman Bersin)

1:00 p.m.

The Commission will immediately convene into Closed Session

Closed Session (Chairman Bersin/Vice Chairman Madkins)

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

2. Appeals and Waivers (Committee Chairman Madkins)

- A&W-1 Approval of the Minutes
- A&W-2 Waivers: Consent Calendar
- A&W-3 Waivers: Conditions Calendar
- A&W-4 Waivers: Denial Calendar

Thursday, February 7, 2002 - Commission Office

1. General Session (Chairman Bersin)

8:00 a.m.

- GS-1 Roll Call
- GS-2 Pledge of Allegiance
- GS-3 Approval of the January 2002 Minutes
- GS-4 Approval of the February 2002 Agenda
- GS-5 Approval of the February 2002 Consent Calendar
- GS-6 Annual Calendar of Events - for Information
- GS-7 Chair's Report
- GS-8 Executive Director's Report
- GS-9 Report on Monthly State Board Meeting

2. Preparation Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Katzman)

- PREP-1 Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities
- PREP-2 Update on the Comparability Studies of Subject Matter Requirements in Other States (AB 877 - Scott, 2000)
- PREP-3 Recommended Approval of SB 395 Staff Development Programs for Teachers of English Learners
- PREP-4 Analysis of the Education Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sections relating to the Requirements and Authorization of the Administrative Services Credential
- PREP-5 Issues and Options in the Preparation And Licensure of School Administrators

3. Legislative Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Madkins)

- LEG-1 Status of Legislation of Interest to the Commission
- LEG-2 Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission

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

- FPPC-1 Update on the Governor's Budget for Fiscal Year 2002-03

5. Credentialing and Certificated Assignments Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Fortune)

- C&CA-1 Proposed Changes to Title 5 Section 80043 Pertaining to the Eminence Credential Application Appeal and Denial Process
- C&CA-2 Transition to Teaching: A Summary of the Pilot Project with Oakland and San Diego School Districts

6. Study Session

10:00 a.m.

- SS-1 Informational Presentation on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

7. Public Hearing

11:00 a.m.

[Proposed Amendments](#) to Sections 80026.4, 80026.6, and 80122 of California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Pertaining to the Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators

8. Reconvene General Session (Chairman Bersin)

- GS-10 Report of Appeals and Waivers Committee
- GS-11 Report of Closed Session Items
- GS-12 Commission Member Reports
- GS-13 Audience Presentations
- GS-14 Old Business
 - Quarterly Agenda for Information
 - February, March and April 2002
- GS-15 New Business
- GS-16 Adjournment

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, California, CA 95814; telephone, (916) 445-0184.

NEXT MEETING:

March 6-7, 2002

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814**

Updated February 14, 2002

**California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

**Meeting of
February 6-7, 2002**

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: PREP - 1

COMMITTEE: Preparation Standards Committee

**TITLE: Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs
Submitted by Colleges and Universities**

 X **Action**

 Information

 Report

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

**Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of
professional educators**

- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators
- Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** 1/14//02
Helen Hawley
Consultant, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** 1/14/02
Margaret Olebe, Ph. D.
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** 1/14/02
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** 1/14/02
Dr. Sam W. Swofford
Executive Director

Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities

Professional Services Division

January 11, 2002

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 listed on page five.

Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities

Professional Services Division

January 11, 2002

Subject Matter Preparation Program Review Panel Recommendations

Background

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

Summary Information on Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs Awaiting Commission Approval

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

Recommendation

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

SCIENCE

- California State University, Stanislaus

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of
February 6-7, 2002*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PREP – 2**

COMMITTEE: **Preparation Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Update on the Comparability Studies of Subject Matter Requirements in Other States (AB 877 – Scott, 2000)**

- Action**
- Information**
- Report**

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

- Goal 1:** **Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**
- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators
- Goal 6:** **Provide leadership in exploring multiple, high quality routes to prepare professional educators for California schools**
- Work with education entities to expand the pool of qualified professional educators

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** _____
Phil Fitch, Ed.D.
Consultant, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** _____
Sam W. Swofford Ed.D.
Executive Director

**Update on the Comparability Studies of Subject Matter
Requirements in Other States
(AB 877 – Scott, 2000)**

Professional Services Division

December 27, 2001

Executive Summary

This is the third agenda item that has been prepared for Commission consideration that relates to the comparability of both multiple subject and single subject, subject matter requirements in other states with those of California. The first agenda item related to the comparability of the multiple subject, subject matter requirements of ten selected states. The Commission voted on September 6, 2001 that nine of the ten states studied were comparable to the Commission approved multiple subject, subject matter requirements. The second agenda item was considered by the Commission at its October 4, 2001 meeting. This item provided comparability data on nineteen additional states for multiple subject, subject matter requirements and the requirements for Washington D.C. The Commission voted on October 4 that eleven of the twenty states studied were comparable to the requirements in California. The second agenda item also included comparability data that was approved by the Commission on October 4, 2001 for single subject, subject matter requirements in several fields. If the Commission acts favorably on the staff recommendations and findings of comparability presented in this item, there will be 36 states that been found to have comparable multiple subject, subject matter requirements. Also, there will be a large number of states found to have comparable single subject, subject matter requirements in various single subject fields

The comparability studies of subject matter requirements of the states were authorized by Commission sponsored legislation) and have been completed through contracted work with Educational Testing Service (ETS), Princeton, New Jersey. The Commission authorized the Executive Director to enter into a contract with ETS during its March 8, 2001, meeting and a contract was signed with ETS in May 2001. The contract calls for seven deliverables between July 1, 2001 and March 2, 2003. The contract with ETS calls for the contractor to review and analyze the subject matter requirements for the other states regarding the preparation of multiple subject and single subject teachers. The contract also calls for a review of credential emphasis or equivalent programs in other states pursuant to AB 877 and includes the development of a database of out-of-state teacher credential requirements. AB 877 requires the Commission to contract for periodic reviews of the comparability of out-of-state requirements related to subject matter requirements and credential emphasis or equivalent programs commencing in 2001 with the reviews to be updated every three years. The database of out-of-state teacher credential requirements is being developed in preparation for the next review cycle commencing in 2004.

Policy Issue to be Considered

Should the Commission adopt the findings on comparability by for the multiple subject-subject matter requirements and single subject-subject matter requirements contained in this agenda item?

Fiscal Impact Statement

AB 877 (Scott, 2000) appropriated \$350,000 from the General Fund for the purpose of conducting comparability studies of out-of-state teacher credential requirements for the 2000-2001 fiscal year.

Recommendation

That the Commission adopt the findings of comparability of the multiple subject-subject matter and single subject-subject matter requirements and standards requirements for the various states identified in this item.

Update on the Comparability Studies of Subject Matter Requirements in Other States (AB 877 – Scott, 2000)

**Professional Services Division
December 27, 2001**

Overview

This agenda report provides the Commission with a progress report on the implementation of AB 877 (Scott, 2000) related to the comparability of subject matter requirements and standards and credential emphasis or equivalent programs of other states. In March, 2001 the Commission authorized the Executive Director to enter into a contract with Educational Testing Service (ETS) located in Princeton, New Jersey, to complete a series of studies of comparability. The contract with ETS calls for seven different deliverables due from the contractor starting July 1, 2001 and ending March 2, 2003, as described in Table 4.

The Commission sponsored AB 877 to study those areas that were lacking in comparability in the initial comparability studies conducted pursuant to AB 1620 (Scott, 1998), and to further streamline and facilitate the entry of qualified out-of-state teachers into the teaching profession in California. A Reciprocity Task Force was established to implement AB 1620. The actions of the Commission that were recommended by the Task Force can be found on page 20 of this agenda item. Building on the initial comparability studies of AB 1620, AB 877 requires the Commission to contract for periodic reviews of the comparability of out-of-state requirements related to subject matter preparation, and credential emphasis or equivalent programs, commencing in 2001. These reviews will be updated every three years, commencing in 2004.

Educational Testing Service (ETS) first used the specific subject matter requirements and test specifications that exist in the various states being reviewed for this second deliverable from ETS, which was received on September 1, 2001. The analysis for comparability enabled ETS staff to both quantify and qualify the specific data. The program standards were then analyzed for comparability. The specific data from the subject matter requirements enabled the staff to further complete a comparison standard by standard. Particular attention was given to the standards from other states that dealt with candidate assessment, required subjects of study and standards related to depth and breadth of content studies.

Methodology Used by Contractor

As was the case for the first deliverable received on July 1, 2001, the second deliverable September 1, 2001 and the third deliverable that was received from ETS on December 1, 2001, included an analysis of the comparability of the standards, subject matter requirements and the test specifications for the subject matter content required for multiple subject (elementary teacher) candidates and in selected cases, single subject (secondary candidates) in the selected states. ETS first analyzed each specific content area in the subject matter requirement of all the states for elementary candidates in other states. The content areas were: literature and language studies; mathematics; visual and performing arts; physical education; human development; history; geography; social studies; science including biology, geoscience, physical science with

experimentation and investigation; and humanities. ETS determined the content match for each content area listed above and for each sub-content area. As an example, the sub-content areas for mathematics are number sense and numeration, geometry, measurement, algebraic concepts, number theory, real number systems, probability, and statistics and mathematical reasoning. The single subject areas studied for this deliverable were foreign language, music, physical education, art, English, mathematics, biology, chemistry, geoscience, physics, and for one state, social studies.

Second, ETS compared the exam specifications that each state had established based on the subject matter requirements. A comparative analysis was completed on each state's exam specifications.

The third comparative study completed by ETS was a standard by standard comparison. Standards related to candidate assessment, content breadth and depth, and specific subjects of study. The target or criteria used to determine comparability was an 80% match in the standards, subject matter requirements and examination specifications. In the case that a state was close to 80% in one area (e.g., subject matter requirements) and higher than 80% in another area (e.g., standards) then the state was determined to be comparable.

Next Steps

As indicated on in Table 4, ETS will submit comparability studies and an analysis of credential emphasis or equivalent programs for the other 49 states and Washington D.C. The major focus of the ETS work will be comparable programs in other states related to Middle School, Early Childhood, CLAD and BCLAD Emphasis Programs. The ETS deliverable for this work is March 31, 2002 and the results of their work should be submitted to the Commission in the May or June, 2002 Commission Agenda.

The tables on the following pages identify the states that have been found to be comparable. Table 1 lists all states previously recognized as having comparable multiple subject, subject matter requirements. Table 2 lists the findings of ETS for three states regarding multiple subject, subject matter requirements.

Table 1

**States Previously Determined to be Comparable
By the Commission Under AB 1620 (Scott, 1998)**

Alabama	Kentucky	Oklahoma
Arizona	Maryland	Oregon
Arkansas	Michigan	Pennsylvania
Colorado	Minnesota	Rhode Island
Connecticut	Missouri	South Carolina
Delaware	Montana	South Dakota
Florida	Nebraska	Tennessee
Georgia	Nevada	Texas
Idaho	New York	Utah
Illinois	North Dakota	Virginia
Indiana	Ohio	Wisconsin

Table 2

Findings on Multiple Subject-Subject Matter Comparability for Three Additional States

State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
Alaska	91	92
Hawaii	84	94
Massachusetts	89	85

Staff recommends that the Commission adopts the findings of ETS shown above, regarding multiple subject, subject matter comparability for three additional states.

Single Subject-Subject Matter Comparability Study

This agenda item also includes the results of recent comparability studies conducted by ETS regarding single subject, subject matter requirements for the forty nine (49) states and Washington D.C.

Table 3**New Findings on Single Subject-Subject Matter Comparability**

Foreign Language					
French – 1 State Previously Found Comparable			Spanish – 18 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match	State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Alaska	88	95	1. Arizona	100	84
2. Louisiana	94	89	2. Hawaii	94	93
3. Michigan	88	86	3. Illinois	94	93
4. Minnesota	85	95	4. Indiana	88	96
5. Texas	100	95	5. Kansas	81	89
			6. Massachusetts	100	84
			7. Montana	88	96
			8. New Hampshire	88	93
			9. New Jersey	88	84
			10. Ohio	88	95
			11. Pennsylvania	88	86
			12. South Carolina	85	86
			13. South Dakota	85	91
			14. Vermont	84	79
			15. Wisconsin	88	95
			16. Louisiana	94	82
			17. Texas	100	95

Art – 17 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Colorado	82	90
2. Hawaii	82	90
3. Idaho	96	95
4. Illinois	96	97
5. Kansas	82	83
6. Louisiana	86	85
7. Massachusetts	100	98
8. Montana	89	95
9. New Hampshire	86	93
10. North Dakota	86	83
11. South Dakota	86	88
12. Wisconsin	86	87

English – 45 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Idaho	83	92
2. Iowa	83	85
3. New Hampshire	100	92
4. Utah	100	92

Mathematics – 37 States Previously Found Comparable		
States	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Idaho	100	99
2. Washington D.C.	100	80
3. Montana	97	98
4. Nevada	88	83
5. New Hampshire	97	98
6. New Mexico	100	85
7. North Dakota	97	98
8. Ohio	84	81
9. Utah	94	98
10. Vermont	84	86

Music – 21 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Florida	88	96
2. Hawaii	100	98
3. Illinois	100	98
4. Indiana	100	100
5. Iowa	88	96
6. Kansas	81	91
7. Louisiana	100	98
8. Michigan	94	88
9. Mississippi	100	98
10. Montana	100	98
11. Nebraska	81	91
12. New Hampshire	100	98
13. New Jersey	100	96
14. New York	100	81
15. North Dakota	100	98
16. South Carolina	100	100
17. Texas	94	96
18. West Virginia	100	88
19. Wisconsin	81	93
20. Wyoming	100	79

Physical Education – 34 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Washington D.C.	100	80
2. Kansas	79	84
3. Louisiana	100	98
4. Maine	100	86
5. Texas	100	100
6. New Mexico	100	85

Social Science – 40 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Washington D.C.	100	100
2. Idaho	79	88
3. Iowa	100	85
4. Nebraska	92	90
5. New Hampshire	100	90
6. North Dakota	100	87
7. Vermont	100	87
8. Wyoming	96	79

Biology – 28 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Arizona	90	89
2. Washington D.C.	100	79
3. Kansas	90	94
4. Massachusetts	100	89
5. Montana	80	97
6. Nevada	100	86
7. New Hampshire	100	98
8. New Jersey	100	95
9. North Dakota	100	98
10. Utah	95	95
11. Vermont	100	89
12. Wisconsin	100	94

Chemistry – 26 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Arizona	90	84
2. Idaho	100	95
3. Michigan	90	83
4. Montana	80	95
5. Nevada	100	89
6. New Hampshire	100	98
7. New Jersey	80	94
8. North Dakota	100	98
9. Pennsylvania	100	91
10. South Dakota	80	83
11. Texas	95	89
12. Utah	80	94
13. Vermont	80	88
14. Wisconsin	80	92

Geoscience – 25 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Alaska	100	97
2. Washington D.C.	100	79
3. Idaho	90	95
4. Kansas	100	94
5. Montana	80	95
6. New Hampshire	100	98
7. North Dakota	80	100
8. South Dakota	85	83
9. Utah	95	95
10. Vermont	100	89
11. Wisconsin	100	94

Physics – 30 States Previously Found Comparable		
State	Percent Content Match	Percent Standards Match
1. Arizona	100	86
2. Washington D.C.	100	79
3. Idaho	100	95
4. Kansas	80	92
5. Massachusetts	100	90
6. Michigan	96	82
7. Montana	80	95
8. New Hampshire	100	98
9. North Dakota	100	98
10. Oregon	88	94
11. South Dakota	95	84
12. Texas	96	88
13. Utah	80	94
14. Vermont	88	88
15. Wisconsin	80	92
16. Wyoming	83	83

Staff Recommends that the Commission approve the single subject-subject matter requirements of the states list above as being comparable to those established by the Commission for single subject-subject matter requirements for California single subject teachers.

Following is a table with information regarding the seven deliverables for the contract with ETS.

Table 4

ETS Contract Schedule

<i>Due Date</i>	<i>Deliverable</i>
1. July 1, 2001	Submit analysis of multiple subject – subject matter and standards comparability, including exam specifications for ten (10) selected states
2. September 1, 2001	Submit analysis of other state multiple subject – subject matter requirements, including exam specifications
3. December 1, 2001	Submit remaining multiple subject – subject matter studies and all remaining single subject – subject matter comparability studies Submit source documents for studies
4. March 31, 2002	Submit analysis documents of the credential emphasis or equivalent programs comparability study with half of the states
5. June 1, 2002	Submit report on the results of the credential emphasis or equivalent programs comparability study with all state data and source documents included
6. December 1, 2002	Submit CD electronic files, state documents and summary of survey results
7. March 2, 2003	Submit complete database
8. March 15, 2003	Contract completed

Previous Actions of the Commission

Regarding AB 1620 (Scott, 1998) and AB 877 (Scott, 2000) Comparability Studies

Following are a series of charts that show the comparability of various multiple, single and special education credential requirements. Candidates from out-of-state are presently being credentialed under these provisions.

**Summary of States Determined to be Comparable
If The Commission Takes Favorable Action 2-6 - 2002**

Multiple Subject-Subject Matter Requirements		36 States
Single Subject-Subject Matter Requirements		
English		49 States
Math		47 States
Social Science		48 States
Science		
Biological Science		40 States
Chemistry		40 States
Physics		46 States
Geoscience		36 States
Physical Education		40 States
Music		41 States
Art		29 States
Foreign Languages	French	6 States
	Spanish	35 States
Special Education		
Mild-Moderate		31 States
Moderate-Severe		22 States
Low Incidence		
Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing		28 States
Physical and Health Impairments		9 States
Visual Impairments		26 States
Early Childhood Special Education		18 States
Clinical Rehabilitation: Audiology		7 States
Clinical Rehab: Lang., Speech, Hearing		24 States
Clinical Rehab: Orientation and Mobility		1 State

Appendix A

Findings of Subject Matter Comparability for Out-of-State Elementary and Secondary Teacher Preparation Programs as of February 6, 2002

State	Multiple Subjects	Single Subject Art	Single Subject English	Single Subject French/ Spanish SP FR	Single Subject Math	Single Subject Music	Single Subject P.E.	Single Subject Science: Biological Science	Single Subject Science: Chemistry	Single Subject Science: Geoscience	Single Subject Science: Physics	Single Subject Social Science
Alabama	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Alaska	X*		X		X*	X	X	X	X	X*	X	X
Arizona	X		X	X*	X			X*	X*		X*	X
Arkansas	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Colorado	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Connecticut	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Delaware	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
D.C.			X	X	X*	X	X*	X*		X*	X*	X*
Florida	X	X	X	X	X	X*	X					X
Georgia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hawaii	X*	X*	X	X*	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X
Idaho	X	X*	X*		X*				X*	X*	X*	X*
Illinois	X	X*	X	X*	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X
Indiana	X	X	X	X*	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X
Iowa			X*			X*						X*
Kansas		X*	X	X*	X	X*	X*	X*		X*	X*	X
Kentucky	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Louisiana		X*	X	X*	X*	X	X*	X*	X		X	X
Maine			X		X		X*					X
Maryland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Massachusetts	X*	X*	X	X*	X	X	X	X*	X	X	X*	X
Michigan	X	X	X		X*	X	X*	X		X*	X*	
Minnesota	X	X	X	X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

- - Pending Commission approval at its February 2002 meeting

Appendix A

State	Multiple Subjects	Single Subject Art	Single Subject English	Single Subject Spanish /French		Single Subject Math	Single Subject Music	Single Subject P.E.	Single Subject Science: Biological Science	Single Subject Science: Chemistry	Single Subject Science: Geoscience	Single Subject Science: Physics	Single Subject Social Science
				SP	FR								
Mississippi			X			X	X*	X	X	X		X	X
Missouri	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Montana	X	X*	X	X*		X*	X*		X*	X*	X*	X*	
Nebraska	X		X			X	X*						X*
Nevada	X		X	X		X*	X	X	X*	X*		X	X
New Hampshire		X*	X*	X*		X*	X*		X*	X*	X*	X*	X*
New Jersey			X	X*		X	X*	X	X*	X*	X	X	X
New Mexico			X			X*	X*	X*				X	X
New York	X		X	X		X	X*	X	X	X	X	X	X
N. Carolina		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
N. Dakota	X	X*	X			X*	X*		X*	X*	X*	X*	X*
Ohio	X	X	X	X*		X*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Oklahoma	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Oregon	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X*	X
Penn.	X	X	X	X*		X	X	X		X*	X	X	X
Rhode Is.	X		X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X
S. Carolina	X		X	X*		X	X*	X	X	X		X	X
S. Dakota	X	X*	X	X*		X	X	X		X*	X*	X*	X
Tennessee	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Texas	X	X	X	X*	X*	X	X*	X*	X	X*	X	X*	X
Utah	X		X*			X*		X	X*	X*	X*	X*	X
Vermont				X*		X*			X*	X*	X*	X*	X*
Virginia	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Washington			X				X		X	X	X	X	X
West Virginia		X	X			X	X*	X	X	X		X	X
Wisconsin	X	X*	X	X*		X	X*	X	X*	X*	X*	X*	X
Wyoming			X				X*					X*	X*

* - Pending Commission approval at its February 2002 meeting

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of
February 6-7, 2002*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PREP - 3**

COMMITTEE: **Preparation Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Recommended Approval of SB 395 Staff
Development Programs for Teachers of English
Learners**

 X **Action**

 Information

 Report

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

- Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**
- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** _____
Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** _____
Dr. Sam W. Swofford
Executive Director

**Recommended Approval of SB 395 Staff Development Programs
for Teachers of English Learners**

Professional Services Division

January 10, 2001

Executive Summary

SB 395 (Hughes, 1999) extended provisions of existing law that authorized staff development training for certain experienced teachers to prepare them to teach English learners in the general education classroom. Under SB 395 such training could be provided to teachers with permanent status as of January 1, 1999 through January 1, 2005, provided that they met all eligibility requirements, and completed either 45 or 90 hours of such training in a Commission-approved program. This item reports on actions taken by the Commission, as set out in statute, to design and implement a program-approval process, and recommends 14 program sponsors be approved as providers of SB 395 staff development.

Policy(s) Issue to be Considered

Should the Commission approve the recommended staff development programs for teachers of English Learners pursuant to SB 395 (Hughes, 1999)?

Fiscal Impact Statement

The revision of program guidelines, development of a program advisory and implementation of the approval process was provided for in the base budget of the Professional Services Division for FY '01 –'02.

Recommendation

Staff recommend that the Commission approve the programs listed in Table 1.

Recommended Approval of SB 395 Staff Development Programs for Teachers of English Learners

Introduction

In California there are several alternative routes for teachers to obtain an authorization to teach English learners, either in their own classrooms or in specialized settings.

Currently, the Commission has approved Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) Emphasis Credential and Certificate Programs for the purpose of preparing teachers to teach English learners in English. The CLAD Emphasis Credential is available to prospective teachers who are pursuing an initial multiple or single subject basic credential through an approved program of professional preparation at a college or university. The CLAD Certificate is issued to credentialed teachers who successfully complete 12 upper division or graduate level degree-applicable units in approved courses at a college or university, or who successfully complete Tests 1, 2, and 3 of the Commission's CLAD/BCLAD Examinations. Both the CLAD Emphasis Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential and the CLAD Certificate authorize teaching English learners in mainstream general education classrooms and in specialized settings.

In addition, certain experienced teachers may obtain a Certificate authorizing teaching English learners in the subjects authorized by the basic teaching credential by completing a 45-hour or 90 hour program of staff development in English Language Development (ELD) and/or Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) offered pursuant to SB 395 (Hughes). This statute amends Education Code Section 44253.10 by extending and revising provisions originally set out in SB 1969, which sunset in 1999. The current statute requires the Commission to approve any new programs of staff development using guidelines for these programs originally developed under SB 1969 (Hughes) and then revised to reflect current policies and practices for teaching English learners. Under the earlier statute only staff development programs offered by professional organizations were required to obtain Commission approval. One program, offered by the California Teachers Association, was approved by the Commission in 1998. Current law requires the Commission to approve all such programs whether sponsored by local education agencies, institutions of higher education or professional organizations. Individuals completing a Commission-approved program will receive a Commission-issued SB 395 Certificate. Individuals who have already completed the Commission-approved program may elect to convert their certificates from locally-issued to Commission-issued certificates.

This item describes the nature of these programs, the process implemented for reviewing proposed programs, and staff recommendations for program approval.

Background

Provisions of SB 395 address: (1) eligibility for staff development programs; (2) programs options and authorizations; (3) program guidelines; and (4) program approval processes. This section of the Education Code requires all individuals to complete the staff development program by January 1, 2005.

Eligibility.

To be eligible for SB 395 training, a teacher must hold a valid, basic teaching credential and be a permanent employee as of January 1, 1999 of a school district or county office of education, with specified exceptions.

The exceptions are a teacher who was previously a permanent employee and then was employed in any California public school district within 39 months of the previous permanent status, or a teacher who has been employed in a school district with an average daily attendance of not more than 250 for at least two years.

Program Options

For teachers who meet either of these two requirements, the law provides for two distinct 45 hour segments of staff development. The content is to consist of: (1) an initial segment of 45 clock hours covering a combination of Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) methods and English Language Development (ELD) instruction, and (2) a second segment of 45 clock hours of training of either ELD instruction or a combination of SDAIE methods and ELD instruction.

Whether a teacher will complete one (45 hours) or two (90 hours) segments depends on the authorization being sought, authorization of his or her basic credential (Multiple Subjects or Single Subject Credential), years of teaching experience, and nature of professional experience. SB 395 provides that:

1. A teacher who holds a *Multiple Subjects Credential or other valid elementary teaching credential and who has nine or more years of teaching experience, and certified experience or training in teaching English learners* may be assigned to teach English learners using SDAIE methods and content-based ELD instruction in subjects taught in a self-contained classroom (consistent with the authorization of his or her basic credential) if he or she completes 45 hours of training in a combination of SDAIE methods and ELD instruction.
2. A teacher who holds a *Single Subject Credential or other valid departmentalized teaching credential* may be assigned to teach English learners using SDAIE methods and content-based ELD instruction in any departmentalized teaching assignment that is consistent with the subject and grade authorization of his or her basic credential if he or she completes 45 clock hours of staff development in a combination of SDAIE methods and ELD instruction. Single Subject Credential holders do not need to have

a certain number of years of teaching experience or other prior professional experience with English learners to participate in this training.

3. A teacher who holds a *Multiple Subjects Credential or other elementary teaching credential and has either less than nine years of full-time teaching experience in California public schools or no certified experience or training in teaching English learners* may be assigned to teach English learners using SDAIE methods if he or she completes 45 clock hours of staff development in a combination of SDAIE methods and ELD instruction. This same teacher may be assigned to provide ELD instruction to English learners in a self-contained classroom if, within three years after completion of the 45 clock hours of staff development in a combination of SDAIE and ELD described above, he or she completes an *additional* 45 hours of staff development which includes additional training in a combination of SDAIE methods and ELD instruction or training in ELD instruction only.

Guidelines

Under this statute the Commission must establish guidelines for the staff development program that are aligned with teacher preparation leading to the CLAD Certificate. The guidelines originally established under SB 1969 were revised to reflect current policies for teaching English learners, including the teaching of reading. To facilitate their use, the number of guidelines was reduced from 22 to 9 and the participant competencies were included within each guideline as appropriate. The current guidelines are:

Guideline 1	Program Design
Guideline 2	Participant Assessment Plan
Guideline 3	Foundational Knowledge
Guideline 4	Role of Assessment
Guideline 5	English Language Development
Guideline 6	SDAIE
Guideline 7	Capacity to Offer a Staff Development Program
Guideline 8	Administration of Teacher Eligibility
Guideline 9	Authorization of Certificates of Completion

These guidelines meet applicable federal statutes and address qualifications of staff developers, as required in this section of the Education Code, and do not require additional time for program completion.

Program Approval

This statute provides for Commission review of staff development programs in relation to the guidelines, and requires that all programs not previously approved be reviewed. Colleges and universities as well as local education agencies are eligible to be program sponsors. Each program submitted for review that does not meet the applicable guidelines upon initial submission may be reviewed a second time. All such reviews

must have been completed by January 1, 2002. Persons already enrolled in programs prior to January 1, 2002 may apply for locally-issued certificates of completion until January 1, 2003.

Review Process

A program advisory containing the revised program guidelines, submission directions, guidance to prospective program sponsors, and relevant coded correspondence was circulated to the field in June 2001. Two informational meetings, one in Southern California and one in Northern California, were held in the same month. In the advisory, timelines for submissions by program sponsors and for response by the Commission after review were set out. Three submission opportunities were established, one each in July, September and November. Prospective sponsors were required to state whether they were applying for the first segment of training, consisting of 45 hours of training in both ELD and SDAIE, and/or the second segment of training, consisting of 45 hours of additional instruction in combined ELD and SDAIE, or ELD only. They were also required to state how the training would be differentiated for elementary and secondary teachers.

A review team of qualified individuals from K-12 and institutions of higher education was selected from a cross-section of statewide applicants. A total of ten individuals participated as reviewers. The review team was trained and calibrated by Commission staff at its initial meeting. All submissions were reviewed by a minimum of three reviewers all of whom were neither affiliated with the program nor from the same part of the state. All programs submitted were reviewed within the required timelines.

A total of nineteen submissions were received. Of these, eleven submissions were for the first 45 hour training segment, one was for the second 45 hour segment and seven submissions were for both segments. No submission was found to meet all guidelines upon initial review. All prospective program sponsors were provided extensive written feedback on those guidelines found to be less than fully met, as well as the opportunity for discussion of the information with staff. Of those submitted, six declined to resubmit their proposals for a second review. One program was not recommended for approval.

Staff Recommendation

Based on a thorough review of program materials submitted in response to the guidelines, staff recommend the following sponsors be approved to provide staff development training for teachers of English learners pursuant to SB 395.

Table 1. Sponsors and Programs for Staff Development Pursuant to SB 395 Recommended for Approval.

Sponsoring Organization	Type of Program
1. California State University, Long Beach Center for Language Minority Education and Research	Segments 1 & 2, Elementary and Secondary
2. Inyo County Office of Education	Segment 1, Elementary and Secondary
3. Lancaster School District, Antelope Valley Consortium	Segments 1 & 2, Elementary
4. Long Beach Unified School District	Segments 1 & 2, Elementary and Secondary
5. Orange County Department of Education	Segment 1, Elementary and Secondary
6. Riverside County Office of Education	Segment 1, Elementary and Secondary
7. San Bernardino Superintendent of Schools Office	Segment 1, Elementary and Secondary
8. San Diego County Office of Education	Segment 1, Secondary
9. San Diego Unified School District	Segment 1, Elementary and Secondary
10. San Joaquin County Office of Education	Segment 1, Elementary and Secondary
11. San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	Segment 1, Elementary and Secondary
12. San Mateo County Office of Education	Segment 1, Elementary and Secondary
13. Ventura County Office of Education	Segment 1, Elementary and Secondary

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of
February 6-7, 2002*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PREP - 4**

COMMITTEE: **Preparation Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Analysis of the Education Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sections Relating to the Requirements and Authorization of the Administrative Services Credential**

 Action

 X **Information**

Strategic Plan Goal(s) :

Goal 1: **Promote education excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators.**

Goal 6: **Provide leadership in exploring multiple, high quality routes to prepare professional educators for California's schools**

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** 1/22/2002
 Terri H. Fesperman
 Assistant Consultant

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
 Dale Janssen
 Acting Director, Certification, Assignment and Waivers

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
 Mary C. Armstrong
 General Counsel

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
 Mary Vixie Sandy
 Director, Professional Services

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** _____
 Dr. Sam W. Swofford
 Executive Director

**Analysis of the Education Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 5,
Sections Relating to the Requirements and Authorization of the
Administrative Services Credential**

**Certification Assignment and Waivers Division
Professional Practices Division**

January 10, 2001

Executive Summary

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is engaged in a comprehensive review of the issues and options in the preparation and licensure of school administrators. During the January meeting, the Commission directed staff to prepare a report on the sections of the Education Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 5, that relate to the Administrative Services Credential requirements and authorization. This item includes a description of the requirements for the Administrative Services Credential for California and out-of-state trained candidates. It also includes an overview of the authorization for the Administrative Services Credential and the non-instructional duties a teacher may perform as a program coordinator.

Policy(s) Issue to be Considered

What are the statutory and regulatory parameters relating to the requirements and authorizations of the Administrative Services Credential?

Fiscal Impact Statement

There is no fiscal impact in this information item.

Analysis of the Education Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Sections Relating to the Requirements and Authorization of the Administrative Services Credential

Certification Assignment and Waivers Division Professional Practices Division

January 10, 2001

Administrative Services Credential Requirements for California Trained Administrators

The requirements for the Administrative Services Credential are found in Education Code Sections 44270, 44270.1, 44270.3 and 44270.4 and in Title 5 Section 80054. The Title 5 regulations were updated in May 2000 with new language that clarified the requirements for the preliminary and professional clear credential and the requirements for out-of-state trained administrators. Previously, the regulations did not include the administrative services requirements that appear in the Education Code.

The requirements for the preliminary Administrative Services Credential for California-trained candidates are found in Education Code §44270 and Title 5 §80054(a). Both may be found in Appendix A of this item. Section 44270 requires an applicant to meet all of the following:

1. Possess a valid California prerequisite credential (*one of the following*):
 - A valid teaching credential based on a bachelor's degree and a teacher preparation program including student teaching. These programs include the Multiple and Single Subject Credential, Education Specialist Credential, Standard Teaching Credentials, and General Teaching Credentials OR
 - A Vocational or Adult Designated Subjects Credential if the individual also possesses a bachelor's degree OR
 - A Services Credential in Pupil Personnel Services, Health Services, Library Media Teacher Services, or Clinical or Rehabilitative Services requiring a bachelor's degree and a professional preparation program including fieldwork.
2. Verification of experience:
 - Three years of full-time teaching experience or three years of full-time experience in the field of pupil personnel, health, library media teacher services, or clinical or rehabilitative service in a public school or private school of equivalent status.
3. Completion of a program:
 - Entry level program, approved by the Commission, of specialized preparation in administrative services or a one-year internship in administrative services .
4. Current employment in an administrative position
 - This employment is after the completion of the professional preparation program and it may be full or part time.

The Title 5 regulations further clarify the Education Code requirements in the following areas:

- Passage of CBEST (per Education Code Section 44252).
- The specialized preparation in administrative services or the internship be accredited by the Committee on Accreditation and that the California institution of higher education offering the Commission accredited program recommend the candidate for the administrative services credential.
- Candidates who are unable to obtain employment in an administrative position will be issued a Certificate of Eligibility, which verifies completion of the requirements for the preliminary Administrative Services Credential.

The requirements for the professional clear Administrative Services Credential for California-trained candidates are found in Education Code §44270.1 and Title 5 §80054(d). Both may be found in Appendix A of this item. Section 44270.1 requires an applicant to meet all of the following:

1. Possess a valid California Preliminary Administrative Services Credential.
2. Verification of experience:
 - Two years of experience in a full-time administrative position in a California public school or private school of equivalent status while holding the preliminary credential.
3. Completion of a program of advanced preparation:
 - The program is based on an individualized program of professional development activities developed by the credential holder, employer, and university personnel consisting of university course work and may include non-university activities or advanced field experiences based on standards and criteria adopted by the Commission.

Section 44270.1 also authorizes the Commission to grant a waiver of the requirement of university course work upon its finding that the candidate, in consultation with personnel of the employing school district and personnel of the university, is not able to develop an individualized program of professional development for the advanced preparation program that meets the individual needs of the candidates. The Commission has never exercised its authority to grant this type of waiver.

Administrative Services Credential Requirements For Out-of-State Prepared Administrators

The Education Code and the Title 5 regulations offer two different routes for out-of-state trained administrators to obtain a California Administrative Services Credential. Education Code Sections 44270.3 and 44270.4 became effective September 27, 2000, which was after the changes were made to the Title 5 regulations for requirements for out-of-state trained administrators, consequently the amendments added in May 2000 were superceded by the sections added to the Education Code.

Education Code Section 44270.3 applies specifically to out-of-state teachers who hold an elementary, secondary or special education teaching credential and who have earned an out-of-state administrative credential. Section 44270.3 requires a candidate for a preliminary California Administrative Services Credential to meet all of the following requirements (the full text can be found in Appendix A):

1. Possess a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
2. Passage of CBEST.

3. Complete a teacher preparation program and be issued an elementary, secondary or special education teaching credential based upon the program and served on that credential for three years.
4. Complete an administrator preparation program and be issued or qualified for the Administrative Services Credential from that program.

Due to the addition of Education Code Sections 44270.3 and 44270.4, the requirements pertaining to out-of-state administrators in Title 5 regulations now only apply to candidates who hold designated subject credentials, services credentials in pupil personnel, health services, library media or clinical or rehabilitative services credential holders.

Title 5 Section 80054 requires out-of-state trained administrators who wish to obtain a preliminary California Administrative Services Credential to complete the following:

1. Possess a California designated subjects or services credential.
2. Complete a professional preparation program in administrative services from a regionally accredited institution of higher education that is comparable to a program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation, and be approved by the appropriate state agency.
3. Passage of CBEST.
4. Three years of successful service on the out-of-state designated subjects or services credential.
5. Verify an offer of employment at a California public or private school of equivalent status. A certificate of eligibility is available to those individuals who do not have an offer of employment.

There are also two options for out-of-state trained administrators to earn the professional clear California Administrative Services Credential. Section 44270.4 added an option for administrators who have three years of experience as a public school administrator. For administrators with this experience, they must meet all of the requirements in Section 44270.3 stated above plus the following:

1. Submit two rigorous performance evaluations, one in each of the applicant's two most recent years of service as an administrator, with satisfactory ratings or better.
2. Verify at least three years as a public school administrator or successfully completed an individual program of professional development that included intensive mentoring, assistance and support as certified by the employing school district.

The Commission has not implemented the individual program of professional development pending the development of the AB 75 administrative support program.

For those out-of-state trained administrators who do not have three years of experience, Education Code Section 44270.1 and Title 5 Section 80054(d) apply as outlined above in this agenda item.

Administrative Services Credential Authorization

In 1998 a plan was approved by the Commission for the Certification Division to draft proposed regulation changes for credential authorizations for several types of credentials. One of those credentials was the Administrative Services Credential. The Education Code and Title 5 Regulations lacked specificity about what constituted administrative duties, consequently it was unclear when an administrator needed to hold an Administrative Services Credential.

Education Code Section 44065, shown in Appendix B, lists thirteen areas of responsibility that the Commission used to determine the authorization for the Administrative Services Credential. Some of the duties listed in the section such as supervising the work of instructors and the instructional program for pupils are clearly administrative while others such as the in-service training of teachers, principals, or other certificated staff is not exclusively an administrative duty.

Commission staff met with a group of educators to discuss proposed changes to regulations governing the authorization for the Administrative Services Credential. Thirteen individuals representing school districts, county offices of education, institutions of higher education, ACSA, CTA, and CFT including teachers and administrators met to discuss the duties of administrators and the non-instructional duties that could be performed by an individual who is prepared to be a teacher.

The authorization for the Administrative Services Credential and Teachers Serving as Program Coordinators, Title 5 Sections 80054.5 and 80020.4.1, were the result of the group discussion. These Title 5 sections were approved in May of 2000 and implemented on January 1, 2001. The complete text of the regulations appear in Appendix B.

The Administrative Services Credential authorizes the holder to provide the following services:

1. Development, coordination, and assessment of instructional programs
2. Evaluation of certificated and classified personnel;
3. Student discipline, including but not limited to suspension and expulsion;
4. Certificated and classified employee discipline, including but not limited to suspension, dismissal, and reinstatement;
5. Supervision of certificated and classified personnel;
6. Management of school site, district or county level fiscal services;
7. Recruitment, employment, and assignment of certificated and classified personnel; and
8. Development, coordination, and supervision of student support services including but not limited to extracurricular activities, pupil personnel services, health services, library services, and technology support services.

Education Code Requirements and Exemptions for Administrative Positions

The Education Code specifies when a principal is required to hold an administrative credential at a school site, outlines local level assignment options, and exempts some positions from requiring an administrative credential. There are several sections of the Education Code that specify administrative or supervisory assignments that may not require an administrative services credential. Section 44860 sets a threshold of six or more teachers at a school site before an administrative credential is required for the principal. An occasionally used §35029, shown below, allows the governing board to waive the credential for the chief administrative officer of that school district.

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

Other sections that exempt an individual from holding an administrative credential include, EC §44270.2 which authorizes the holder of a pupil personnel services credential as well as the holder of an administrative services credential to supervise a pupil personnel program.

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

When determining if an assignment requires an individual to hold an administrative services credential, it is not the title of the position that is the determining factor, but the duties the individual will be performing. An employer must review the job duties for the assignment using Title 5 Section 80054.5 to determine if the Administrative Services Credential is required. Another factor to consider is the district and county's role in determining whether the position requires an Administrative Services Credential or the job duties the individual is performing requires the administrative credential. Section §80020.4.1 was added to regulation to clarify that the holder of a teaching credential based on a bachelor's degree, teacher preparation, and student teaching can serve as a school, district, or county program coordinator of staff development or curricular development. Previously some employers believed that these duties required an administrative credential.

Appendix A

Administrative Services Credential Requirements

Education Code Section 44270.

(a) The minimum requirements for the preliminary services credential with a specialization in administrative services are all of the following:

(1) Possession of one of the following:

(A) A valid teaching credential requiring the possession of a baccalaureate degree and a professional preparation program including student teaching.

(B) A valid designated subjects vocational education, adult, or special subjects teaching credential, as specified in Section 44260, 44260.1, 44260.2, 44260.3, or 44260.4, provided the candidate also possesses a baccalaureate degree.

(C) A valid services credential with a specialization in pupil personnel, health, or clinical or rehabilitative services, as specified in Section 44266, 44267, 44267.5, or 44268, or a valid services credential authorizing service as a library media teacher, as specified in Section 44269.

(D) A valid credential issued under the laws, rules, and regulations in effect on or before December 31, 1971, which authorizes the same areas as in subparagraphs (B) and (C).

(2) Completion of a minimum of three years of successful, full-time classroom teaching experience in the public schools, including, but not limited to, service in state- or county-operated schools, or in private schools of equivalent status or three years of experience in the fields of pupil personnel, health, clinical or rehabilitative, or librarian services.

(3) Completion of an entry level program of specialized and professional preparation in administrative services approved by the commission or a one-year internship in a program of supervised training in administrative services, approved by the commission as satisfying the requirements for the preliminary services credential with a specialization in administrative services.

(4) Current employment in an administrative position after completion of professional preparation as defined in paragraph (3), whether full or part time, in a public school or private school of equivalent status. The commission shall encourage school districts to consider the recency of preparation or professional growth in school administration as one of the criteria for employment.

(b) The preliminary administrative services credential shall be valid for a period of five years from the date of initial employment in an administrative position, whether full or part time, and shall not be renewable.

(c) A candidate who completed, by September 30, 1984, the requirements for the administrative services credential in effect on June 30, 1982, is eligible for the credential authorized under those requirements. All other candidates shall satisfy the requirements set forth in this section.

Education Code Section 44270.1.

(a) The minimum requirements for the professional services credential with a specialization in administrative services are all of the following:

(1) Possession of a valid preliminary administrative services credential, as specified in Section 44270.

(2) A minimum of two years of successful experience in a full-time administrative position in a public school or private school of equivalent status, while holding the preliminary administrative services credential, as attested by the employing school district or agency, including, but not limited to, the State Department of Education, in the case of state school administrators, and county offices of education, in the case of county school administrators.

(3) Completion of a commission-approved program of advanced preparation. Each candidate, in consultation with employing school district personnel and university personnel, shall develop an individualized program of professional development activities for this advanced preparation program based upon individual needs. Each individualized program will include university coursework and may include, nonuniversity activities or advanced administrative field experiences. The commission shall adopt standards and criteria for the university programs of advanced preparation and nonuniversity activities.

(b) The commission may, at the request of a credential candidate, grant a waiver, pursuant to subdivision (m) of Section 44225, of the requirement of university coursework upon its finding that the candidate, in consultation with personnel of the employing school district and personnel of the university, is not able to develop an individualized program of professional development for the advanced preparation program that meets the individual needs of the candidates.

(c) The professional administrative services credential shall be valid for a period of five years from date of issuance and may be renewed upon completion of professional renewal requirements specified by the commission.

Education Code Section 44270.2.

The services credential with a specialization in administrative services shall authorize the holder to perform administrative services at all grade levels. Any person who administers a pupil personnel program shall hold a services credential with a pupil personnel or administrative specialization.

Education Code Section 44270.3.

Notwithstanding any provision of this chapter, the commission shall issue a preliminary services credential with a specialization in administrative services to an out-of-state trained administrator who meets all of the following requirements:

(a) Possesses a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.

(b) Successfully passed the basic skills proficiency test administered pursuant to Section 44252.5.

(c) Completed a teacher preparation program at a regionally accredited institution of higher education, was issued an elementary, secondary, or special education teaching credential based upon that program, and served on that credential for at least three years.

(d) Completed an administrator preparation program at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and was issued, or qualified for, an administrative services credential based upon that program.

(e) Submitted fingerprint cards and met the requirements of California for teacher fitness pursuant to Sections 44339, 44340, and 44341.

Education Code Section 44270.4.

Notwithstanding any provision of this chapter, the commission shall issue a professional services credential with a specialization in administrative services to an out-of-state trained administrator who meets all of the following requirements:

(a) Possesses a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.

(b) Successfully passed the basic skills proficiency test administered pursuant to Section 44252.5.

(c) Completed a teacher preparation program at a regionally accredited institution of higher education, was issued an elementary, secondary, or special education teaching credential based upon that program, and served on that credential for at least three years.

(d) Completed an administrator preparation program at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and was issued an administrative services credential based upon that program.

(e) Submitted to the commission a minimum of two rigorous performance evaluations, one in each of the applicant's two most recent years of service as an administrator, upon which the applicant received ratings of satisfactory or better.

(f) Successfully served as a public school administrator for at least three years or successfully completed an individual program of professional development that included intensive mentoring, assistance, and support as certified by the employing school district.

(g) Submitted fingerprint cards and met the requirements of California for teacher fitness pursuant to Sections 44339, 44340, and 44341.

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

(a) The minimum requirements for the preliminary Administrative Services Credential include (1) through (6).

(1) One of the following:

(A) a valid California teaching credential that requires a baccalaureate degree and a program of professional preparation, including student teaching or the equivalent; or

(B) a valid California designated subjects teaching credential provided the applicant also possesses a baccalaureate degree; or

(C) a valid California services credential in pupil personnel services, health services, library media teacher services, or clinical or rehabilitative services requiring a

baccalaureate degree and a program of professional preparation, including field work or the equivalent;

(2) Completion of one of the following:

(A) a specialized and professional preparation program in administrative services taken in California and accredited by the Committee on Accreditation; or

(B) a professional preparation program in administrative services, including successful completion of a supervised field work or the equivalent, taken outside California that is comparable to a program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation. The program must be from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and approved by the appropriate state agency where the course work was completed; or

(C) one-year internship program in administrative services accredited by the Committee on Accreditation;

(3) Passage of the California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST) described in Education Code Section 44252(b);

(4) Verification of one of the following:

(A) three years of successful, full-time teaching experience in the public schools, including, but not limited to, service in state- or county-operated schools, or in private schools of equivalent status; or

(B) three years of successful, full-time experience in the fields of pupil personnel, health, library media teacher, or clinical or rehabilitative services in the public schools, including, but not limited to, service in state- or county-operated schools, or in private schools of equivalent status;

(5) One of the following:

(A) a recommendation from a California regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a preliminary administrative services program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation; or

(B) an individual who completed his or her professional preparation program outside of California as described in (a)(2)(B), may apply directly to the Commission for the preliminary Administrative Services Credential; and

(6) Verification of an offer of employment in a full- or part-time administrative position in a public school or private school of equivalent status.

(7) An individual who has completed requirements (1) through (5) but does not have an offer of employment may apply for a Certificate of Eligibility which verifies completion of all requirements for the preliminary Administrative Services Credential and authorizes the holder to seek employment.

(b) A Preliminary Administrative Services Credential issued on the basis of the completion of all the requirements in subsection (a) shall be issued initially only until the date of expiration of the valid prerequisite credential, as defined in (a)(1) of this section but for not more than five years. A Preliminary Administrative Services Credential that expired in less than five years shall be renewed until the date of expiration of the valid prerequisite credential, as defined in (a)(1) of this section but for not more than five years.

(c) A preliminary Administrative Services Credential authorizes the services specified in section 80054.5.

(d) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Administrative Services Credential shall include (1) through (4):

- (1) Possession of a valid preliminary administrative services credential;
 - (2) Verification of two years of successful experience in a full-time administrative position in a California public school or California private school of equivalent status, while holding the preliminary administrative services credential;
 - (3) Completion of an individualized program of advanced administrative services preparation accredited by the Committee on Accreditation designed in cooperation with the employing agency and the college or university; and
 - (4) A recommendation from a California regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a professional clear administrative services program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation.
- (e) A professional clear Administrative Services Credential issued on the basis of the completion of all requirements shall be dated per Title 5 Section 80553.
- (f) A professional clear Administrative Services Credential authorizes the services specified in section 80054.5.

NOTE

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

Appendix B

Administrative Services Credential Authorization

Education Code Section 44065.

(a) Except as provided in subdivision (d), any person employed on or after July 1, 1963, by a school district, including a district having the merit system as outlined in Article 6 (commencing with Section 45240) of Chapter 5 of this part, or by a county superintendent of schools, in a position in which 50 percent or more of his or her duties performed during the school year, whether performed in a particular school or district or countywide, consist of rendering service in directing, coordinating, supervising or administering any portion or all of the types of functions listed below in this section shall hold a valid teaching or service credential as appropriate, whichever is designated in regulations adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, authorizing the particular service.

The types of functions are:

- (1) The work of instructors and the instructional program for pupils.
- (2) Educational or vocational counseling, guidance and placement services.
- (3) School extracurricular activities related to, and an outgrowth of, the instructional and guidance program of the school.
- (4) Planning courses of study to be used in the public schools of the state.
- (5) The selection, collection, preparation, classification or demonstration of instructional materials of any course of study for use in the development of the instructional program in the schools of the state.
- (6) Research connected with the evaluation and efficiency of the instructional program.
- (7) The school health program.
- (8) Activities connected with the enforcement of the laws relating to compulsory education, coordination of child welfare activities involving the school and the home, and the school adjustment of pupils.
- (9) The school library services.
- (10) The preparation and distribution of instructional materials.
- (11) The in-service training of teachers, principals, or other certificated personnel.
- (12) The interpretation and evaluation of the school instructional program.
- (13) The examination, selection, or assignment of teachers, principals, or other certificated personnel involved in the instructional program.

(b) Any person who was employed by a district or by a county superintendent of schools before July 1, 1963, to perform any of the services designated by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to require a supervision or administration credential, may continue to perform such services without possessing the credential otherwise required as long as he remains continuously employed to perform the same services in that county superintendent's office or in that district in which he was employed on that date, or is continuously employed to perform the same services in a district which results from a reorganization involving the same district.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the governing board of any school district maintaining kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive, or providing adult education classes, may employ for purposes of instructing apprentices duly registered

with the Division of Apprenticeship Standards, persons holding any of the following valid credentials:

- (1) A community college instructor credential.
- (2) A community college limited service credential.
- (3) A community college special limited service credential.

(d) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), a school district or county superintendent of schools may hire persons who do not hold valid teaching or service credentials to perform the examination, selection or assignment of teachers, principals, or certificated personnel involved in the instructional program.

**California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

**Meeting of
February 6-7, 2002**

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PREP - 5**

COMMITTEE: **Preparation Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Issues and Options in the Preparation and Licensing of
School Administrators**

 Action

 X **Information**

 Report

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

- Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**
- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators
 - Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates

Prepared By: _____
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Date: _____

Authorized By: _____
Dr. Sam W. Swofford
Executive Director

Date: _____

Issues and Options in the Preparation and Licensure of School Administrators

Professional Services Division

January 22, 2002

Executive Summary

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is engaged in a comprehensive review of issues and options in the preparation and licensure of school administrators. During 2001, the Executive Director and staff had extensive interaction with various stakeholder groups, including professional administrator and teacher groups, faculty and administrators from colleges and universities, school board members and representatives from the private sector regarding administrator preparation and licensure. The Executive Director also appointed a task force and directed them to investigate the viability of the existing Administrative Services Credential and the standards that govern preparation for that credential. The Task Force findings were presented to the Commission for information during its November 2001 meeting.

During the December meeting, the Commission directed staff to prepare a report on existing standards and assessments that are used for administrator preparation and licensure as well as information about licensing requirements in other states. During the January meeting, staff presented in written form an overview of standards and assessments, and representatives from Educational Testing Services provided an overview of the School Leadership Assessment Series that they administer. Commissioner's asked staff to prepare for a more comprehensive discussion of standards at the February Commission meeting. This report includes a description and analysis of the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSELs), the Standards for School Leadership adopted by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), and the Commission's adopted Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credentials. The report also includes an overview of assessments that are used for administrator licensure.

Policy(s) Issue to be Considered

What standards should govern preparation for the Administrative Services Credential?

Fiscal Impact Statement

Activities related to the review and potential revision of this credential are covered under the Commission's base budget.

Issues and Options in the Preparation and Licensure of School Administrators

Professional Services Division

January 22, 2002

Background

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is engaged in a comprehensive review of issues and options in the preparation and licensure of school administrators. During 2001, the Executive Director and staff had extensive interaction with various stakeholder groups, including professional administrator and teacher groups, faculty and administrators from colleges and universities, school board members and representatives from the private sector regarding administrator preparation and licensure. The Executive Director also appointed a task force and directed them to investigate the viability of the existing Administrative Services Credential and the standards that govern preparation for that credential. The Task Force findings were presented to the Commission for information during its November 2001 meeting. The following eight policy questions provide a framework for the Commission's discussion of this important credential area:

1. Policy Question One: What does the 21st Century schools require in terms of management at each level?
2. Policy Question Two: Which school management positions should require a credential?
3. Policy Question Three: What should be the content of administrator preparation?
4. Policy Question Four: Which entities should be authorized to provide administrator preparation?
5. Policy Question Five: Which decisions about administrator preparation should be left to local school districts to decide?
6. Policy Question Six: What should the structure of administrator preparation involve?
7. Policy Question Seven: What does an appropriate "learning to lead" continuum look like for school and district administrators?
8. Policy Question Eight: What is an appropriate accountability system for administrator preparation programs?

During the December meeting, the Commission directed staff to prepare a report on existing standards and assessments that are used for administrator preparation and licensure as well as information about licensing requirements in other states. During the January meeting, staff presented in written form an overview of standards and assessments, and representatives from Educational Testing Services provided an overview of the School Leadership Assessment Series that they administer. Commissioner's asked staff to prepare for a more comprehensive

discussion of standards at the February Commission meeting. This report includes a description and analysis of the California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSELs), the Standards for School Leadership adopted by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), and the Commission's adopted Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credentials. The report also includes an overview of assessments that are used for administrator licensure.

Overview of Standards for School Leaders

The California Professional Standards for Education Leaders were developed by a broadly representative group that included the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) the California School Leadership Academy (CSLA), representatives from colleges and universities, representatives from state agencies, and representatives of the professional development community. The six standards are based on standards developed at the National level by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium which are used to guide preparation and certification in a number of other states.

The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders were developed between 1994 and 1996 under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers. The standards, which are based on research on productive educational leadership, were drafted by personnel from 24 state education agencies (including the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing) and representatives from various professional associations. The six standards present a common core of knowledge, dispositions, and performances that are intended to link leadership more forcefully to productive schools and enhanced education outcomes.

The Commission's Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for the Administrative Services Credential provide specific direction regarding the structure and content of administrator preparation to sponsors of preparation programs leading to the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential. Standards for the Preliminary Credential are organized into three categories: Program Design and Curriculum; Field Experiences; and Domains of Candidate Competence and Performance. Standards the professional clear credential are organized into four categories: Program Design and Curriculum; Support and Mentoring Plan; Non-University Activities; and Candidate Competence and Performance.

Table 1 lists the six CPSEL standards and the six ISLLC standards, with differences in the standards language appearing in italics. Each standard is followed by a set of indicators. The ISLLC indicators describe the knowledge, dispositions and performances that are expected in each domain of the standards. The CPSEL indicators describe performances only, though the performance expectations presume a knowledge base, and, to some extent, a disposition toward leadership. Table 2 lists the Commission's standards of candidate competence and performance. Each standard is followed by a set of factors that are used by accreditation team members to evaluate whether and to what degree the standard is met by a preparation program. Table 2 also identifies the relationship between the CCTC standards and the CPSEL and ISLLC standards.

Table 1. CPSEL and ISLLC Standards for School Leaders

CAPSL STANDARDS	ISLLC STANDARDS
<p>Standard 1 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Facilitate the development of a shared vision for the achievement of all students based upon data from multiple measures of student learning and relevant qualitative indicators. 10. Communicate and implement the shared vision so that the entire school community understands and acts on the mission of the school as a standards-based educational system. 11. Leverage and marshal sufficient resources to implement and attain the vision for all students and subgroups of students. 12. Identify and address any barriers to accomplishing the vision. 13. Shape school programs, plans, and activities to ensure integration, articulation, and consistency with the vision. 14. Use the influence of diversity to improve teaching and learning. 	<p>Standard 1 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.</p> <p>Knowledge The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. learning goals in a pluralistic society 3. the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans 4. systems theory 5. information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies 6. effective communication 7. effective consensus-building and negotiation skills <p>Dispositions The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a school vision of high standards of learning ▪ continuous school improvement ▪ the inclusion of all members of the school community ▪ ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults ▪ a willingness to continuously examine one’s own assumptions, beliefs, and practices ▪ doing the work required for high levels of personal and organization performance <p>Performances The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. the vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members 4. the vision and mission are communicated through the use of symbols, ceremonies, stories, and similar activities 5. the core beliefs of the school vision are modeled for all stakeholders 6. the vision is developed with and among stakeholders 7. the contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are recognized and celebrated 8. progress toward the vision and mission is communicated to all stakeholders 9. the school community is involved in school improvement efforts 10. the vision shapes the educational programs, plans, and actions 11. an implementation plan is developed in which objectives and strategies to achieve the vision and goals are clearly articulated 12. assessment data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision and goals 13. relevant demographic data pertaining to students and their families are used in developing the school mission and goals 14. barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, and addressed 15. needed resources are sought and obtained to support the implementation of the school mission and goals 16. existing resources are used in support of the school vision and goals 17. the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised

<p>Standard 2 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create an accountability system of teaching and learning based on student learning standards. 2. Utilize multiple assessment measures to evaluate student learning to drive an ongoing process of inquiry focused on improving the learning of all students and all subgroups of students. 3. Shape a culture where high expectations for all students and for all subgroups of students is the core purpose. 4. Guide and support the long-term professional development of all staff consistent with the ongoing effort to improve the learning of all students relative to the content standards. 5. Promote equity, fairness, and respect among all members of the school community. 6. Provide opportunities for all members of the school community to develop and use skills in collaboration, leadership, and shared responsibility. 7. Facilitate the use of appropriate learning materials and learning strategies which include the following: students as active learners, a variety of appropriate materials and strategies, the use of reflection and inquiry, an emphasis on quality versus quantity, and appropriate and effective technology. 	<p>Standard 2 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.</p> <p>Knowledge The administrator has knowledge and understanding of::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ student growth and development ▪ applied learning theories ▪ applied motivational theories ▪ curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement ▪ principles of effective instruction ▪ measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies ▪ diversity and its meaning for educational programs ▪ adult learning and professional development models ▪ the change process for systems, organizations, and individuals ▪ the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth ▪ school cultures <p>Dispositions The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling ▪ the proposition that all students can learn ▪ the variety of ways in which students can learn ▪ life long learning for self and others ▪ professional development as an integral part of school improvement ▪ the benefits that diversity brings to the school community ▪ a safe and supportive learning environment ▪ preparing students to be contributing members of society <p>Performances The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ all individuals are treated with fairness, dignity, and respect ▪ professional development promotes a focus on student learning consistent with the school vision and goals ▪ students and staff feel valued and important ▪ the responsibilities and contributions of each individual are acknowledged ▪ barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed ▪ diversity is considered in developing learning experiences ▪ life long learning is encouraged and modeled ▪ there is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance ▪ technologies are used in teaching and learning ▪ student and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated ▪ multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students ▪ the school is organized and aligned for success ▪ curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs are designed, implemented, evaluated, and refined ▪ curriculum decisions are based on research, expertise of teachers, and the recommendations of learned societies ▪ the school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis ▪ a variety of sources of information is used to make decisions ▪ student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques ▪ multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students ▪ a variety of supervisory and evaluation models is employed ▪ pupil personnel programs are developed to meet the needs of students and their families
--	---

<p>Standard 3 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Monitor and evaluate the programs and staff at the site. 3. Establish school structures, patterns, and processes that support student learning. 4. Manage legal and contractual agreements and records in ways that foster a professional work environment and secure privacy and confidentiality for all students and staff. 5. Align fiscal, human, and material resources to support the learning of all students and all groups of students. 6. Sustain a safe, efficient, clean, well-maintained, and productive school environment that nurtures student learning and supports the professional growth of teachers and support staff. 7. Utilize the principles of systems management, organizational development, problem solving, and decision-making techniques fairly and effectively. 8. Utilize effective and nurturing practices in establishing student behavior management systems. 	<p>Standard 3 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.</p> <p>Knowledge The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development • operational procedures at the school and district level • principles and issues relating to school safety and security • human resources management and development • principles and issues relating to fiscal operations of school management • principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space • legal issues impacting school operations • current technologies that support management functions <p>Dispositions The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ making management decisions to enhance learning and teaching ▪ taking risks to improve schools ▪ trusting people and their judgments ▪ accepting responsibility ▪ high-quality standards, expectations, and performances ▪ involving stakeholders in management processes ▪ a safe environment <p>Performances The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development is used to inform management decisions ▪ operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for successful learning ▪ emerging trends are recognized, studied, and applied as appropriate ▪ operational plans and procedures to achieve the vision and goals of the school are in place ▪ collective bargaining and other contractual agreements related to the school are effectively managed ▪ the school plant, equipment, and support systems operate safely, efficiently, and effectively ▪ time is managed to maximize attainment of organizational goals ▪ potential problems and opportunities are identified ▪ problems are confronted and resolved in a timely manner ▪ financial, human, and material resources are aligned to the goals of schools ▪ the school acts entrepreneurially to support continuous improvement ▪ organizational systems are regularly monitored and modified as needed ▪ stakeholders are involved in decisions affecting schools ▪ responsibility is shared to maximize ownership and accountability ▪ effective problem-framing and problem-solving skills are used ▪ effective conflict resolution skills are used ▪ effective group-process and consensus-building skills are used ▪ effective communication skills are used ▪ a safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing school environment is created and maintained ▪ human resource functions support the attainment of school goals ▪ confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained
--	--

<p>Standard 4 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Incorporate information about family and community expectations into school decision making and activities. 3. Recognize the goals and aspirations of diverse family and community groups. 4. Treat diverse community stakeholder groups with fairness and with respect. 5. Support the equitable success of all students and all subgroups of students through the mobilization and leveraging of community support services. 6. Strengthen the school through the establishment of community, business, institutional, and civic partnerships. 7. Communicate information about the school on a regular and predictable basis through a variety of media and modes. 	<p>Standard 4 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.</p> <p>Knowledge The administrator has knowledge and understanding of::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community ▪ the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community ▪ community resources ▪ community relations and marketing strategies and processes ▪ successful models of school, family, business, community, government and higher education partnerships <p>Dispositions The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ schools operating as an integral part of the larger community ▪ collaboration and communication with families ▪ involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes ▪ the proposition that diversity enriches the school ▪ families as partners in the education of their children ▪ the proposition that families have the best interests of their children in mind ▪ resources of the family and community needing to be brought to bear on the education of students ▪ an informed public <p>Performances The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ high visibility, active involvement, and communication with the larger community is a priority ▪ relationships with community leaders are identified and nurtured ▪ information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs is used regularly ▪ there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations ▪ credence is given to individuals and groups whose values and opinions may conflict ▪ the school and community serve one another as resources ▪ available community resources are secured to help the school solve problems and achieve goals ▪ partnerships are established with area businesses, institutions of higher education, and community groups to strengthen programs and support school goals ▪ community youth family services are integrated with school programs ▪ community stakeholders are treated equitably ▪ diversity is recognized and valued ▪ effective media relations are developed and maintained ▪ a comprehensive program of community relations is established ▪ public resources and funds are used appropriately and wisely ▪ community collaboration is modeled for staff ▪ opportunities for staff to develop collaborative skills are provided
--	--

Standard 5

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students *by modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity.*

2. Demonstrate skills in decision making, problem solving, change management, planning, conflict management, and evaluation.
3. Model personal and professional ethics, integrity, justice, and fairness and expect the same behaviors from others.
4. Make and communicate decisions based upon relevant data and research about effective teaching and learning, leadership, management practices, and equity.
5. Reflect on personal leadership practices and recognize their impact and influence on the performance of others.
6. Encourage and inspire others to higher levels of performance, commitment, and motivation.
7. Sustain personal motivation, commitment, energy, and health by balancing professional and personal responsibilities.
8. Engage in professional and personal development.
9. Demonstrate knowledge of the curriculum and the ability to integrate and articulate programs throughout the grades.
10. Use the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain.
11. Protect the rights and confidentiality of students and staff.

Standard 5

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students *by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.*

Knowledge

The administrator has knowledge and understanding of::

- the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society
- various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics
- the values of the diverse school community
- professional codes of ethics
- the philosophy and history of education

Dispositions

The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

- the ideal of the common good
- the principles in the Bill of Rights
- the right of every student to a free, quality education
- bringing ethical principles to the decision-making process
- subordinating one's own interest to the good of the school community
- accepting the consequences for upholding one's principles and actions
- using the influence of one's office constructively and productively in the service of all students and their families
- development of a caring school community

Performances

The administrator:

- examines personal and professional values
- demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics
- demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance
- serves as a role model
- accepts responsibility for school operations
- considers the impact of one's administrative practices on others
- uses the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain
- treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect
- protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff
- demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community
- recognizes and respects the legitimate authority of others
- examines and considers the prevailing values of the diverse school community
- expects that others in the school community will demonstrate integrity and exercise ethical behavior
- opens the school to public scrutiny
- fulfills legal and contractual obligations
- applies laws and procedures fairly, wisely, and considerately

<p>Standard 6 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. View oneself as a leader of a team and also a member of a larger team. 3. Ensure that the school operates consistently within the parameters of federal, state, and local laws, policies, regulations, and statutory requirements. 4. Generate support for the school by two-way communication with key decision makers in the school community. 5. Work with the governing board and district and local leaders to influence policies that benefit students and support the improvement of teaching and learning. 6. Influence and support public policies that ensure the equitable distribution of resources, and support for all the subgroups of students. 7. Open the school to the public and welcome and facilitate constructive conversations about how to improve student learning and achievement. 	<p>Standard 6 A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.</p> <p>Knowledge The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ principles of representative governance that undergird the system of American schools ▪ the role of public education in developing and renewing a democratic society and an economically productive nation ▪ the law as related to education and schooling ▪ the political, social, cultural and economic systems and processes that impact schools ▪ models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural and economic contexts of schooling ▪ global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning ▪ the dynamics of policy development and advocacy under our democratic political system ▪ the importance of diversity and equity in a democratic society <p>Dispositions The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ education as a key to opportunity and social mobility ▪ recognizing a variety of ideas, values, and cultures ▪ importance of a continuing dialogue with other decision makers affecting education ▪ actively participating in the political and policy-making context in the service of education ▪ using legal systems to protect student rights and improve student opportunities <p>Performances The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the environment in which schools operate is influenced on behalf of students and their families ▪ communication occurs among the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate ▪ there is ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups ▪ the school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities ▪ public policy is shaped to provide quality education for students ▪ lines of communication are developed with decision makers outside the school community
---	---

Table 2. CCTC Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance

CCTC Standards of Candidate Competence and Performance	Relationship to CPSEL/ISLLC Standards
<p>Standard 9: Educational Leadership. Each candidate in the program is able to articulate a vision consistent with a well developed educational philosophy and is able to lead individuals and groups toward the accomplishment of common goals and objectives.</p> <p><i>The following factors serve as a guide for initial program design and ongoing program evaluation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate displays values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to achieve school goals. ▪ Each candidate understands the importance of the leadership role in schools and the responsibility of exercising that leadership in positive ways. ▪ Each candidate is familiar with a variety of leadership styles and is able to demonstrate appropriate styles in specific situations. ▪ Each candidate demonstrates an understanding of shared leadership and the need to foster and develop leadership skills in others. ▪ Each candidate is able to manage conflict, build consensus, and communicate effectively orally and in writing. ▪ Each candidate understands the importance of developing good interpersonal relationships with colleagues, teachers, parents, school board members, community members, and students. ▪ The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the institution. 	<p>ISLLC/CPSEL Standard 1</p>
<p>Standard 10: Organizational Management. Each candidate demonstrates understanding of the organization, structure, and cultural context of schools and is able to lead others in the development and attainment of short-term and long-term goals.</p> <p><i>The following factors serve as a guide for initial program design and ongoing program evaluation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate understands basic principles of organizational theory so as to be able to lead and manage schools as organizational entities. ▪ Each candidate demonstrates the ability to apply theoretical perspectives to his or her own organizational setting. ▪ Each candidate understands the organization of the school and the roles of individuals within that school setting. ▪ Each candidate is able to identify a wide range of intellectual, political, ethical, cultural, and economic forces that impact on school organizations. ▪ Each candidate demonstrates the ability to lead groups and individuals in the development and implementation of long or short range goals. ▪ The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the institution. 	<p>ISLLC/CPSEL Standard 3</p>
<p>Standard 11: Instructional Program. Each candidate demonstrates the ability to design, implement and evaluate instructional programs and lead in their development and improvement.</p> <p><i>The following factors serve as a guide for initial program design and ongoing program evaluation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate understands basic principles of curriculum design and is able to interpret and guide the planning, implementation and evaluation of school district curricula. ▪ Each candidate understands the developmental needs of diverse learners and is able to insure appropriate learning methods and activities for diverse groups of students. ▪ Each candidate understands the importance of and demonstrates the ability to work with staff, parents, pupils, and community in curriculum development and evaluation. ▪ Each candidate gains an understanding of the appropriate use of resources--human, fiscal, and other--to the benefit of student instruction and the ongoing operation of schools. ▪ Each candidate is able to plan and organize programs for staff 	<p>ISLLC/CPSEL Standard 2</p>

<p>development consistent with curricular and instructional needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate is able to direct appropriate ancillary services to students for the improvement of teaching and learning. ▪ Each candidate understands procedures for student assessment and uses assessment information to improve the instructional program. ▪ The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the institution. 	
<p>Standard 12: Management of Schools. Each candidate is able to plan, organize, implement, manage, facilitate and evaluate the daily operation of schools in ways that achieve organizational goals and lead to the safe productive operation of schools.</p> <p><i>The following factors serve as a guide for initial program design and ongoing program evaluation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate works with faculty, parents, students, school board members, and other school stakeholders to translate a shared vision into strategic and operational plans. ▪ Each candidate defines roles and relationships for implementing and monitoring strategies and operational plans. ▪ Each candidate identifies resources and strategies required to implement plans. ▪ Each candidate develops an understanding of appropriate ways to manage student behavior in a school setting so as to develop and maintain a positive and safe school climate. ▪ Each candidate develops the ability to manage student services in response to individual and diverse students, making full use of the knowledge and services of appropriate support personnel. ▪ Each candidate acquires information management skills, including the ability to collect and analyze data, make and assist others in making informed decisions, and interpret and convey information in appropriate and thoughtful ways. ▪ Each candidate develops the ability to facilitate shared decision-making among members of the school community. ▪ The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the institution. 	<p>ISLLC/CPSEL Standard 3</p>
<p>Standard 13: Human Resource Administration. Each candidate demonstrates understanding of the importance and dimensions of human resource administration and the need to attract, retain, develop and motivate school personnel in ways that enhance learning and professional development and that lead to positive and productive school settings.</p> <p><i>The following factors serve as a guide for initial program design and ongoing program evaluation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate is able to work with all school personnel as well as with students, parents, school boards, and community members to establish a positive school climate and so that teachers and students can be successful. ▪ Each candidate develops an understanding of successful staff recruitment, selection, and induction approaches. ▪ Each candidate demonstrates the ability to make appropriate personnel assignments and recognizes the importance of full utilization of each employee's skills, abilities, and training. ▪ Each candidate understands the importance of staff development for all employees and is able to organize effective and appropriate professional development opportunities. ▪ Each candidate acquires processes and techniques for the evaluation of personnel performance. ▪ Each candidate understands the collective bargaining process and the administrator's role and the unions' role in that process. ▪ The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the institution. 	<p>ISLLC/CPSEL Standard 2</p>

<p>Standard 14: Fiscal Resource and Business Service Administration. Each candidate develops an understanding of the effective and efficient management of fiscal resources and business services.</p> <p><i>The following factors serve as a guide for initial program design and ongoing program evaluation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate understands the sources and appropriate use of federal, state, and local school funding. ▪ Each candidate develops knowledge of sound fiscal and business management skills and practices. ▪ Each candidate understands the relationship between human and fiscal resource planning in the management of schools. ▪ Each candidate understands the role of the school administrator in developing a school budget, administering the budget, and evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of the services and products funded by the budget. ▪ Each candidate is aware of the division of fiscal responsibility between the school site and the central office. ▪ Each candidate develops skill in managing and scheduling school facilities in ways that promote appropriate and maximum use. ▪ The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the institution. 	<p>ISLLC/CPSEL Standard 3</p>
<p>Standard 15: Legal and Regulatory Applications. Each candidate understands the federal, state and local educational laws, regulations and other policies that govern schools, and knows how to act in accordance with these provisions.</p> <p><i>The following factors serve as a guide for initial program design and ongoing program evaluation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate gains an understanding of federal and state constitutional provisions, statutory standards, and regulatory applications governing public schools. ▪ Each candidate understands the importance of local rules, procedures, and directives related to schools. ▪ Each candidate understands the procedures and requirements for the employment, evaluation and retention of school personnel. ▪ Each candidate understands the requirements relating to credentialing laws, including assignment authorizations. ▪ Each candidate understands the collective bargaining process and is able to interpret and administer contracts. ▪ Each candidate operates in fair and impartial ways, acting in accordance with the spirit as well as the letter of the law. ▪ The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the institution. 	<p>ISLLC/CPSEL Standard 6</p>
<p>Standard 16: Policy and Political Influences. Each candidate recognizes the relationships among public policy, governance and schooling and is able to relate policy initiatives to the welfare of students in responsible and ethical ways.</p> <p><i>The following factors serve as a guide for initial program design and ongoing program evaluation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate understands the need for schools to be responsive to diverse community and constituent groups. ▪ Each candidate understands governance roles and has opportunities to practice consensus building, develop collaborative relationships, and engage in team building activities. ▪ Each candidate understands the need for interagency and interdisciplinary cooperation. ▪ Each candidate understands the interaction between schools and the social issues and concerns that impact the larger society. ▪ Each candidate understands schools as a political system and is able to identify the relationships between public policy and education. ▪ The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the institution. 	<p>ISLLC/CPSEL Standards 5 and 6</p>

<p>Standard 17: School and Community Collaborations. Each candidate in the program collaborates with parents and community members; works with community agencies, foundations, and the private sector; and responds to community interests and needs in performing administrative responsibilities.</p> <p><i>The following factors serve as a guide for initial program design and ongoing program evaluation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate understands the socio-demographic make-up of the school community and is able to develop and evaluate instructional programs, strategies and approaches appropriate to diverse student needs. ▪ Each candidate recognizes the importance of collaboration and demonstrates the ability to communicate and work with parents, school boards, and community members. ▪ Each candidate becomes aware of the wide range of social services available to children and families in the community and is able to effectively deliver and coordinate educational services with other service providers. ▪ Each candidate understands the importance of school public relations, is responsive to community issues and concerns, and is able to build and mobilize support for schools in the community. ▪ The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the institution. 	<p>ISLLC/CPSEL Standard 4</p>
<p>Standard 18: Use of Technology. Each candidate in the program effectively manages the various uses of technology for instructional and administrative purposes in the educational setting.</p> <p><i>The following factors serve as a guide for initial program design and ongoing program evaluation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each candidate has opportunities to develop and improve in their competence of using technological tools. ▪ Each candidate understands the importance and role of multi-media technologies for instructional support, administrative decision-making, and the management of data in schools. ▪ Each candidate uses computers and other technologies in the performance of administrative responsibilities. ▪ Each candidate is able to make informed decisions about appropriate technologies for school use. ▪ Each candidate is able to manage the use of technology for the improvement of the instructional program. ▪ The program meets other factors related to this standard of quality brought to the attention of the team by the institution. 	<p>ISLLC/CPSEL Standard 2</p>

Analysis of the CPSEL, ISLLC and CCTC Standards

The standards highlighted in this agenda report share a common basis in their focus on the preparation of school leaders, but have, in some cases, very different areas of emphasis. A staff analysis of the standards yielded the following observations about their relative strengths and weaknesses.

1. The ISLLC standards are more detailed than the CPSEL standards. In analyzing the indicators, staff found that in many cases multiple ISLLC indicators were consolidated in the language of one CPSEL indicator. For example, the first indicator under CPSEL Standard 1 incorporates four of the ISLLC indicators. As a result, with one or two notable exceptions, staff found a great deal of conceptual alignment between the ISLLC and the CPSEL standards.
2. The CPSEL standards, by design, contain a clear focus on standards and accountability. The group that met for two years to develop the CPSEL standards sought to maintain comparability by retaining the language of the ISLLC standards, but made a conscious effort in the indicators to attend to the reforms that have been launched recently in California. The clearest instance of this difference between the ISLLC and the CPSEL standards is apparent in Standard 2. The first four indicators under CPSEL Standard 2 state the following:

(An effective school leader can...)

- Create an *accountability system* of teaching and learning *based on student learning standards*.
- Utilize *multiple assessment measures* to *evaluate student learning* to drive an ongoing process of inquiry focussed on *improving the learning of all students* and all subgroups of students.
- Shape a culture where *high expectations for all students* and for all subgroups of students is the core purpose.
- Guide and support the long-term *professional development of all staff* consistent with the ongoing effort to improve the learning of all students *relative to the content standards*.

The indicators under ISLLC Standard 2 take a more generic approach, calling for: a knowledge base that includes measurement, evaluation and assessment strategies; knowledge of the change process; a disposition toward student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling; the belief that all students can learn; the ability to identify, clarify and address barriers to student learning; the ability to consider diversity in developing learning experiences; the ability to ensure that student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques; and the ability to ensure that multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students.

While the knowledge, dispositions and performances called for in the ISLLC standards are closely related to the performances called for in the CPSEL standards, the focus on student standards, accountability systems, and data regarding student performance are more specifically geared toward the outcomes California policymakers are seeking from their reform efforts.

3. Like the ISLLC standards, the CCTC standards (9-17) make no reference to state adopted standards for students or accountability systems. CCTC Standard 11 includes one indicator that calls for each candidate to understand procedures for student assessment and uses of assessment information to improve the instructional program. The use of assessments to inform improvements in instruction is a theme that runs through both the ISLLC and the CPSEL standards. But the focus on implementation of state-adopted academic content standards for students is only addressed in the CPSEL standards.
4. The CPSEL standards are almost exclusively “student centered”: that is to say, all aspects of the standards and indicators relate in one way or another to student learning. One outcome of this is a lack of detailed attention to other aspects of school leadership, which are the focus of five of the CCTC standards (Standards 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15.) The CCTC standards clearly place a much greater emphasis on organizational management, management of schools, human resource administration, fiscal resource and business service administration, and legal and regulatory applications than on student-centered instructional leadership. This is the most glaring difference between the CCTC standards and the CPSEL standards. The ISSLC standards attend to both of these domains of administrator knowledge and skill, but not to as great a degree as either the CCTC standards or the CPSEL standards.
5. The CPSEL standards pay very little attention to an administrator’s ability to use technology. Only one standard (Standard 2, last indicator) explicitly identifies the need for administrators to “facilitate the use of appropriate learning materials and learning strategies which include... appropriate and effective technology”. The ISSLC standards contain more references to technology, and the CCTC standards include one standard that is focussed exclusively on the use of technology. The ability to use technology is widely regarded as critical for school leaders.
6. The CCTC standards are written broadly and contain specific elements that pertain, by design, to various administrative roles at the site or central office levels. The CCTC standards are not comprehensive in this regard, but are suggestive of the broader range of administrative duties that have heretofore been under the umbrella of the Administrative Services Credential. CCTC Standard 13, for example, addresses human resources administration, which is applicable at both the school site and central office levels. Similarly, CCTC Standard 14 addresses fiscal resource and business service administration in ways that are important for future site administrators as well as business services professionals and superintendents. The CCTC standards were written to encompass all of the positions that currently require an administrative credential, and thus reflect a “one-size-fits-all” approach. Additional standards for the Professional Clear Credential address the need for differentiation of roles through the use of an individualized induction plan. The CCTC standards, and the credential structure itself, have been criticized for not adequately addressing these differences. In contrast, the ISLLC and CPSEL standards focus exclusively on the role of the site administrator.

In summary, the three sets of standards highlighted in this report reflect the evolution of our thinking during the last ten years about what it is necessary for administrators to know and be able to do in 21st century schools. The era of standards and accountability make instructional

leadership at the site level the clear priority. But there are other, perhaps more mundane, aspects of management that are also important to the job of administration. As the Commission considers the policy question, *What should be the content of administrator preparation?*, each of these sets of standards may have something to contribute to a response.

National Assessments Used for Administrator Licensure

During the January 2002 meeting, Commissioners had the opportunity to hear from Educational Testing Service (ETS) about the School Leadership Series, a series of three assessments that have been developed or are under development for use in the licensing of school administrators. Commission staff had the opportunity at the end of January to visit ETS and participate in the scoring of two of these assessments, and will present additional information in February about the ways in which these assessments might be used in California.

The Commission acted in December to sponsor legislation creating a “fast track” for school administrators that is similar to the fast track option created for teachers in SB 57 (Scott, 2001). Commission staff are reviewing the ETS assessments, as well as other existing assessments that have been or could be used for this purpose. The primary issue that staff explored with ETS is the extent to which these assessments are comprehensive enough to serve as a “proxy” for preparation, such that an aspiring administrator who passed each assessment could be offered a preliminary or professional administrative services credential without completing a formal preparation program. One other state is currently exploring this issue (Ohio), and early indications from ETS suggest that using these assessments for this purpose is both possible and appropriate. The assessments are based on the ISLLC standards, and purport to do a comprehensive job of assessing a candidate’s level of competence in the areas addressed by the standards. Using these assessments as a proxy for preparation may require that a higher passing score be adopted than is used in other states. Should the Commission choose to move in this direction, ETS would conduct a standard setting study in California and recommend a passing score to the Commission. Staff will be prepared to present additional information during the February meeting about these assessments. What follows is a brief description of each assessment and the states that are using them.

The ETS School Leadership Series is composed of two distinct assessments, the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) and the School Superintendent Assessment (SSA). Both of these assessments were developed to provide thorough, fair and carefully validated assessments for states to use as part of the licensure process for school leaders. They reflect the most current research and professional judgment and experience of educators across the country, and are based on both national job analysis studies and the ISLLC standards. ETS has been working with ISLLC to develop a new portfolio assessment that is intended for use with new administrators and can be used for professional development purposes or for licensing purposes.

The School Leaders Licensure Assessment became operational in the Fall of 1998. It was designed as an initial licensing assessment for principals and assistant principals. It has been validated for other positions as well. It is a six-hour test involving 25 constructed response items. The items present realistic scenarios and case studies, and candidates are asked to react to

each scenario and demonstrate their ability to apply the ISLLC Standards in real life situations. Sample test items and scoring rubrics are included in Attachment 3. There are nine states and the District of Columbia that require administrators to pass the SLLA in order to earn an initial license: Arkansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia and the District of Columbia.

The following five states are either in the standard setting process or scheduled to begin standard setting in the coming months: Connecticut, Indiana, Nevada, Ohio and New Jersey.

The SLLA is used in conjunction with completion of a program of preparation, most often a Master's Degree program in these states.

The School Superintendent Assessment (SSA) builds on the base established by the SLLA, and is used in one state currently (Missouri) as a requirement for Superintendent licensure. It consists of nine constructed response items and takes three hours to complete. The SSA focuses specifically on scenarios and case studies that relate to the Superintendent's job, e.g., relations with school boards, collaborating with the community. It is also based on the ISSLC standards. Nevada and Ohio are currently in the standard setting stage, and are expected to adopt the SSA in the near future as a requirement for licensure.

The School Leader Portfolio Assessment is a new assessment that ETS is developing for use with the next level of certification for states that have two tiers or phases of licensure. It is intended for use with new administrators (2-5 years of experience) and is completed within the context of the administrator's job. It takes two years to complete the portfolio process, which is scenario/case-study based and involves documentation of problem solving using the ISLLC standards. ETS estimates that this assessment will be available for use in the Fall of 2002.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 1462
Amendment Date:	January 29, 2002
Author:	Assembly Member Nakano
Sponsor:	
Subject of Bill:	Career Technical Education study
Date Introduced:	February 23, 2001
Status in Leg. Process:	Senate Committee on Education
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Seek Amendments
Date of Analysis:	January 31, 2002
Analyst:	Dan Gonzales

Summary of Current Law

The Commission issues multiple, single subject, and designated subjects credentials. Under current law the Designated Subjects Credential authorizes teaching or service in technical, trade, or vocational courses or in courses organized primarily for adults. The Commission issues Designated Subjects Credentials in Adult Education, Vocational Education, Special Subjects, and Supervision and Coordination.

The Vocational Education credential allows the holder to teach the subjects named on the credential in grades K-12 and in classes organized for adults, in technical, trade, or vocational courses which are part of a program of technical, trade or vocational education. Vocational Education Credentials include Office Occupations, Automotive Mechanics, Computer Applications, and Nursing Services.

Some of the requirements to earn a Professional Clear Vocational Education Credential are:

- A Preliminary Vocational Education Credential. The preliminary credential is based on work experience and education equivalent to a high school degree.
- Recent vocational education teaching experience.
- Completion of a Commission-accredited program of personalized preparation.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

Commission staff is reviewing the credential requirements for the Vocational Education Credential. Staff plans to submit recommendations to the Commission in spring 2002.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

Under this measure, the Commission would be a member of a committee charged with increasing the number and improving the quality of vocational education teachers. The Superintendent of Public Instruction would have to consult the Commission when convening the committee.

Specifically, this bill would require:

- The Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, to convene a committee of experts to determine programs and processes that would increase the number and improve the quality of career technical education teachers.

Comments. The Commission's consultative role is unnecessary. The Superintendent of Public Instruction can appoint members to the committee without conferring with the Commission. Consulting implies responsibility for the outcome without the authority. The Superintendent of Public Instruction could consult the Commission and not follow through with the Commission's recommendations.

However, the Commission must be a member of the committee because some of the topics the committee will study are related to the preparation and licensure of vocational education teachers.

Many people in the field now call vocational education "career technical education."

- The committee to develop guidelines and topics to conduct an independent study to gather comprehensive data to recommend to the Senate and Assembly Committees on Education.

- The committee to submit the study and final report to the Senate and Assembly Committees on Education by January 1, 2004.

Comments. If the bill is signed this year and becomes effective on January 1, 2003, the committee would have one year to study methods to improve the number and quality of vocational education and submit the study and final report to the Legislature.

- The final report to include recommendations on, but not limited to, methods to:
 - Recruit and retain career technical education teachers.
 - Strengthen the academic content of the current designated subjects credential pedagogy.
 - Incorporate academic and career technical integrated curriculum into teacher preparation programs, including induction and support activities, and options for dual articulation among credential requirements.
 - Determine the need for a multiple delivery system of professional development that varies among workplaces.

Comments. Two of the recommendations that would be included in the report are related to the Commission's mission. The Commission should be the state agency that provides recommendations on how to strengthen the academic content of any credential and how to integrate academic and career curriculum into teacher preparation programs. The requirement to study those recommendations should be deleted from the purview of the committee or the Commission, in consultation with the field, should provide those recommendations.

Currently, vocational education teachers interested in earning a Single or Multiple Subjects Credential could enter an intern program or use the early completion provisions allowed under SB 57.

- The superintendent to try to ensure that the membership of the committee represents a broad cross-section of career technical education programs and partnership academies, and a regional balance.
- The superintendent or their designee be appointed chairperson of the committee.
- The membership of the committee not to exceed 15 members. A majority of the committee members must be career technical education teachers appointed by the majority teacher's organization, including teachers from regional occupation programs, adult education, and regular career technical education programs, and partnership academy teachers.

- The committee to include representatives of:
 - Business and industry engaged in partnerships with career technical education programs.
 - Labor unions offering apprenticeship programs.
 - The University of California and the California State University.
 - The Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- The committee to submit the study parameters to the State Department of Education for inclusion in its request for proposals to conduct the study.

The bill states the intent of the Legislature is that the study be funded entirely by federal funds identified by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Comments. According to State Department of Education staff, federal Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act funds may be used for the study.

Fiscal Analysis

The Commission's costs to participate on the committee would be minor and absorbable.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

- 1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.**
- 4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.**
- 5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**

Organizational Positions on the Bill

Support

No known support on this version of the bill.

Oppose

No known opposition on this version of the bill.

Suggested Amendments

The Commission's role on the committee should be clarified. Staff suggests an amendment that would delete the Commission's consultative role and remove the requirement that a committee appointed by the Superintendent recommend changes to credentialing law.

Reason for Suggested Position

SEEK AMENDMENTS – Commission staff recommends a seek amendments position. The suggested amendments would clarify the Commission's role and that the committee appointed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction is not responsible for studying credentialing issues.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Senate Bill XXX (Replaces SB 328)
Authors:	Senator Jack Scott
Sponsor:	
Subject of Bill:	Adds Alternative, Standards-Based Routes to both the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credentials
Date Introduced:	Unknown
Last Amended:	NA
Status in Leg. Process:	Senate Rules Committee
Current CTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Sponsor
Date of Analysis:	January 31, 2002
Analyst:	Linda Bond and Mary Sandy Leyne Milstein and Marilyn Errett

Summary of Current Law

Existing law requires all candidates for a preliminary Administrative Services Credential to complete a program of specialized and professional preparation in administrative services or a one-year internship in a program of supervised training in administrative services, approved by the Commission as satisfying the requirements for the preliminary services credential with a specialization in administrative services. In addition, all candidates must have a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited university, pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), possess a basic teaching, service or designated subjects credential, serve for three years on the basis of that credential and pass identification and character clearance.

AB 75 (Steinberg), which became law on January 1, 2002, establishes the Principal Training Program and provides incentive funding to provide school site administrators with instruction and training. The Commission may approve a program developed pursuant to this article as meeting part or all of the requirements to fulfill standards for a Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential.

Existing law, initiated through the Commission-sponsored measure SB 57 (Scott, 2001), provides an expedited credentialing route for teachers who can demonstrate competency through written and performance assessments.

Current law does not provide an opportunity for individuals who have acquired the requisite knowledge and skills, through specialized training and experience, to demonstrate their proficiency for certification in lieu of completing a full Administrative Services preparation program.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

For several months, the Commission has engaged in a comprehensive review of the issues and options related to the preparation and licensure of school administrators in California. As part of this review, the Commission sponsored forums across the state in 2001 regarding administrator preparation; convened a Task Force on Administration Preparation to study to current Commission and national preparation standards and review the structure and content of the current credential; and heard public testimony from representatives of administrator preparation programs, administrators, school districts, county offices of education and professional organizations. Included in the discussions are issues related to flexibility and Commission-approved options for candidates.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would provide candidates for a preliminary or professional administrative services credential an alternative credentialing route based upon Commission standards. To earn an administrative services credential, this measure provides that candidates would meet the following requirements:

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (one of the following):

1. Passage of a rigorous national written examination testing administrator knowledge, skill and ability, adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for this purpose; or
2. Complete a Master's Degree in Educational Administration or related field, as determined by the commission, from a regionally accredited university.

Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential (one of the following):

1. Successfully complete a program that is accredited by the Commission for the professional clear services credential with a specialization in administrative services; or
2. Demonstrate mastery of Commission-accredited fieldwork performance standards and receive a recommendation for the professional clear services credential with a specialization in administrative services from a Commission-accredited program; or
3. Pass a national administrator performance assessment adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for this purpose.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policies may apply to this measure:

- 2. 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.**
- 4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.**
- 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.**

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

This measure will not result in any additional costs to the Commission. The Commission would not be required to develop either a written examination of administrator competence or a performance assessment, since both already exist. Candidates choosing this voluntary option would pay the exam administrator for the cost of the assessment. In fact, the provision of this option will save both participating candidates and the State money.

Organizational Positions on the Bill

This measure is supported by the Association of California School Administrators, the California School Boards Association, the California Association of Suburban School Districts and the Riverside and San Bernardino County Personnel Administrators.

Reason for Suggested Position

This measure aligns with recent efforts by the Commission to provide competency-based routes to obtaining a credential while upholding high certification standards and accreditation procedures. SB 57 (Scott, 2001) provided for demonstrated competency in teacher licensing. SB XXX continues the Commission's goal of holding all programs and credentialing routes to the same high standards while providing multiple routes to a credential for individuals. SB XXX allows for multiple providers to meet Commission accreditation standards.

In addition, it targets candidates with demonstrated skills, knowledge and ability equivalent to those typically acquired in an administrator preparation program and provides for rigorous assessment and accreditation reviews to assure candidate competence and program quality.

Services Credential with a Specialization in Administrative Services Alternative, Competency-Based Routes

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 44270.5 is added to the Education Code, to read:

44270.5. (a) Notwithstanding any provision of this chapter and as an expedited alternative to Section 44270, the commission may issue a preliminary services credential with a specialization in administrative services to a candidate who completes the following requirements:

(1) Possession of a teaching or services credential as specified in paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 44270.

(2) Completion of the experience requirement specified in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 44270.

(3) Meets the requirements of one of the following:

(A) Successful passage of a test, adopted by the commission, assessing the knowledge, skills, and abilities typically provided in a preparation program for a services credential with a specialization in administrative services.

(B) Possession of a Master's degree in Educational Administration or a related field, as determined by the commission, from a regionally accredited institution of postsecondary education.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this chapter and as an alternative to Section 44270.1, the commission may issue a professional clear services credential with a specialization in administrative services to a candidate who holds or is eligible for a preliminary services credential with a specialization in administrative services, and who meets the requirements of one of the following:

(1) Successfully completes program that is accredited by the commission for the professional clear services credential with a specialization in administrative services and receives a recommendation for the professional clear services credential with a specialization in administrative services from the commission –accredited program.

(2) Demonstrates mastery of commission-accredited field work performance standards for a professional clear services credential with a specialization in administrative services, and receives a recommendation for the professional clear services credential with a specialization in administrative services from a commission-accredited program.

(3) Passes a national administrator performance assessment adopted by the commission.

Background

On January 10, 2002, Governor Gray Davis submitted to the Legislature his proposed budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2002-03. This agenda item is intended to advise Commissioners of the salient points of the Commission's portion of the budget.

Summary

Proposed Budget (Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2001-02	FY 2002-03	Difference	Percentage Change
Total Budget	\$88,838	\$72,440	-\$16,398	-18.5%
State Operations	30,511	26,199	-4,312	-14.1%
Local Assistance	58,327	46,241	-12,086	-20.7%
Positions	196.4	193.5	-2.9	-1.5%

Budget Highlights

Governor's Proposed Reductions:

2001-02 (Current Year)

State Operations

- \$168,000 General Fund reduction primary in operating expenses and equipment.

2002-03 (Budget Year)

State Operations

- \$189,000 General Fund reduction primary in operating expenses and equipment.

Local Assistance

- \$10.8 million General Fund reduction in the Pre-Intern/Intern, Paraprofessional, and Math Initiative Programs.

Note: The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program, co-administered by the Department of Education, has a proposed General Fund reduction of \$20 million in both FY 2001-02 and FY 2002-03.

Commission-Initiated Budget Change Proposal:

- \$1.498 million from the Teacher Credentials Fund for the third-year costs of the Teacher Credentialing Service Improvement Project.

The attached chart denotes the various details as presented above in the Budget Highlights.

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

**Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Proposed 2002-03 Governor's Budget Actions**

Fiscal Year ^{1/}	Actions	Dollars	Funding Source
	Budget Change Proposals:		
2002-03	Approved--Teacher Credentialing Service Improvement Project (Third Year Funding)	\$1,498,000	Teacher Credentials Fund
2002-03	Denied--Augmentation for credit/debit card transaction fees	--	--
2002-03	Denied--Staffing to address increased workload in the Division of Professional Practices	--	--
	Local Assistance Program Reductions:		
2002-03	Alternative Certification (Intern) Program/Pre-Intern Program	\$6,200,000	General Fund-Proposition 98
2002-03	Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program	\$4,000,000	General Fund-Proposition 98
2002-03	Mathematics Initiative for Teaching Program	\$600,000	General Fund-Proposition 98
2001-02 / 2002-03	Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (Co-Administered by the Department of Education)	\$20,000,000 (\$40,000,000 over two years)	General Fund-Proposition 98
	Other Reductions:		
2001-02	Control Section 3.90	\$78,000	General Fund
	Teacher Credential Fee Buyout	(\$74,664)	
	Paraprofessional/Fellowships (Support)	(\$3,336)	
2001-02 / 2002-03	10 Percent GF Operating Expenses and Equipment	\$167,600	General Fund
	Teacher Credential Fee Buyout	(\$165,000)	
	Paraprofessional/Fellowships (Support)	(\$2,600)	
2002-03	15 Percent GF Reduction Per Governor's Order 10/11/01	\$21,000	General Fund
	Paraprofessional (Support)	(\$9,000)	
	Fellowships (Support)	(\$12,000)	

^{1/} Fiscal year 2001-02 denotes current year actions, and fiscal year 2002-03 denotes budget year actions.

**California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

**Meeting of
February 6-7, 2002**

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: C&CA

COMMITTEE: Credentials, Assignments and Waivers

**TITLE: Transition to Teaching: A Summary of the Pilot
Project with Oakland and San Diego School Districts**

 Action

XX **Information**

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

**Goal 1: Promote education excellence through the preparation and certification of
professional educators**

**Goal 6: Provide leadership in exploring multiple, high quality routes to prepare
professional educators for California's schools**

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** 1/16/2002
Michael D. McKibbin
Consultant, Teacher Development

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Amy Jackson
Administrator, Teacher Development

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Dale Janssen
Acting Director, Certification, Assignment and Waivers

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** _____
Dr. Sam W. Swofford
Executive Director

Transition to Teaching: A Summary of the Pilot Project with Oakland and San Diego School Districts

Professional Services Division

February 7, 2002

Executive Summary

Oakland and San Diego Unified School districts participated in a pilot project to determine the most productive steps to eliminate the use of emergency permits in these large school districts. When the pilot began in 2000, CCTC records showed 539 Emergency Permits or waivers in Oakland and 243 in San Diego. Currently there are 114 teachers on emergency permits in Oakland and 17 in San Diego. The Pilot identified five steps or strategies that were used by the districts to achieve these reductions. The assistant superintendents for human resources from each of the pilot districts, Dr. Deberie Gomez (San Diego) and Dr. Delores Lemon -Thomas (Oakland) will present summaries of their participation in the pilot project.

Policy(s) Issue to be Considered

What are the steps necessary to eliminate or greatly reduce the use of Emergency Permits and waivers in large school districts?

Fiscal Impact Statement

The costs of this pilot project were covered by the budgets of the Professional Services and Certification Assignments, and Waivers Divisions of the CCTC and the participating school districts. The costs to former emergency permit holders to move to full certification in the pilot districts were covered by a federal grant. These expenses include: tuition and books, career and academic advisement, exam preparation costs, exam fees, and credential application fees.

Transition to Teaching: A Summary of the Pilot Project with Oakland and San Diego School Districts

Introduction

Placing a qualified teacher in every classroom is a priority goal for the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. At the initiation of two Commissioners, staff began to explore the question, "What would it take to eliminate or greatly reduce the necessity for emergency permits and credential waivers in large school districts?" Two districts, San Diego City Schools and Oakland Unified School District, volunteered to be part of a pilot project to examine the challenges and develop the strategies necessary to address this question.

Background

Oakland Unified School District is the sixth largest district in California with over 54,000 students. The district employs over 2,900 teachers. In 1999-2000, 74% of the teaching staff held full teaching credentials. Commission records identified 539 teachers on Emergency Permits or Waivers. In addition, the district had 740 teachers who were at or near retirement age. The district was having difficulty retaining its teaching staff and recruiting and employing fully certificated teachers. The district's need for teachers is estimated at 400 new teachers every year for the next five years.

San Diego Unified School District is the second largest school district in the state with 142,000 students and 8,400 teachers. It is growing at a rate that requires the hiring of approximately 1,000 new teachers each year. About 97% of the district's teachers are fully credentialed. The number of Emergency Permit and Waiver teachers reached three to four hundred in previous years, and on January 3, 2001, Commission records showed 243 waivers and emergency permit holders. Though these numbers were relatively low, the district was not satisfied and sought to lower its number of non-credentialed teachers.

Information gathered by the Commission's Certification, Assignment and Waivers (CAW) Division and reported in 2000 and the 2001 Pre-intern Report to the Legislature, indicates that 60% of the persons who receive an Emergency Permit do not renew it after one year. A 1996 study of a statewide sample of emergency permit holders found that more than two-thirds of those who began teaching on a long term emergency permit never ultimately received a full, permanent credential. It was found that frequently those who did complete the requisite six semester units of coursework to renew their Emergency Permit were taking courses that were convenient and available. However these courses were not necessarily the courses they needed to demonstrate subject matter competence or provide them the pedagogical skills to improve their teaching.

In order to facilitate the transition from emergency permits to full certification, multiple preparation options are available. Most Emergency Permit holders lack one or more of the statutory prerequisites for entrance into a teacher preparation program. The most common missing prerequisite is demonstration of subject matter knowledge. In 1997 the CCTC sponsored, and Senator Jack Scott authored, legislation that would target Emergency Permit holders and launch the Pre-intern Program to provide focused, systematic preparation in subject matter. For those Emergency Permit holders who meet entrance requirements, internship programs provide a teacher preparation option where persons complete their credential program while being employed in a teaching position.

Both of the pilot districts participate in the Pre-intern and Intern programs. Each of the districts requested and was granted significant increases in the number of pre-interns in 2001-2002. Both Oakland and San Diego participate in five internship programs. In both cases the districts are partners in intern programs with a California State University, a University of California, private universities, as well as a District Intern program.

The Pilot Project Plan

Personnel from the human resources and professional development staffs of the two districts agreed to meet with the Commission's teacher development staff, including representatives from the Paraprofessional, Pre-intern, Intern, and Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs, and Certification staff of the Commission. Representatives of the Northern and Southern California Teacher Recruitment Centers joined the group. The initial conversations centered on the appropriate roles for each of these entities. The role of the Commission staff was to gather data, provide accurate credential information, provide information about existing and potential funding opportunities, and seek external funds to cover the potential additional costs of the pilot project. Each of the districts took on the tasks of matching their records against those of the Commission and identifying those individuals who possessed emergency permits or waivers and the circumstances that caused the district to request those permits. The Teacher Recruitment Centers offered assistance in identifying individuals on emergency permits and supplying potential recruits to the districts. The participants elected to meet every two months to report progress and to arrange for mutual assistance.

Early activities in the pilot consisted of data collection and data reconciliation. One issue that caused the districts concern was the procedure that the Commission uses to count emergency permit holders. For example, an emergency permit may be issued for one year to an individual at the request of a school district. If that person leaves that district, and is replaced by another person for whom the district has requested an Emergency Permit, this is registered at the Commission as two emergency permits for that one-year time period even though they were employed for the same teaching slot. Similarly, if the district employs a teacher on an Emergency Permit and that same teacher clears their credential one month later, the Commission's statistics would continue to count that as an Emergency Permit teacher for the duration of that year. Another issue was that Limited Term Emergency Permits were issued to fully credentialed teachers who were meeting a temporary need of the district. In most cases these teachers were seeking appropriate

preparation to become fully authorized in a new assignment but they were already fully credentialed in at least one area. No differentiation is made in Commission statistics between persons in this circumstance and those without any kind of credential. This latter circumstance is prevalent in special education where many fully credentialed teachers are moving into special education from regular education. While it was not in dispute that they must eventually be fully credentialed to teach in special education, the districts requested that the CCTC consider them credentialed teachers, since they hold a teaching credential at all.

Oakland. In the first year of the pilot, Oakland Unified School District was able to reduce the number of emergency permits from 539 to 254. This was done primarily by increasing participation in alternative certification programs (pre-intern and intern programs). Ninety-seven (97) of those remaining on emergency permits could be accounted for in the following ways: persons counted twice for one position; limited assignment emergency permits; persons already enrolled in the student teaching phase of a teacher preparation program; or in a few cases, Emergency Permit holder who met all of the qualifications for a preliminary credential but who had not applied for the credential. Once all of these individuals were accounted for, 157 persons on emergency permits remained.

The district's credential analyst assisted by the human resources staff and the staff of the Northern California Recruitment Center scheduled an interview with every remaining Emergency Permit holder. The message that was given to the emergency permit holders was very clear, "If you are not making tangible, satisfactory progress toward full certification, you will not be employed by this district." In other words the district made moving into a pre-intern, intern, or other form of teacher preparation, where available, a condition of employment for the 2001-2002 school year.

For many this interview was the first conversation that the Emergency Permit holder had ever had about their credential situation. Many of the Emergency Permit holders were unaware of the options and opportunities that were available. For others, they were skeptical, even defiant. For some there were legitimate reasons for remaining on an emergency permit. Some of these reasons are still in the process of being resolved. For example, there is no internship in the area of special education offered by any of the colleges and universities that serve Oakland. Discussions have begun with education deans and special education faculty at East Bay colleges and universities, but these Emergency Permit holders are still without an intern program to enter.

As of December, 2001 these are the results of the efforts of Oakland Unified School District.

- 114 individuals still remain on Emergency Permits.
- Forty-nine (49) were converted to another credential, including 34 who were eligible for a professional clear credential.
- Seven (7) were placed in an intern program, and eight (8) were converted to pre-intern certificates.

- Thirty (30) persons who had held emergency permits were not offered contracts for 2001-02.
- Seventy-eight (78) emergency permits that were renewed, and thirty-six (36) new employees were hired on emergency permits. Of these, fifty (50) are waiting for availability of a special education internship program and five are seeking library media certification.

San Diego. San Diego began this pilot project with 243 persons on emergency permits or credential waivers. There were also another 60 persons on emergency permits in seventeen (17) charter schools authorized through San Diego City Schools. While San Diego City Schools initiated the conversation regarding this project with the Charter schools, the District does not have authority to engage them in the project. As with Oakland, the process began with identification of those who were on emergency permits. Each of these persons was sent a letter making it clear that satisfactory progress was necessary to maintain employment in the district. A general meeting was called to explain the options that would allow them to be contracted for the 2001-2002 school year. The letters and general meeting were followed by individual consultation sessions tailored to help candidates further understand their status and teacher preparation options available to them. All but seventeen of those serving on an emergency permit were able to be moved to a teacher preparation program. In 162 of the cases the Emergency Permit holders were moved into pre-intern programs, which places these candidates in an organized program to provide subject matter preparation and coherent and consistent local support for their teacher preparation program. Sixty-eight (68) of the Emergency Permit holders were eligible to move directly into one of the five intern programs that currently serve teachers in San Diego City Schools. While the District had availed itself of special education intern programs with two local State universities, they entered into a third intern program agreement with a local private institution that could provide a flexible program entry that this large urban district needed as they continued to hire teachers throughout the school year.

Eleven (11) of the seventeen (17) that remain on emergency permits are in the area of special education. Many of these are in low incidence disability areas, such as physically disabled, or deaf/hard of hearing, and there is no preparation program readily available to these candidates in the San Diego area. Six (6) of the individuals were seeking the library media credential for which emergency permit is the only option. The human resources personnel in San Diego City Schools, along with the staff of the Commission, are working to find innovative ways to fully prepare those teacher candidates who are not being adequately served by the existing program options. For example, discussions are occurring to explore using distance learning opportunities to provide instruction in low incidence special education areas. The district is also preparing to expand their district intern program into miscellaneous single subject areas for which there is no current intern program available with the universities.

As indicated earlier, library media teachers present an unusual challenge. There were four (4) of these teachers who were prepared and credentialed in other states. In the state where they were prepared, no regular multiple or single subject credential was required,

but in California a regular teaching credential is a prerequisite to the Library Media Credential. Therefore, these teachers were teaching in California under an emergency permit. The Commission staff was able to find a Title 5 option to authorize their service without an emergency permit.

Pilot Project Strategy

Five common strategies to identify and place emergency permit holders in appropriate programs emerge from this pilot project. These strategies are presented in Chart 1. The strategies that are listed in the chart and described below were identified based on the joint discussions held with Commission staff and the findings as each district explored their local procedures and options. Most of the strategies fall into the area of common sense. A goal of this pilot project was to develop a set of procedural strategies that could be used by other districts to reduce or eliminate emergency permits.

Chart 1 Strategies in the Transition to Teaching Pilot Project

- I Data Collection and Analysis**
- II Counseling of Candidates**
- III Collaboration and Information of Participants and Partners**
- IV Program Development and Transition**
- V Policy Mitigation and Program Support**

The first step for any district seeking to reduce emergency permits is to **collect data** on the persons who are not credentialed in the district. The pilot found that in some cases the data were not complete. Data held by different divisions did not match, and the data that the district had did not always match CCTC data. Some of the reasons for mismatched data were pointed out earlier in this report (e.g., double counting emergency permit holders who occupied the same teaching positions at different times of the year). Once the numbers were initially reconciled, the task turned to determining who these people were and what support each needed to move toward completing a credential.

The pilot districts found that one-on-one **counseling** was both critical and time consuming. Among the questions that were asked of the emergency permit holders were the following.

- In what university are you enrolled?
- Have you taken (and passed) the appropriate subject matter exam?
- What credential are you pursuing?

- Do you know what the renewal requirements for an emergency permit are?
- What are your career goals, and why did you decide to take a job on an emergency permit?
- Do you know about the opportunities that are available in this district to become fully credentialed?

The two districts reported that the answers that were given were extremely varied. Responses ranged from, “No I don’t know anything about the questions you are asking;” to “Why are you asking me these questions?” “Don’t you know that there is a shortage of teachers and you need me?” In both districts, at every level, the school board, the superintendent, and the human resources personnel, had agreed that moving persons from emergency permits was a priority and that moving toward full certification would be a condition of employment. For some of the Emergency Permit holders the incentive of continued employment was necessary for those individuals to agree to take the next step in the credential process. For many, they needed the assistance of people who understood the process of becoming a credentialed teacher. Often, according to the district’s reports, emergency permit holders are sincerely unaware of the options that exist for them to achieve the credential that they desire.

Early in this pilot project it became very clear **collaboration and sharing information among the participants and partners** was critical if this pilot was going to meet its goal. In some cases the communication channels were well established, but had not been the focus of current collaborative efforts. In some cases, the pilot project offered a new opportunity to establish or reestablish connections. The collaboration was a time of breaking down the myths and the barriers that were getting in the way of all partners. Besides those working in human resources, the district’s divisions that dealt with professional development needed to be involved, as did the special education staff. The Commission’s certification and professional services divisions supported the effort by assisting with data collection and analysis, clarifying policies and seeking supplementary funding opportunities. Also critical was the need for more robust relationships with the colleges and universities in each district’s service area. For both districts existing programs needed to be expanded, and new programs and relationships needed to be developed. Additional difficult issues that needed to be reconciled were also identified, such as capacity of the universities to expand programs and the ability of the large universities to provide the flexibility of program entry that is and will be needed to sustain this effort.

A finding of this joint exploration is that not all of the necessary infrastructure is in place to handle all of the needs for certificated teachers in all credential areas. The participants must **develop new teacher preparation programs and improve the transition mechanisms within existing programs**. For example, a need remains to expand the availability of Education Specialist Internships. Programs are not always available, and when they are, these programs do not offer preparation for teachers of low incidence disabilities. Internship programs are not available in all of the single subject areas.

Transitions from emergency to pre-intern and pre-intern to intern program are not happening efficiently and emergency permit holders do not know the range of program options that do exist. These issues require focused attention by districts and the Commission staff. In the case of Low Incidence Education Specialists, more innovative delivery systems must be implemented and supported since so few of these programs exist in California.

A number of challenges emerged in the pilot project discussions that involved the CCTC. Among the issues that surfaced, were limits in the length of pre-intern certificates, the lack of viable education specialist programs, and limitations in District Intern legislation that will not allow expansion to areas of greatest need, such as special education. The need to increase frequency of subject matter exam dates was also discussed. Another issue that was identified is how emergency permits are counted, particularly those emergency permits (limited assignment) in which the holder already holds a full credential. The group explored potential sources of **support and assistance** that could be made available to the districts. Besides assuring full access to state funds, including alternative certification funds, Commission staff agreed to pursue federal funds. At the time the pilot project was commencing, the U.S. Department of Education released a Request For Proposals (RFP) related to the quality of the teaching workforce. In cooperation with the pilot districts, the CCTC staff responded to the RFP and was awarded a grant of one million dollars. Over a three-year period, the funds cover expenses of the participants in an appropriate teacher preparation program. Expenses covered include: tuition and books, career and academic advisement, exam preparation costs, exam fees, and credential application fees.

The five regional Teacher Recruitment Centers can play an important role in assisting districts as they move emergency permit holders into appropriate credential programs. Each regional center can assure that their staff are knowledgeable about credentialing in California and about the program options available in the various universities and colleges. Credential technicians in school districts and county offices can counsel prospective teachers regarding the range of options for gaining credentials. University credential technicians and counselors can provide accurate information about program options about their own college or university. A need exists for credential “one stop shopping,” and the participants in the pilot project thought that Teacher Recruitment Centers were ideally positioned to provide this service.

Summary

An early analysis demonstrates that this pilot project has been successful in moving toward meeting the goal of eliminating or greatly reducing emergency permits. The two districts have shown that the use of emergency permits can be diminished in a relatively short period of time. The pilot project has identified five common strategies as listed in chart one. These strategies can be replicated in other districts that are high users of emergency permits and waivers.

The key to the early success of the joint effort was the district commitment, as a matter of policy and practice, to put a fully credentialed teacher in every classroom. This commitment was made by the school board, the superintendent and human resources personnel.

Commission staff worked to address each district's need as they were uncovered through intensive review of emergency permit holders. As needs surfaced, staff explored current state policy and practice and were able to adjust guidelines to better serve the current needs of districts.

The pilot project team of district and Commission staff will continue to meet on a regular basis. The team is planning to develop a user friendly guidebook to assist other districts in eliminating emergency permits. The team will develop and conduct technical assistance workshops for districts to be offered as early as spring 2002. In the coming months, the Commission staff will present an agenda item that summarizes all of the strategies that are being undertaken to reduce the use of emergency permits and waivers.

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of
February 6-7, 2002*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: SS-1

COMMITTEE: Study Session

TITLE: Informational Presentation on the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

Action

Information

Report

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

Prepared By: _____
Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Date: _____

Approved By: _____
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Date: _____

Authorized By: _____
Dr. Sam W. Swofford
Executive Director

Date: _____

**Informational Presentation on
The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards**

Professional Services Division

January 15, 2002

Executive Summary

Since 1987 the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) has operated a voluntary national assessment and certification system for experienced teachers based on high, rigorous standards. This work of NBPTS nationally and in California will be described and experiences of board certified California teachers will be shared during this informational session.

Policy(s) Issue to be Considered

None at this time.

Fiscal Impact Statement

NA

Recommendation(s)

None at this time.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

Presentation by
Betty Castor, President
Charles A. Summers, Vice-President
Marissa Hipol-Rice, NBPTS Certified Teacher
Myrna Hipol-Estrada, NBPTS Certified Teacher

Background

Scope and Purpose. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards was created in 1987 in response to a Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy report entitled *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*. This report called for a National Board to “establish high standards for what teachers need to know and be able to do, and to certify teachers who meet that standard.” Today the NBPTS is an independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan and non-governmental organization governed by a 63-member board of directors, a majority of whom are classroom teachers. The other directors include school administrators, school board leaders, governors and state legislators, higher education officials, and business and community leaders. Six Californians currently are members of the board.

The mission of the NBPTS is “to establish high and rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do, to develop and operate a national voluntary system to assess and certify teachers who meet these standards, and to advance related educated reforms for the purpose of improving student learning in American schools.” Currently the NBPTS offers 24 certificates applicable to 95% of the eligible teaching population. It has awarded certificates to 9531 teachers since 1995, including 1300 Californians.

NBPTS certification is intensive standards-based professional development for experienced teachers. It is available to all teachers who hold a baccalaureate degree, have taught for a minimum of three years in either a public or private school, and have held a valid state license for those three years. Teachers must demonstrate their knowledge and skills through a series of performance-based assessments and written exercises. Complementary to state licensing, this certification is an opportunity for experienced teachers to demonstrate accomplished practice. A National Board Certificate is valid for ten years.

California Incentives. California offers a number of incentives for participation in the NBPTS process. California teachers who become National Board Certified and hold a preliminary multiple or single subject credential may apply for a professional clear credential. California teachers who hold National Board Certification based on teaching experience in another state may be issued a California professional clear credential in the

subject area for which the teacher has received national certification. California teachers who obtain National Board Certification are eligible for a one time \$10,000 incentive award, provided they are employed in a public school district or charter school and teach at least 50% time. Teachers who teach at least 60% time in a low performing school are eligible for a one time \$20,000 award. This award is given over four years in \$5000 installments.

To encourage candidates, California pays \$1000 of the \$2300 candidate application fee. These subsidies are provided for in the state budget. In 2000-01 over 1000 candidates received these fee subsidies. Currently up to \$2 million has been allocated in the state budget for this purpose. In addition, private funds supported an additional \$1000 fee subsidy for 812 teachers who met certain criteria, including teaching in low performing schools. Those teachers received \$2000 of the \$2300 fee from external funds.

Presentation

National Board President Betty Castor and Vice-President Charles A. Summers will provide additional information about the board. Marissa Hipo-Ricel and Myrna Hipol-Estrada will describe their experiences with the National Board process.

PUBLIC HEARING

Proposed Amendments to Sections 80026.4, 80026.6, and 80122 of California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Pertaining to the Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators

Introduction

The proposed amendments to Sections 80026.4, 80026.6, and 80122 pertaining to the Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators are being presented for public hearing. Included in this item is the background of the proposed regulations, a brief discussion of the proposed changes and the financial impact. Also included are the responses to the notification of the public hearing, a copy of that notification distributed in coded correspondence 01-0020, dated December 10, 2001.

Background of the Proposed Regulations

The Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators was designed as an option to request a subsequent waiver, or renew an emergency permit for the initial reissuance, by engaging in 90 hours of intensive professional development in lieu of completion of six units of conventional university course work or taking the appropriate subject matter examination. The Plan to Develop waives the college or university teacher preparation evaluation that is required for the initial reissuance of an emergency permit.

Staff believes the Commission will derive three benefits from the proposed changes:

- Individuals employed on waivers will be encouraged to complete the subject matter requirements in order to qualify for the emergency permit as quickly as possible.
- The five-year time limit placed by legislation on an emergency permit holder to complete credential requirements essentially eliminates the rationale for Plans to Develop Fully Qualified Educators.
- The phasing out of Plans to Develop Fully Qualified Educators as an option to renew an emergency permit or waiver would not preclude an employer from still offering the training as on-going support or as an employment hiring enhancement.

Proposed Changes

Section 80026.4 – Staff is proposing that employers will no longer be able to initially request approval of Plans to Develop Fully Qualified Educators after January 1, 2003 and that all approved Plans to Develop Fully Qualified Educators not be offered after January 1, 2004. There is a five-year time limit set by the Legislature to complete credential requirements while holding an emergency permit.

Section 80026.6 – Staff is proposing that all approved Plans to Develop Fully Qualified Educators not be offered after January 1, 2004. There is a five-year time limit set by the Legislature to complete credential requirements while holding an emergency permit.

Section 80122(g)(2) – Staff is proposing all approved Plans to Develop Fully Qualified Educators not be offered after January 1, 2004. This would encourage individuals on waivers to meet emergency permit requirements quicker. Once the individual is on the

emergency permit he or she would have to complete credential requirements within five-years.

Section 80122(h)(2) – Staff is proposing all approved Plans to Develop Fully Qualified Educators not be offered after January 1, 2004. This would encourage individuals on waivers to meet emergency permit requirements quicker. Once the individual is on the emergency permit he or she would have to complete credential requirements within five-years.

The following pages include the changes recommended by staff to be made to the existing Title 5 regulations that govern emergency permits and waivers.

Disclosures Regarding the Proposed Actions

The Commission has made the following initial determinations:

Mandated costs to local agencies or school districts: None

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

Cost or savings to any state agency: None

Cost or savings in federal funding to the state: None

Significant effect on housing costs: None

Significant statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting business including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states: None

Cost impacts on a representative private person or business: The Commission is not aware of any cost impacts that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

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

Effect on small businesses: The Commission has determined that the proposed amendment to the regulations does not effect small business. The regulations are not mandatory but an option that effects public school districts and county offices of education.

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 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

4 organizational opinions

0 personal opinion

In Opposition

0 organizational opinion

0 personal opinion

The Commission received four (4) written responses in support of the proposed amendment to Section 80026.4, 80026.6, & 80122 of the Title 5 Regulations.

Responses Representing Organizational Opinions in Support

- Achieve Opportunities for Children, Youth and Families: Madaly Ramos Cortagena, Site Director
- Stone Corral School District: Juan Lopez, Superintendent
- Eastside Union School District: Constance E. Webb, Superintendent
- Somerset Educational Services: Mary Ann Salem, Director of Student Services

Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed regulations to Sections 80026.4, 80026.6, and 80122.

**Proposed Regulations for Section 80026.4, Division VIII
of Title 5 California Code of Regulations**

§ 80026.4 Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators

(a) Any employing agency may submit a Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators to the Commission for approval. Such a Plan shall be developed by the employing agency, in collaboration with a county office of education, regionally accredited college or university, Special Education Local Planning Area, or other public education entity in the region of the employing agency, as appropriate. The Plan shall describe efforts by the employing agency to:

(1) recommend to the Commission the certification of personnel who, by virtue of education, training or experience, have been judged by certificated educators from the employing agency as competent to serve in an assignment, but are not yet certified to do so;

(2) support and assist persons who have training and experience in teaching, but neither training nor experience in the area to which they will be assigned; and

(3) provide development activities for persons who have neither training nor experience in teaching, for example, through university or district internships, technologically based learning, or intensive professional development programs.

(b) Any Plan To Develop Fully Qualified Educators may propose alternatives to enrollment in a Commission accredited preparation program for the first year of development of persons granted an emergency permit for the first time. Such alternatives shall be designed to provide ninety clock hours of professional development and to be equivalent to at least 6 units of course work offered to first-year emergency permit holders by a college or university with an preparation program accredited by the Commission. Any such proposed alternatives shall include information on how the performance of the applicants for the reissuance of an emergency permit shall be evaluated.

(c) Any Plan To Develop Fully Qualified Educators may propose ways for the employing agency to streamline or decentralize existing procedures for the issuance or reissuance of any or all of the emergency permits listed in Section 80023 to allow the employing agency to devote more personnel or fiscal resources to supporting, assisting and developing fully qualified educators, and fewer resources to paperwork or other tasks associated with applying for emergency permits.

(d) Plans to Develop Fully Qualified Educators may be initially approved by the Commission until January 1, 2003 and all approved Plans to Develop Fully Qualified Educators shall no longer be offered after January 1, 2004.

Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225, subdivisions (d) and (g), and 44300, Education Code.

**Proposed Regulations for Section 80026.6, Division VIII
of Title 5 California Code of Regulations**

§80026.6. Requirements for the Reissuance of Emergency Permits

(a) The reissuance requirements for an emergency permit identified in Section 80023 shall include all of the following:

(1) A completed Application for Credential Authorizing Public School Service (form 41-4, rev 4-94),

(2) Payment of the fee(s) required by Section 80487.

(3) Prior submission of a Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators that satisfies the provisions of Section 80026.

(4) Verification that orientation, guidance and assistance have been provided as required in Section 80026.5.

(5) For the first reissuance only, an evaluation by a Commission-accredited professional preparation institution identifying requirements the emergency permit holder must complete to be eligible for the related credential.

(6) The following, unless exceptions for reissuance are listed under the specific requirements for the type of emergency permit for which application is being made:

(A) Completion of at least six semester units (or the equivalent quarter units) of approved coursework in a Commission-accredited professional preparation program required for issuance of the related credential; or

(B) for the first reissuance only, completion of a minimum of ninety hours of professional development activities that are directly related to the subject or class authorized by the emergency permit if the applicant is employed by a employing agency with a Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators which has been accredited by the Commission. This option will no longer be available after January 1, 2004.

Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225, subdivisions (d) and (g), and 44300, Education Code.

**Proposed Regulations for Section 80122, Division VIII
of Title 5 California Code of Regulations**

§80122. Requirements for Variable Term Waivers.

The application for a waiver document shall include all of the following:

(a) Name of Employing Agency. The application shall identify the employing agency seeking a waiver.

(b) Section Number. The application shall cite the specific Education Code or Title 5 section number(s) for which a waiver is being requested. In the case of waivers for the purpose of assignment in school programs addressing issues of educational reform, the application may instead identify the plan under which the reform will take place and, if applicable, the date when the plan was approved by the employing agency or the appropriate state agency, whichever came later.

(c) Reason for Waiver. The application shall summarize the reason the waiver is being requested, including, but not limited to, the specific employment criteria for the position that must be filled, a description of the efforts to locate and recruit individuals who hold the appropriate credential or who can be assigned under one of the available assignment options, and a description of the efforts the employing agency has made to establish alternative training options such as co-sponsoring internships with institutions of higher education or establishing a District Intern program.

(d) Proposed Solution. The application shall describe how the waiver will remedy the situation, give the rationale for the request including what makes the applicant the best candidate to fill the position, and describe any negative effect(s) that are likely to occur if the request is not granted.

(e) Identification of Applicant. The application shall identify, by name, date of birth and Social Security number, the applicant for whom the waiver is requested.

(f) If the applicant does not already have fingerprint clearance on file with the Commission, the application must include two fingerprint cards and the completed Application for Character and Identification Clearance (form 41-CIC, rev 11-93), and appropriate fee(s).

(g) Requirements and Commitment. The request shall:

(1) list the requirement(s) that the applicant must complete to be eligible for the credential which authorizes the service being requested and the anticipated date(s) of completion of those requirement(s),

(2) include a commitment by the applicant, in the form of an original signature, to pursue a course of study leading to full certification, with the understanding that no subsequent waiver will be requested should the applicant fail to verify completion of requirement(s) leading toward the credential ~~or completion of the alternative requirement(s) specified in the employing agency's approved Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators,~~

(3) list the name and/or position of any person assigned to provide support and assistance to the applicant while he or she is serving on the waiver, and

(4) state that the employing agency has made a commitment to support and assist the applicant, as feasible, in completing the credentialing requirement(s).

(h) Additional Requirements

(1) To fill a position to serve special education students, the employing agency must include the SELPA among those receiving notice of the intent to request a waiver.

~~(2) Waiver requests from geographically isolated regions with severely limited ability to develop personnel shall include a Plan to Develop Fully Qualified Educators pursuant to Section 80026.4 or an explanation as to why such a plan is not feasible.~~

(i) Effective Date and Proposed Duration. The application shall specify the beginning date of service on the waiver and the date when the waiver will cease to be needed.

(j) Public Notice. The request shall include verification that a notice of intent to employ the applicant in the position identified has been made public as follows:

(1) If the waiver request is being submitted by a public school district, it must include a copy of the agenda item presented to the governing board of the district in public meeting with a signed statement from the superintendent, or his or her designee, that the item was acted upon favorably. The agenda item must state the name of the applicant, the assignment in which the applicant will be employed including the subject(s) and grade level(s) that he or she will be teaching and that the applicant will be employed on the basis of a credential waiver.

(k) Signatures. The application shall include the signature of the district personnel administrator or superintendent or the county superintendent if service will be provided in a county-operated school or the administrator of the state-operated school or of the nonpublic, nonsectarian school or agency, or his or her designee certifying that the information provided is accurate and complete.

(l) Fee(s). Effective July 1, 1996, the waiver request shall include payment of the fee(s) required by Section 80487. Waiver requests for individuals who hold a valid non-emergency teaching credential based on possession of a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution and completion of a professional preparation program that includes student teaching shall include payment of the fee(s) required by all sub-sections of Section 80487, as appropriate, except 80487(a)(1).

Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Section 44225, subdivisions (g) and (m) and 44235, Education Code.