



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

Web-Posted
June 27, 2002
Updated July 15, 2002

July Commission Agenda

July 10-11, 2002
Commission Offices, 1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814

Correspondence regarding any of these agenda items should be sent to the attention of the Executive Director at the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814-4213.

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

Wednesday, July 10, 2002 - Commission Office

- 1. Executive Committee (Chairman Bersin) 11:00 a.m.**
 - EXEC-1 Approval of the June 6, 2002 Executive Committee Minutes
 - [EXEC-2](#) Proposed Amendments to the Commission Policy Manual

- 2. 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)

- 3. Appeals and Waivers (Committee Chairman Madkins)**
 - A&W-1 Approval of the June 2002 A&W Minutes
 - A&W-2 Reconsideration of Waiver Denials
 - A&W-3 Waivers: Consent Calendar
 - A&W-4 Waivers: Conditions Calendar
 - A&W-5 Waivers: Denial Calendar

Thursday, July 11, 2002 - Commission Office

- 1. General Session (Chairman Bersin) 8:00 a.m.**
 - GS-1 Swearing In Ceremony of New Commissioners
 - GS-2 Roll Call
 - GS-3 Pledge of Allegiance
 - GS-4 Approval of the May 2002 Minutes
 - GS-5 Approval of the June 2002 Agenda

- GS-6 Approval of the June 2002 Consent Calendar
- GS-7 Annual Calendar of Events - for Information
- GS-8 Chair's Report
- GS-9 Executive Director's Report
- GS-10 Report on Monthly State Board Meeting
 - ▶ [Addendum to GS-10](#) (In-Folder) -- Posted July 15, 2002

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

- LEG-1 Status of Legislation of Interest to the Commission
 - ▶ [Addendum to LEG-1](#) (In-Folder) -- Posted July 24, 2002
- LEG-2 Analysis of Bills of Interest to the Commission
 - ▶ [Addendum to LEG-2](#) (In-Folder) -- Posted July 15, 2002

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

- FPPC-1 Update on the Governor's Budget for Fiscal Year 2002-03
 - ▶ [Addendum to FPPC-1](#) (In-Folder) -- Posted July 24, 2002
- FPPC-2 Report on Contracts and Procurement
 - ▶ [Addendum to FPPC-2](#) (In-Folder) -- Posted July 24, 2002
- FPPC-2 Teacher Credentialing Service Improvement Project Phase II Demonstration
 - ▶ [Addendum to FPPC-3](#) (In-Folder) -- Posted July 24, 2002

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

- [PREP-1](#) Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities
- [PREP-2](#) Request for Initial Institutional Accreditation for California State University, Channel Islands
- [PREP-3](#) A Report on Teacher Development Programs
- [PREP-4](#) Proposal to Explore Changes in Eligibility Requirements for the California Pre-intern Program

5. Performance Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Johnson)

- [PERF-1](#) Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT): Proposed Contract Amendment

6. Reconvene General Session (Chairman Bersin)

- GS-11 Report of Appeals and Waivers Committee
- GS-12 Report of Closed Session Items
- GS-13 Report of the Executive Committee
- GS-14 Commission Member Reports
- GS-15 Audience Presentations
- GS-16 Old Business
 - Quarterly Agenda for Information
 - July, September and October 2002
- GS-17 New Business
- GS-18 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:

September 5, 2002

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

Revisions to Policy Manual

Summary

The current Policy Manual does not fully provide Commissioners and staff with the requisite flexibility to address their responsibilities in an efficient and effective manner. Clarification is also needed to address changes necessitated by changing Commission meeting schedules as well as recent directions by the Executive Committee.

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impact.

Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Executive Committee recommend to the Commission that the Policy Manual be amended to clarify procedures to be followed by the Commission.

Report on the State Board of Education Meeting June 26-27, 2002

This report discusses issues of general interest to the Commission acted upon by the State Board of Education at its June 26-27, 2002 meeting.

AB 75. Last year the Legislature passed and the Governor signed AB 75 (Steinberg) which provides incentive funding for principal support, assistance, and development. AB 75 provides an alternative, local district option for candidates who wish to complete administrator credential requirements. The new law requires the State Board to approve training providers. State Board approved the first list of 238 training providers last month and approved an additional 47 training providers this month.

AB 466. The State Board of Education approved providers of professional development under the AB 466 Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program. The 170 providers will train 65,064 teachers and paraprofessionals at a cost of \$155 million in 2002-03.

No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) Enrichment Activities. Under the NCLB, tutoring or enrichment activities beyond the regular school day must be provided to low-income students not meeting Academic Content Standards in Title I schools. Parents may select from a State Board-approved list of Supplemental Education Service Providers. The State Board approved the criteria for approval last month and approved a list of 14 Supplemental Education Service Providers at this meeting.

**BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

JUNE 25, 2002

SPONSORED BILLS

Bill Number – Author – Version Summary	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
SB 57 - Scott - Amended 8/30/01 Provides a “fast track” credential option for private school teachers and others who can demonstrate their knowledge, skills and abilities in the classroom.	Sponsor - Introduced version - (December 2000)	Signed by the Governor. Chapter 269, Statutes of 2001.
SB 299 - Scott - Amended 8/30/01 Clarifies the Education Code Sections related to the Committee of Credentials and makes numerous non-controversial, technical and clarifying changes to the Education Code.	Sponsor - Introduced version - (December 2000)	Signed by the Governor. Chapter 342, Statutes of 2001.
SB 1655 - Scott - Amended 4/1/02 Adds Alternative, Standards-Based Routes to both the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credentials.	Sponsor - As Drafted 2/21/02, SB 328 - (February 2002)	Assembly on Appropriations Committee. Scheduled to be heard on June 26, 2002.
SB 1656 - Scott - Amended 4/1/02 Clarifies language in the Education Code to ensure that applications of and credentials held by registered sex offenders are automatically denied or revoked respectively.	Sponsor - Amended 1/7/02, SB 326 - (January 2002)	Assembly Committee on Appropriations. Not yet set for hearing.

ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number – Author – Version Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
<p>AB 75 - Steinberg - Amended 8/28/01 Creates a voluntary program to provide training to California’s principals and vice-principals to include academic standards, leadership skills, and the use of management and diagnostic technology. This is a Governor’s Initiative and the Governor’s Budget includes \$15 million for this program.</p>	<p>Watch - Introduced - (February 2001) Support - 2/22/01 - (March 2001)</p>	<p>Signed by the Governor. Chapter 697, Statutes of 2001.</p>
<p>AB 272 - Pavley - Amended 7/18/01 Would make a holder's first clear multiple or single subject teaching credential valid for the life of the holder after two renewal cycles, if the holder meets specified requirements.</p>	<p>Oppose - Introduced version - (March 2001)</p>	<p>Vetoed.</p>
<p>AB 401 - Cardenas - Amended 5/01/01 Requires the SPI to contract with an independent evaluator to determine if there is a difference in the distribution of resources (including credentialed teachers and pre-intern, intern and paraprofessional programs) between low-performing schools and high-performing schools within school districts. The report would be due by January 1, 2004 and subject to funding through the Budget Act.</p>	<p>Watch - Introduced version - (April 2001)</p>	<p>Chapter 647, Statutes of 2001.</p>
<p>AB 721 - Steinberg - Amended 4/17/01 The CCTC could award grants to teacher preparation programs to develop or enhance programs to recruit, prepare and support new teachers to work and be successful in low performing schools.</p>	<p>Support - 3/29/01- (April 2001)</p>	<p>Dead. February 7, 2002.</p>
<p>AB 833 - Steinberg - Amended 7/18/01 Requires the SPI to calculate a teacher qualification index measuring a student's access to experienced credentialed teacher for each school.</p>	<p>Watch - 3/29/01 - (April 2001)</p>	<p>Vetoed.</p>

Bill Number – Author – Version Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
<p>AB 961 - Steinberg, Vasconcellos, Ortiz, Diaz et. al. - Amended 9/14/01 Establishes the High Priority Schools Grant Program to allocate \$200 million to low performing schools in API deciles one through five, with a priority for funding on the first and second deciles.</p>		<p>Signed by the Governor. Chapter 749, Statutes of 2001.</p>
<p>AB 1148 - Wyland - Amended 4/17/01 Would require the Legislative Analyst’s Office to identify the variables that account for significant differences in test performance in elementary and high schools where the schools have similar resources.</p>	<p>Watch - Introduced version - (April 2001)</p>	<p>Dead. February 7, 2002.</p>
<p>AB 1232 - Chavez - Amended 5/17/01 Would establish the California State Troops to Teachers Act. Retired officers or noncommissioned officers who agree to teach for five years and participate in a paraprofessional, pre-internship or internship program would be eligible for a bonus payment.</p>	<p>Seek Amendments - Introduced version - (March 2001) Support - 5/01/01 (May 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Appropriations consent calendar April 25, 2002.</p>
<p>AB 1241 - Robert Pacheco - Amended 8/22/01 Would require the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to submit a written report on the feasibility of the development of a uniform teacher preparation program.</p>	<p>Seek Amendments - Introduced version - (April 2001) Watch - 4/05/01 - (May 2001)</p>	<p>Signed by the Governor. Chapter 714 Statutes of 2001.</p>
<p>AB 1307 - Goldberg - Amended 8/28/01 Would require the CCTC to adopt regulations that provide credential candidates with less than 24 months to complete the program to not meet new requirements under specified conditions.</p>	<p>Oppose - Unless Amended - Introduced version - (April 2001) Approve - 6/27/01 (July 2001)</p>	<p>Signed by the Governor. Chapter 565 Statutes of 2001.</p>
<p>AB 1431 - Horton - Amended 9/7/01 Creates a pilot program, in a minimum of three districts, to provide a 3-day training program for substitute teachers in low performing schools. Requires Los Angeles Unified to be one of the three participants in the pilot program.</p>	<p>Watch - Introduced version - (April 2001)</p>	<p>Vetoed.</p>

Bill Number – Author – Version Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
AB 1462 - Nakano - Amended 4/25/01 Requires the Commission to be a member of a committee charged with increasing the number and improving the quality of vocational education teachers.	Watch - (1/29/02) - (February 2002)	Re-referred to Senate Committee on Appropriations. Hearing postponed by Committee.
AB 1662 - R. Pacheco - Amended 4/30/01 Would require a master's degree for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential.	Oppose - 5/02/01 - (May 2001)	Dead. February 7, 2002.
AB 2053 - Jackson - Amended 4/16/02 Authorizes beginning special education teachers to take part in BTSA even if they have taught previously on another credential, as funds are available. Provides the option to expedite inductions for special education teachers.	Support - 2/15/02 - (March 2002)	Re-referred to Assembly Judiciary Committee June 11, 2002.
AB 2120 - Simitian - Amended 4/30/02 Would state the intent of the Legislature to develop a professional development block grant for teachers in K-12 by consolidating several of those programs.	Oppose - 2/19/02 - (February 2002)	Assembly Committee on Appropriations. Held under submission.
AB 2160 - Goldberg, Wesson, and Strom-Martin - Amended 4/11/02 Expands the scope of collective bargaining to include the use of mentors and professional training and development among other things.	Oppose - 2/2/02-(March 2002) Oppose - Unless Amended-4/11/02 (May 2002)	Assembly inactive file June 24, 2002.
AB 2288 - Chavez - Amended 4/16/02 Would require the Commission to convene a commission to complete a study on the implementation and expansion of the Troops to Teachers program.	Seek Amendments - 2/21/02 - (April 2002)	Assembly Committee on Appropriations. Held under submission.
AB 2566 - Pavley - Amended 4/18/02 This bill would provide support for more pre-interns to improve their retention rate and give them the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to teach. This measure considers the State's current fiscal condition by imposing the requirement that the bill will be implemented when state or federal funds are available.	Support - 4/18/02 - (May 2002)	Assembly Committee on Appropriations. Held under submission.

Bill Number-Author - Version Summary	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
AB 2575 - Leach - Amended 5/1/02 Requires the Commission to issue a professional clear single subject credential to a candidate who passes CBEST, has a master's degree in the subject to be authorized by the credential, takes Commission approved pedagogical courses and has teaching or professional experience.	Oppose - 2/21/02 - (March 2002)	Senate Education Committee. Scheduled to be heard on June 27, 2002.
AB 2616 - Lowenthal/Liu - Amended 4/24/02 Appropriates \$1,570,000 from the General Fund to CSU to establish distance learning and other off-campus options to increase the number of teachers for visually impaired students.	Support - 2/21/02 - (March 2002)	Senate Education Committee. Scheduled to be heard on June 27, 2002.
ACR 177 - Diaz - Amended 6/19/02 Would urge school districts to support teachers prepared in other countries.	Support - 3/20/02 - (April 2002)	Senate 3 rd reading.

SENATE BILLS

Bill Number – Author – Version Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
<p>SB 321 - Alarcon - Amended 7/18/01 Would allow school districts to provide a 30-day training program for teachers they hire on an emergency permit. Provides \$2 million for implementation to be dispersed to LAUSD after Commission approval of training program. Provided \$125K to Commission for administrative costs.</p>	<p>Seek Amendments - Introduced version - (April 2001)</p>	<p>Signed by the Governor Chapter 576, Statutes of 2001. Deleted \$2 million for implementation.</p>
<p>SB 508 - Vasconcellos - (April 8, 2002 Proposed Conference Report). Would make non-controversial changes to the High Priority Schools Grant Program (AB 961) passed last year.</p>	<p>Watch - 4/23/01 (May 2001)</p>	<p>Signed by the Governor. Chapter 42, Statutes of 2002.</p>
<p>SB 572 - O’Connell - Amended 5/03/01 Prohibits school districts from limiting the years of service credit used to determine the salary of a teacher coming from another school district.</p>	<p>Support - If Amended - Introduced version - (April 2001) Watch – 5/03/01 – (May 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Appropriations. Scheduled to be heard on June 26, 2002.</p>
<p>SB 688 - O’Connell - Amended 6/4/01 Would make beginning teachers in regional occupation centers and programs eligible for BTSA.</p>	<p>Approve - Introduced version - (April 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Appropriations. Held under submission.</p>
<p>SB 743 - Murray - Amended 8/23/01 Would require the CCTC to develop a plan that addresses the disproportionate number of teachers serving on emergency permits in low-performing schools in low-income communities. The plan is due by July 1, 2002 and includes a \$32,000 appropriation from the General Fund.</p>	<p>Watch - Introduced version of SB 79 - (February 2001)</p>	<p>Vetoed.</p>

Bill Number – Author – Version Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
<p>SB 792 - Sher - Amended 7/03/01 Would require the CCTC to issue a two-year subject matter credential after earning a baccalaureate degree and passage of CBEST and a clear credential after completion of 40 hours of preparation and professional development, if any, and passage of the teacher preparation assessment.</p>	<p>Oppose - Introduced version - (March 2001) Oppose - 4/5/01 - (April 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Education Committee. Set, 1st hearing - failed passage. Reconsideration granted.</p>
<p>SB 837 - Scott - Amended 9/5/01 Would specify the documentation that a school district must provide the CCTC to justify a request for an emergency permit. This bill would also increase the state grant and district match for the pre-intern program and permit the CCTC to allow for district hardship.</p>	<p>Support - Introduced version - (March 2001)</p>	<p>Signed by the Governor. Chapter 585, Statutes of 2001.</p>
<p>SB 900 - Ortiz - Amended 3/28/01 Would increase efficiency in processing information requests by grouping those agencies with similar standards and information needs together.</p>	<p>Support - If Amended - 3/28/01 - (April 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Appropriations. Not yet scheduled for hearing.</p>
<p>SB 1250 - Vincent - Amended 2/13/02 This measure would allow some retired teachers to be exempt from CBEST if they complete a teacher refresher course.</p>	<p>Oppose - Unless Amended - 4/3/02 - (May 2002)</p>	<p>Assembly Education Committee. Scheduled for hearing on June 26, 2002.</p>
<p>SB 1483 - McClintock - Amends the Education Code to change the membership of the Commission. Also corrects a technical error.</p>	<p>Watch - Introduced version 2/19/02 - (March 2002)</p>	<p>Senate Rules Committee. Not yet assigned to Committee.</p>

Bill Number-Author-Version Summary	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
SB 1547 - (As Proposed to be Amended) Soto - Amended 4/17/02 Requires the Commission to issue certificates that authorize the holder to instruct limited- English-proficient pupils.	Oppose - 2/20/02- (April 2002)	Senate Education Committee. Failed passage on May 1, 2002. Held in Committee.
SB 2029 - Alarcon - Amended 4/17/02 Allows district intern programs that satisfy Commission adopted standards to offer a program in all areas of special education.	Support - 2/22/02 - (March 2002)	Assembly Education Committee. Scheduled for hearing on June 26, 2002.

Revised on July 8, 2002

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Senate Bill 1646
Author:	Senator Alpert
Sponsor:	California Association of Suburban School Districts
Subject of Bill:	Baccalaureate degree in elementary education
Date Introduced:	February 21, 2002
Date Amended:	July 3, 2002
Status in Leg. Process:	Assembly Appropriations Committee
Current CCTC Position:	None
Recommended Position:	Watch
Date of Analysis:	July 5, 2002
Analyst:	Anne L. Padilla

Summary of Current Law

Education Code Section 44259 establishes the minimum requirements for preliminary multiple or single subject teaching credentials. These requirements include a Baccalaureate degree or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of postsecondary education, and except for out-of-state candidates specified in Section 44227, prohibits degrees in professional education. This same code section directs the Commission to offer undergraduate minors in education and special education to students who intend to become teachers.

Education Code Section 44259.1 describes integrated programs of subject matter and professional preparation (“blended programs”) that enable candidates for teaching credentials to engage in professional preparation concurrent with subject matter preparation, while completing baccalaureate degrees at regionally accredited postsecondary institutions. These integrated programs are based on intensive collaboration among subject matter departments and education units within postsecondary institutions and local public elementary and secondary school districts and provide candidates opportunities with early field work experience in public elementary and secondary schools.

Education Code Section 66904 requires that all proposals for new postsecondary educational programs be forwarded to the California Postsecondary Education

Commission for review. "New programs" is further defined in this section as including all courses leading to a graduate or undergraduate degree.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

In 1998 the Commission sponsored legislation, SB 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni), which among its provisions, established statutory authorization for integrated ("blended") programs of subject matter preparation and professional preparation. The Commission has approved more than 25 blended programs statewide that integrate subject matter, pedagogy and early field experiences. These programs are sponsored by both public and private four-year universities.

The Commission has used both state and federal grant funds to encourage the establishment of blended programs. The Commission's 1998-99 budget included \$350,000 to provide grants to public colleges and universities seeking accelerated approval to develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation. The Commission has also made available to public and private higher education institutions resources from California's Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant to expand blended programs.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would require each campus of the California State University (CSU) and urge each campus of the University of California to establish a baccalaureate degree in elementary education, for the purpose of allowing candidates for multiple subject teaching credentials to study their professional preparation concurrently with their subject matter preparation.

The bill specifies that these baccalaureate degree programs in elementary education would:

- Provide opportunities for candidates to complete intensive field experiences in public elementary schools early in their undergraduate program;
- Be approved (for credentialing purposes) by the Commission using the same standards for program approval as all other programs must meet;
- Be developed and implemented based on collaboration and shared decision-making by each state university's school or department of education and the subject matter departments within the state university, the local public elementary and unified school districts and where appropriate, the local community colleges;
- Be housed in the state university's school or department of education;
- Require each candidate to have one area of emphasis that is a part of the adopted course of study commonly taught in grades 1 to 6, (English, mathematics, social sciences, science, visual and performing arts, health and physical education) that is grounded in one core academic area. The area of emphasis would be listed on each candidate's diploma;

- Requires that the degree program to incorporate substantively the latest research regarding infant and child brain development, as specified;
- Be based on and incorporate the California academic content standards and the state curriculum frameworks adopted by the State Board of Education;
- Be implemented only if the necessary federal waiver is granted to authorize specified students to be eligible for federal Pell Grants;
- Requires the Commission to encourage all University of California campuses as well as accredited private postsecondary institutions to offer baccalaureate degrees in elementary education.

Comments:

1. This bill mirrors many of the blended program elements contained in Education Code Section 44259.1.
2. Under current federal law, if an institution offers both undergraduate and graduate programs in teacher preparation, only the undergraduate students would be eligible for Pell grants. The author and sponsor are currently seeking a federal waiver from this requirement so that all students in teacher preparation programs, regardless of their standing, would be eligible for Pell grants.

Fiscal Analysis

Costs to the Commission: Unknown costs to the Commission to review new programs requiring Commission approval.

Costs to the CSU: Unknown but potentially significant costs to universities for the development and implementation of new programs.

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.**

Organizational Positions on the Bill

Support

California Association of Suburban School Districts (Sponsor)

Association of School Administrators

California Language Teachers Association

California School Boards Association

Fallbrook Unified Elementary School District

Glendale Unified School District

Long Beach Unified School District
Los Angeles Unified School District
San Diego Unified School District
Tustin Unified School District

Oppose
California Faculty Association

Reason for Suggested Position

This measure most directly affects the California State University.

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of
July 10-11, 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

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** 6/19/02
Phyllis Jacobson, Ed. D.
Consultant, Professional Services Division

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** 6/19/02
Betsy Kean, Ph. D.
Consultant, Professional Services Division

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** 6/19/02
Lawrence Birch, Ed. D.
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** 6/19/02
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** 6/19/02
Dr. Sam W. Swofford
Executive Director

Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities

Professional Services Division

June 19, 2002

Executive Summary

This item contains a listing of a subject matter program recommended for approval by an appropriate review panel, 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.

Policy Question

Should the subject matter program identified in this report be approved?

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the subject matter preparation program listed in this report.

Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities

Professional Services Division

June 19, 2002

Background Information

The work of developing new standards for the preparation of California teachers began with SB 1422 (1992). Subsequent legislation, SB 2042 (1998), prompted the appointment of Advisory Panels to develop new standards for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs and for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs. The SB 2042 Advisory Panels met between 1998-2001, and presented draft standards to the Commission in January, 2001. An extensive field review of the new standards followed, and the SB 2042 Advisory Panels subsequently met to review the input from the field and revise the Draft Standards based on field input. The final draft Standards were presented to the Commission in September, 2001.

At its meeting of September 6, 2001, the Commission approved new Standards under SB 2042 for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs, and an Implementation Plan for transitioning to these new sets of Standards. At its meeting of October 4, 2001, the Commission approved new Blended Program Standards under SB 2042, and at its meeting of March 7, 2002, the Commission approved new Induction Program Standards under SB 2042.

Using resources from the Title II HEA Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, the Commission made available planning grants for institutions willing to become "Early Adopters" of the SB 2042 Standards. Thirty-two institutions subsequently were granted funds and submitted their program responses to the SB 2042 Standards by the deadline date of April 1, 2002. Of these thirty-two institutions, eleven were submitting responses to the Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Standards, and thirty were submitting responses to the Professional Teacher Preparation Standards (several institutions were submitting response to both).

Additional program submission windows are: September 2, 2002, November 1, 2002, February 3, 2003, April 1, 2003, August 1, 2003, and September 1, 2003.

Selection and Composition of the Review Panels

A panel of experts consisting of K-12 professionals and post-secondary education professionals are reviewing program proposals under the new standards. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing made a concerted effort to identify readers with particular background expertise relating to the SB 2042 standards and to the fields of teacher preparation and subject matter preparation. Applications and criteria for selection were mailed to all institutions with currently accredited programs, were distributed at professional meetings, and were posted on the Commission's website. Each reader's application was reviewed against the criteria, and qualified readers were then recommended to the Executive Director for appointment to the SB 2042 Review Panel.

Readers were assigned to a Professional Teacher Preparation Review Panel, an Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Review Panel, or to the AB 1059 review panel (assigned to review the responses to Standard 13 related to teaching English Learners).

Review Panel Training and the Review Process

The Review Panels met several times between April and June, 2002. The initial meeting in April, 2002, included training on the SB 2042 Standards and several calibration activities to ensure the internal consistency of the program review. Review teams for the Professional Teacher Preparation programs generally reviewed one program submission; review teams for the Elementary Subject Matter Preparation programs generally reviewed two program submissions; review teams for the AB 1059 program submissions reviewed multiple program submissions.

SB 2042 and AB 1059 Review teams began their reading of their assigned program document(s) during the April 2002 meetings, and continued the reading process during the remainder of April. Reviewers read the program sponsors' responses to the Common Standards and to the applicable Program Standards. At the beginning of May 2002, feedback was provided to all of the program sponsors regarding the Review Team's findings. Review Teams determined either that a given standard and all of its elements were "Met," or that "Additional Information [was] Needed" in order to make a determination relative to that standard and/or one or more of its elements.

Program sponsors subsequently provided additional information responding to the Review Team's requests, and another Review Team meeting was held in Sacramento on June 4, 2002. Early Adopter program responses that had arrived by that date were reviewed by the Review Team members, and a determination was made as to whether the particular program being reviewed had met all of the applicable SB 2042 and/or AB 1059 standards. The Review Teams will be meeting again on July 8 to review the additional material submitted by the remaining Early Adopter programs.

The SB 2042 Program Submission Review Process was facilitated for the first time by an extensive technology component. As a result of a pilot program with Palo Alto Research Center Incorporated (PARC), the Commission used a secure web-based, group-sharable and group-editable review form to facilitate the work of the Review Teams. This web-based software, "Sparrow," allowed the posting of program documents from the Early Adopter program sponsors so that reviewers could have virtually instant access to documents wherever they were. This ability to receive and post documents at will, regardless of particular computer hardware or software, allowed readers to communicate with each other easily and at any time, and reduced the number of times that readers had to make the trip to Sacramento for meetings.

Program Accreditation/Approval Recommendations by the Review Team

The Review Teams used a technology-facilitated process of sharing their thoughts and their individual review forms with each other. A designated individual, the "Team Leader," took the responsibility to combine the various review forms and post a single unified review document to Sparrow. After the review document was posted to Sparrow, Commission staff reviewed the document for completeness and accuracy, and then forwarded the professional preparation program accreditation recommendation in a report to the Committee on Accreditation and the subject matter preparation program approval recommendation to the Commission. Recommendations are not given to the Committee on Accreditation or the Commission until the Review Teams have determined that the proposal meets all required standards.

The program recommended for approval at this meeting is the first elementary subject matter preparation program to be recommended under the SB 2042 standards.

Recommendation

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

University of La Verne

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of
July 10-11, 2002*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: PREP - 2

COMMITTEE: Preparation Standards Committee

TITLE: Request for Initial Institutional Accreditation for California State University, Channel Islands

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:** 6/18/02

Lawrence Birch, Ed. D.
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** 6/18/02

Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** 6/18/02

Dr. Sam W. Swofford
Executive Director

**Request for Initial Institutional Accreditation for California State University,
Channel Islands**

Professional Services Division

June 17, 2002

Executive Summary

This agenda report reviews the adopted procedures to be used for initial accreditation of institutions under the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*. The report contains a request for a waiver of the Commission's regional accreditation requirement and a request for initial institutional accreditation for California State University, Channel Islands according to the Commission's procedures.

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. The Commission's base budget also includes resources to support review of institutional proposals for initial accreditation. No augmentation of the budget is needed for continuation of the program review and approval activities.

Policy Question

Should the Commission waive the requirement for regional accreditation for a three year period and grant initial institutional accreditation to California State University, Channel Islands?

Recommendation

That the Commission review the request for initial accreditation and grant a three year waiver of the regional accreditation requirement and grant initial institutional accreditation to California State University, Channel Islands.

Request for Initial Institutional Accreditation for California State University, Channel Islands

Professional Services Division

June 17, 2002

Background

Prior to the *Accreditation Framework (1995)*, institutions not previously approved to offer programs of professional preparation would submit a program proposal responding to the Commission's preconditions and standards. If the institution was accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) or another regional accrediting body and if the response to the preconditions and standards was judged to be satisfactory, the Commission voted to give approval to the institution to begin offering one or more programs. Under the *Accreditation Framework*, a distinction is made between "initial accreditation of institutions" and "initial accreditation of programs," as described below.

Initial Accreditation of Institutions

Under the authority of the Education Code, the Commission is given the responsibility to determine the eligibility of institutions to offer preparation programs and to recommend issuance of credentials to candidates completing programs of preparation.

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

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

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

Accreditation Framework Section 4 A 1 - Initial Accreditation of Institutions. A postsecondary education institution that has not previously been declared eligible to offer credential preparation programs must submit an application to the Commission for initial professional accreditation. Institutional accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) or another regional accrediting body is required for initial professional accreditation by the Commission. The Commission may establish additional procedures and criteria for the initial professional accreditation of institutions to prepare and recommend candidates for state credentials in education.

Under the above provisions, the only specific criterion for initial accreditation of institutions is regional accreditation. However, the Commission is given authority by the *Framework* to establish additional procedures and criteria. The Commission did adopt procedures and added the review of responses to the institutional preconditions to the list of requirements for initial accreditation.

Adopted Procedures for Initial Accreditation of Institutions

In October 1998, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing adopted procedures for the Initial Accreditation of Institutions. The procedures apply to institutions who have not previously prepared educators for state certification in California:

1. The institution prepares a complete program proposal, responding to all preconditions, Common Standards and appropriate Program Standards. The proposal will be considered as the application for accreditation.
2. Initial Accreditation will be considered a two-stage process:
 - a. The proposal will be reviewed for compliance with the appropriate institutional preconditions (regional accreditation, institutional responsibility, non-discrimination procedures, completion of a needs assessment, involvement of practitioners in the design of the program, agreement to provide information to the Commission, etc.) and brought before the Commission for initial accreditation action. If the proposal meets the Commission's requirements, the institution will be recommended for initial accreditation.
 - b. If the Commission acts favorably on the proposal, it will be forwarded to the Committee on Accreditation for program accreditation action according to adopted procedures. (The institution's responses to the program standards for each program area the institution wishes to offer are reviewed by Commission staff or program review panels of expert advisors to determine the sufficiency of the responses. Once it is determined that the program proposal meets the Commission's standards, it is recommended to the Committee on Accreditation for initial program accreditation.)
3. Once granted initial accreditation, the institution will then come under the continuing accreditation procedures already adopted by the Committee on Accreditation and will participate in the regular cycle for on-site reviews.

Request for Initial Institutional Accreditation from California State University, Channel Islands

California State University, Channel Islands is the twenty-third and newest campus of the California State University system. For the last thirty years, leaders in the Ventura-Oxnard region have been seeking the establishment of a public university to meet the educational and cultural needs of the region's residents. For approximately twenty-five years, California State University, Northridge has maintained an off-campus site in the area. In 1997, Senate Bill 623 authorized the transfer of the site of the former Camarillo State Hospital and Developmental Center to the California State University system to develop a state university for Ventura County and Southern Santa Barbara County. The site was officially conveyed by the State of California to the CSU Trustees in 1998, and the new institution was designated California State University, Channel Islands (CSUCI). In the fall of 1999, the CSU, Northridge Off-Campus Center relocated to the new site with approximately 1,800 students.

California State University, Channel Islands will open to degree-seeking junior transfers in the fall of 2002, and to freshmen in the fall of 2003 and graduate its first students in 2004. The first CSUCI degree programs include biology, business, computer science, English, environmental science and resource management, fine arts, liberal studies, and mathematics. The institution also plans to offer a post baccalaureate multiple subjects teaching credential program. Degree programs offered by CSU, Northridge

will continue in 2002 and will gradually phase out over a period of not more than five years. The institution is committed to develop educator preparation programs. Initially, the institution will only offer the multiple subjects teaching credential and the elementary subject matter preparation program. Within two years a special education program will be opened, followed by an educational leadership program and a single subject program.

At the present time there are thirty faculty members in the various disciplines and five in education, specifically. Most of them will teach in the elementary subject matter preparation program or the teacher preparation program. As the institution quickly grows to its projected enrollment of 4,000 within four years, many additional faculty hires will be made. The faculty is currently organized across disciplines, without departments. Faculty members report to the Dean and Director of CSU Northridge at Channel Islands, and CSU, Channel Islands. The Dean reports directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Request for Waiver of Accreditation Requirement

Because the institution has not yet achieved WASC accreditation, California State University, Channel Islands requests a waiver of the regional accreditation requirement in order to gain initial institutional accreditation from the Commission. In the past, the Commission has granted this type of waiver a limited number of times, for institutions in the early stages of development. Under the provisions of Education Code Section 44225 (m) that grants the Commission waiver authority, waivers can be given to post-secondary institutions. One of the reasons given for granting waivers listed in Section 44225 is to "Provide other temporary exceptions when deemed to be appropriate by the Commission." In the past, the Commission has granted these waivers with the understanding that they are temporary, they enable educational institutions to meet the goals established by the state, they provide significant help in addressing identified critical needs of schools and school children, and there are accompanying mechanisms for assuring that Commission standards are not lowered and the quality of preparation is maintained under the waiver provisions.

California State University, Channel Islands agrees, should the waiver be granted, to meet all Commission requirements for programs. In addition, the institution agrees to have a visiting team review the teacher preparation program three years from the initiation of the program. A written report of the team's findings will be submitted to the Committee on Accreditation and to the Commission. An extension of the waiver beyond three years will be considered only if the team finds that all applicable standards are fully met. Within the same three year period, CSUCI will have achieved candidate status under WASC standards as a condition for any consideration of a waiver extension.

Steps to Western Association of Schools and Colleges Accreditation

Institutions seeking accreditation from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) must go through three major steps before accreditation is conferred; eligibility, candidacy and accreditation. It is the purpose of the WASC Commission to validate to the public the ongoing credibility of an institution of higher education. Completion of all three steps can take from three to six years.

Eligibility – Determining an institution's eligibility is the first step in the accreditation process. Institutions must be reviewed for eligibility based upon requirements established by the WASC Commission. The institution must assess itself in relation to the eligibility criteria. The institution must have:

- A charter and /or formal authority to award degrees from the appropriate governmental agency.
- A formally adopted statement of institutional purposes.
- A governing board that operates as an independent policy-making body.
- A chief executive officer whose full-time or major responsibility is to the institution.
- One or more educational programs leading to the baccalaureate degree or beyond.
- A coherent and substantial program of general education.
- Faculty sufficient to support the programs offered.
- Evidence of adequate learning resources to support the programs.
- Admissions policies and procedures consistent with the institution's stated objectives.
- Evidence of basic planning for the development of the institution.
- An adequate financial base of funding commitments.
- A published policy or procedure for refunding fees and charges to students.
- An accurate and current catalog.

The institution submits an eligibility report responding to each of the eligibility criteria and a summary data form. The institution is expected to already be offering courses and degrees at the time of eligibility determination. The WASC Commission staff convenes an eligibility committee which reviews the documents and meets with institutional representatives before determining eligibility. The committee files a report of its action and a review of the institution in relation to each of the criteria. Although not a formal status with the WASC Commission, eligibility signifies that an institution has satisfied 13 criteria regarding institutional capacity and is ready to begin the formal self-study process leading to initial Candidacy.

Candidacy – Candidacy is achieved after the institution has completed a self-study report and has been successful in an on-site visit. Candidacy is a formal status with the WASC Commission and is an indication that an institution is progressing toward accreditation. An institution with Candidate status has a maximum period of six years to become accredited. This candidacy period enables an institution to organize its operations; establish sound policies, procedures, and management information systems; improve quality; and demonstrate compliance with WASC standards. The granting of candidacy does not assure that accreditation will eventually be attained.

Accreditation – An institution may seek accreditation after an appropriate period of Candidacy. It must have graduated at least one class in one or more of its principal programs. The institution is required to undergo an extensive and comprehensive self-study followed by an on-site evaluation of institutional performance. Accreditation means that the institution meets the WASC standards and is likely so to continue. In addition it demonstrates that an institution operates at a high level of quality consistent with its stated purposes; that it has documented the availability of sufficient resources to support existing and

planned programs at a satisfactory level of quality; and that it has committed itself to institutional improvement, periodic self-evaluation, and continuing compliance with WASC standards, policies and procedures.

A letter was sent from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges to the Administrator of Accreditation providing a report on the accreditation status of CSUCI. On October 1, 2001, the Eligibility Committee of WASC granted CSUCI eligibility for a period of three years. On February 18, 2002 the University submitted its Proposal for Candidacy Review. That proposal was subsequently accepted and CSUCI is scheduled for a Preparatory Visit, February 5-7, 2003 and an Educational Effectiveness Review, October 22-24, 2003. This is an accelerated schedule for completing the accreditation process, but on the basis of information submitted, WASC has determined that the institution is likely to successfully complete the accreditation process.

Review of Institutional Proposal

The institutional accreditation proposal was reviewed by Dr. Lawrence Birch, the Commission's Administrator of Accreditation. California State University, Channel Islands has submitted a complete response to all preconditions, and the Commission's Common Standards. The responses to the Multiple Subject program standards and Elementary Subject Matter standards are being finalized. The responses to the preconditions are appropriate with the exception that the institution does not meet the WASC/regional accreditation requirement.

Subject to the waiver of the WASC accreditation requirement, California State University, Channel Islands is recommended for initial institutional accreditation. If the Commission acts to grant initial accreditation, the program proposals will be reviewed further and forwarded to the Committee on Accreditation for Program Accreditation consideration, or in the case of the Elementary Subject Matter Program, to the Commission.

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Meeting of
July 10-11, 2002*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: PREP - 3
COMMITTEE: Preparation Standards Committee
TITLE: A Report on Teacher Development Programs

 Action
 X Information

- Goal 1: Promote education 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
 - Assess and monitor the efficacy of the Accreditation System, Examination System and State and Federal Funded Programs
 - Implement, monitor and report on the outcomes of new programs initiatives
- Goal 6: Provide leadership in exploring multiple, high quality routes to prepare professional educators for California's school**
- Work with education entities to expand the pool of qualified professional educators
 - Pursue avenues with other organizations in expanding the pool of qualified educators

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** 6/14/2002
Teri Clark, Marilynn Fairgood, Mike McKibbin, Suzanne Tyson
Consultants, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** 6/14/2002
Beth Graybill
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** 6/14/2002
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** 6/14/2002
Dr. Sam W. Swofford
Executive Director

A Report on Teacher Development Programs

Professional Services Division

June 14, 2002

Executive Summary

The Commission has administered teacher development programs for a number of years. The following report provides an update on the status of those programs.

Policy Issue to be Considered

How well are the teacher development programs progressing toward achieving the goals of teacher recruitment and teacher retention?

Fiscal Impact Statement

Compiling and drafting this report has been funded from the base budget of the Professional Services Division.

A Report on Teacher Development Programs

Professional Services Division

June 14, 2002

Introduction

California has, within the past few years, adopted academic content standards for all K-12 students. We have begun a rigorous student assessment system, established an academic performance index to assess each school's performance, and implemented a high stakes high school exit exam. We have invested heavily in assuring the success of our students as we move forward with these reforms. There is solid, sustained evidence proving a direct link between the qualifications of teachers and the achievement of students. This research, is summarized in two reports: *Solving The Dilemmas of Teacher Supply, Demand and Standards*, issued by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future; and *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement*, by the Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy. Now, as never before, we must assure that all students have well-prepared teachers.

The need for teachers has increased due to student population growth, implementation of Class Size Reduction, and teacher retirement and continues to increase. According to a study conducted by SRI International, California needs between 25,000 and 30,000 fully trained teachers annually, to keep up with growth in student population and current levels of teacher attrition.

The supply of teachers is increasing. The Commission is now issuing over 18,000 new teaching credentials each year. The high quality support and assistance provided to new teachers through teacher development programs is essential to helping these new teachers stay active members of the teaching workforce.

Over the past several years, California has been building a teacher quality pipeline for nontraditional candidates who are pursuing a teaching credential. As the overseers of that pipeline the Commission ensures that, though there are various options, the end result is the same: a quality teacher. The quality is maintained and kept consistent through the use of the same standards for each program. The elements of this pipeline include the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, the Pre-Internship program, District and University Internship Programs, all administered by the Commission and the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA) jointly administered by the California Department of Education and the Commission.

This report provides an update of the status of each of these teacher development programs. The description of each program is organized around five topics: the purpose of each program, eligibility requirements, data collected on participant retention, accountability, processes in place and the benefits of participation for candidates. Table 1 provides an overview of the four teacher development programs including goals, numerical data for 2001-02 and the enabling statutes. Table 2 provides data from 1995 to the present in the number of participants and funding levels in the four teacher development programs.

Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

Purpose

The primary purpose of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program (PTTP) is to create local career ladders that enable school paraprofessionals to become certificated classroom teachers. In return for financial assistance for tuition, fees, books and other costs received under the program each participant must make a commitment that he or she will provide one school year of classroom instruction in the district or county office education through which they received the support for each year of support provided.

In addition to improving the instructional services that paraprofessionals provide, the program was created to respond to teacher shortages, diversify the teaching profession, and establish innovative models for teacher education. Education Code Section 44392 defines school paraprofessionals who are eligible to participate in the program as the following job classifications:

educational aide, special education aide, special education assistant, teacher associate, teacher assistant, teacher aide, pupil service aide, library aide, child development aide, child development assistant, and physical education aide.

Eligibility

School districts or county offices of education submit proposals to the Commission based on participation criteria prescribed by law. Once approved, the local education agency (LEA) selects paraprofessionals to participate in the program based on a locally-designed selection process. To be eligible for the program, paraprofessionals must be currently employed in a school district or county office of education that has been awarded a PTTP grant. While continuing to serve as paraprofessionals in their districts, participants must complete a minimum number of units per year, either baccalaureate or professional preparation coursework, and maintain the grade point average required by the partner college/university. There is no minimum number of units required prior to participation in the program. It is the responsibility of each local administrative team to determine that participants fit, academically, into cohorts of no less than 10, and no more than 30, participants.

Retention Data

One goal of the program is to “home-grow” teachers from the ranks of paraprofessionals who are currently serving in many urban school districts. Prior to acceptance in the program, each paraprofessional must sign a commitment statement agreeing to provide one year of instructional service for each year of support received through the program. This service must be completed after the individual receives a preliminary credential and thus insures the employer will have the services of a fully-qualified teacher for a number of years.

From January 1995 through June 1999 the program enjoyed a 99% retention rate in teaching. Of the 319 fully-credentialed graduates trained through the program, 315 are still employed in California public schools. Two of the four who are no longer teaching in California are serving as teachers in another state. The program's high retention rate is due, in part, to participants' experience and familiarity with the classroom settings at their school site. In most instances participants have served in a classroom environment for more than eight years. Therefore, program graduates have an easier transition into serving as the teacher of record than those individuals with little or no classroom experience.

Accountability Processes

The PTTP requires a long-term commitment from each participant. This multi-year program can take as many as seven years to complete. That commitment includes completion of required coursework, maintaining the required grade point average, completing the required number of units each quarter/semester and providing one year of instructional service for each year of support received through the program. Successful completion of degree and program requirements is monitored each quarter/semester by program administrators and IHE advisors. If a candidate earns a failing grade in any required course he/she must repeat the course at his/her expense. Should an individual enroll in a course that is not included in their academic plan the individual is responsible for the cost of that course. Partner college/university bookstores include lists of participants and books required for each course. This ensures only those books identified for the acceptable courses may be purchased through the program. Should a participant fail to maintain the required grade point average he/she is counseled out of the program and required to repay the grant.

Programs receive \$3000 for each participant. Accountability is accomplished through monitoring of budgets and expenditure reports. Programs must also submit an Annual Report that includes information as required in Education Code Section 44393. Each project has been given program guidelines that govern fiscal oversight and accountability.

Program Benefits to Candidates

In addition to the financial benefits which include payment of tuition, fees and books, the PTTP provides benefits such as personal nurturing by program administrators, tutorial support, peer mentoring, and for those who do not speak English as their first language, first language support. PTTP graduates are also given priority consideration for teaching employment opportunities in their district.

The typical certification path for paraprofessionals is completion of baccalaureate degree requirements, which includes subject matter coursework, followed by entry into a university or district internship program. This pathway not only enables candidates to continue working while they make progress toward their credential, but also provides candidates with strong support and assistance throughout their preparation program.

Finally, candidates enjoy financial support in attaining their goals. Sixty-seven percent of program participants identified their household annual income range as being under \$20,000. Additionally, 34% indicated they are heads of households and 34% pay for their own medical coverage. Taking these factors into consideration participants cannot afford to support their families and complete the coursework required to earn a preliminary credential. The financial support provided through the program allows participants to complete certification requirements without the worry of how they can continue their education while taking care of their families.

The PTTP is the first step in the Learning to Teach Continuum and provides a support network that shepherds paraprofessionals through a baccalaureate degree and teacher preparation program. Most of the local education agencies participating in the PTTP also offer all four teacher development programs which allows for a seamless transition from Paraprofessional to Pre-Intern, Intern and beginning teacher.

Pre-Intern Program

Purpose

In 1997 the California Legislature passed and the Governor signed Assembly Bill 351 (Scott, Chapter 934, Statutes of 1997). This bill established the Pre-intern Program. AB 351 defines a Pre-intern Program as one that provides pre-interns with "early, focused, and intensive preparation in the subject matter that they are assigned to teach and development in classroom management, pupil discipline, and basic instruction methodologies." The program is designed to facilitate as quickly as possible a candidate's entry into an internship or other teacher preparation program. The Pre-intern Program assists candidates with learning classroom practices and with attaining subject matter knowledge. Since most pre-interns demonstrate subject matter competency by exam, most programs provide some test preparation assistance to help full-time teachers who have not taken the required amount of course work or passed the required subject matter examinations in the courses they are teaching. The program serves individuals who would otherwise be on an emergency permit, and transition to an internship credential program or a traditional teacher preparation program is an expectation. Assistance with this transition is provided early in the Pre-intern Program. Pre-intern participants serve in a classroom on a Pre-intern Teaching Certificate.

Eligibility

Pre-intern programs are available for individuals who intend to complete multiple-subject, single subject, or special education credentials. To be eligible for the program, a teacher must be hired by a district that participates in the Pre-intern Program and verify that she or he has at least a baccalaureate degree, attained a passing score on CBEST, and completed college coursework in the subject being taught. Forty semester units are required in specified general education subjects for multiple subject authorization. Eighteen semester units are required in specified single-subject areas.

Retention Data

A primary focus of the Pre-intern Program is to retain individuals who might otherwise leave the profession by providing them with an organized system of support and instruction. In the first four years of the program, almost 90% of all pre-interns were retained for a second year in the district in which they were teaching. In comparison, approximately 65% of all teachers on Emergency Permits were retained for a second year in the district in which they were teaching. In program surveys and interviews of pre-interns conducted during the last four years, the majority reported that support and assistance from the Pre-intern Program are primary factors in their decisions to remain in teaching.

Accountability Processes

Individual candidate accountability is accomplished through monitoring test taking frequency and individual passing scores on the required subject matter examinations. In order to renew the Pre-intern Certificate for a second year, pre-interns must provide evidence that they have taken the appropriate examinations. A compilation of examination passing rates show that 60% of pre-interns pass the examination within two years. This rate is similar to the national passing rate on the same examinations, despite the fact that the pre-intern test-taking population is comprised of a larger percentage of groups that tend to pass at lower rates than the general population. One group less likely to pass examinations is comprised of individuals who have previously failed the subject matter examination. Seventy percent of pre-interns are in this group and have reported that they had previously taken and failed a subject matter examination before entering the Pre-intern Program. Pre-interns pass the exams at twice the rate of this comparison group.

Program accountability is accomplished through monitoring the budgets, retention rates and passing rates of each program. Program guidelines that describe desirable practices have been drafted and serve as examples for programs to follow. Directors' surveys and surveys of pre-interns serve as a check on program quality. Every two years programs submit Program Improvement Plans that describe changes made in the program in response to state data that has been provided to them from the survey process. Starting in 2000-2001 Directors were required to provide signed consent forms for each pre-intern served. The consent forms allow a process for which program eligibility for individuals can be verified and establishes a database across all teacher development programs administered or jointly administered by the Commission. This

year the consent form process was put on-line to provide better accountability for funding purposes.

Program Benefits to Candidates

Many pre-interns have said that they would have left teaching without the support they received from the Pre-intern Program. They have cited increased feelings of competence gained as a result of increasing their knowledge of the subject they are teaching, feedback that they receive about their teaching. Subject matter competence is attained through study sessions that provide materials and training aligned with content test specifications related to the required subject matter examination. Feedback on a pre-intern's teaching practice is accomplished through classroom observations, visitations to demonstration classrooms, and conferences with trained coaches/support providers. Before entering a classroom and throughout the school year, pre-interns receive initial teacher training that is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the appropriate Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The benefit derived from their involvement with the standards and expectations is that pre-interns are well prepared to continue learning and refining their knowledge base in the next steps of their preparation in the Intern and BTSA Programs that are also aligned with the CSTP and TPEs.

Assistance in making a transition into an Intern program or a teacher preparation program is another main benefit of the Pre-intern Program. Each program is encouraged to establish strong collaboration with credential preparation programs so that the pre-intern will be welcomed into the next phase of teacher preparation after passing subject matter exams.

Internship Program

Purpose

There are two types of internship programs: university intern and district intern. In 1967, the Teacher Education Internship Act of 1967 was enacted. In 1983, lawmakers enacted the Hughes-Hart Education Reform Act (Senate Bill 813) which authorized districts to develop and implement district internships. Then, in 1993, the Alternative Teacher Certification Act of 1993 (AB 1161, Quackenbush), established funding criteria for the two kinds of internships established previously.

The Alternative Teacher Certification Act of 1993 established the Alternative Certification Grant Program. School districts or colleges and universities could apply for funds to develop new or enhance existing internship programs. Three purposes and goals of the alternative certification program were set forth in the enabling statutes and policies.

The first purpose of internship programs is to expand the pool of qualified teachers by attracting persons into teaching who might not otherwise enter the classroom, and attract those who bring valuable attributes and experiences into teaching. These groups include career changers, those underrepresented in the teaching workforce, those committed to teaching in hard-to-staff schools, teachers in content and credential shortage fields, and those who could not enter a traditional program because of economic, family circumstances.

The second purpose of teaching internships is to enable K-12 schools to respond immediately to pressing needs while providing professional preparation for interns that is as extensive and systematic as traditional programs, links education theory with classroom practice throughout each intern's preparation, and takes advantage of the experiences that interns bring with them.

The third purpose of internships is to provide effective supervision and intensive support so each new intern's learning can be targeted to her/his needs, and so beginning teachers who are interns can extend, apply and refine what they learn about teaching in the course of their initial preparation. The goal is to invest in these teachers so that they will have the skills to succeed and the commitment to stay in hard-to-staff classrooms.

Eligibility

A university or district internship is a fully paid position in a public school where the intern serves as teacher of record while simultaneously participating in a teacher preparation program. These programs may be one or two years long, and must meet the same or higher procedural and performance standards as other teacher preparation programs. Internships may be completed in any credential area. Funding is available for internships for Multiple Subject, Single Subject, and Education Specialist credentials.

Entry requirements for internships are the same as those for traditional teacher preparation programs. Interns must verify that they have at least a baccalaureate degree, a passing score on

CBEST, subject matter competency, knowledge of the U.S. Constitution either by coursework or exam, and character identification. Candidates must have an offer of employment and be admitted to an internship credential program.

Retention Data

Most interns teach in California's hardest-to-staff schools. The interns tend to stay in these classrooms at far greater rates than persons prepared by other methods. Retention data collected through the Internship program over the last five years indicates that among program graduates, 97% are still teaching after the first year; 93% after their second year of teaching, 90% after three years, 85% after four years, and 77% after five years. All that complete their one or two year programs are recommended for a preliminary credential and many in two year programs have completed the statutory requirements for a professional clear credential.

Accountability Processes

Because interns are responsible for the achievement of the students in their classroom, the success and accountability of the intern can be tied to the success of students in the classroom. Assessment is done over the length of the internship so that remediation and improvement can be applied and monitored. Most of the intern programs are designed so that mid-course corrections can be made, the curriculum can be adjusted and the appropriate remedies can be made.

Most intern programs use extensive procedures that include case studies, student work and other measures as part of a portfolio assessment process. Portfolios entries are gathered over the full period of the internship (usually two years). Usually each entry requires self-reflection and is connected to student learning in one of several ways. In most cases it is a living document which has formative as well as summative features. Most project directors believe they have a comprehensive assessment picture upon which valid judgements about an intern's competence could be made.

Program accountability is accomplished through annual reports that are filed by each program. The annual reports include demographic data, recruitment source data, and retention rates. Programs submit budgets that provide information on expenditures, and the amount spent on various aspects of the program, such as instruction, support, recruitment and selection, candidate assessment and program administration. The last portion of the annual report is the narrative analysis of the progress of the program. The programs provide a report on their successes, lessons learned and challenges in each of the required program components listed in the enabling statutes (curriculum, instruction, support and assessment). Every two years programs complete a program improvement plan describing the changes that they plan to make. Starting in 2001-2002 directors were required to provide signed consent forms for each intern served. This year the consent form process was put on-line to provide better accountability for funding purposes.

In addition to the accountability process as a funded program all intern programs participate in the CCTC accreditation process in which peer review teams ascertain whether all procedural and performance standards are met.

Program Benefits to Candidates

Current interns and graduates of internship programs report that internships provide them with an avenue into teaching that is particularly well suited to their needs. The curriculum is adjusted to help them deal with the immediate concerns that they encounter. The support network provides ongoing feedback that encourages them to try new strategies and adjust and correct their instruction as necessary. Interns identify the peer support that they receive as a particular strength of the program.

Internship programs provide an avenue into teaching for individuals who may not be well suited for traditional student-teaching based teacher preparation. For those persons who are more mature and have spent their adult lives in careers that emphasize “learning by doing” the internship model is a good fit with their preferred learning style. Internships provide an economic base for those who can not afford the costs of a traditional teacher preparation program.

Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program

Purpose

The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program was established by the Legislature and Governor Wilson as a consequence of a pilot study by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of Education, which was called the California New Teacher Project (CNTP). In the final report of the CNTP, the CCTC and the CDE reported several significant findings. Fewer than half of California's school districts at the time of this study provided the support and training that beginning teachers needed to become better teachers, remain in the teaching profession, and help their students become better learners. In addition, the assessments of prospective and novice teachers did not effectively assure the public that teaching credentials were granted only to competent individuals. The CNTP demonstrated that intensive support, continued preparation and informative assessments of teachers in their first professional years resulted in significantly better instruction for students.

The pilot study report entitled, *Success for Beginning Teachers: The California New Teacher Project*, included several significant policy recommendations. Included in those recommendations was the following:

To increase beginning teacher success and effectiveness, state education policies governing teacher preparation, induction, credentialing and professional development need to be redesigned to provide for a better transition from *student of teaching to the role of teacher*. California needs to establish an integrated system of new teacher support and assessment, beginning with university preparation and continuing through induction into teaching. More effective induction of new teachers would include a gradual introduction to the norms and responsibilities of teaching, advice and assistance from experienced colleagues, and useful information about each teacher's performance compared to established expectations for what beginning teachers should know and be able to do. Sufficient state and local resources, including new funds as they become available, must be committed to the success of beginning teachers (*Success for Beginning Teachers*, pages 2-3).

In response to these recommendations, the Governor and the Legislature established the BTSA Program in the State Budget for 1992-93. The BTSA Program provides an effective transition into the teaching profession. This transition is facilitated by the assignment of a support provider to each beginning teacher. The support provider is charged with providing individualized support and assistance to the beginning teacher as guided by the results of formative assessment of each beginning teacher's practice as measured by the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.

With the passage of SB 2042 (Bergeson, Mazzone, 1998), all beginning teachers are now required to complete an approved induction program to obtain a Professional Multiple or Single

Subject Teaching Credential. With the adoption of the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs*, induction programs are now an essential part of the Learning to Teach Continuum and are firmly linked to California's credential structure.

Eligibility

BTSA Programs are designed to support teachers with a preliminary or professional clear credential during their first two years of employment in a teaching assignment. By working with teachers that have completed credential requirements, BTSA builds on the knowledge, skills and abilities teachers gain in their teacher preparation programs. BTSA provides support and assessment to both general education and education specialist teachers.

Retention Data

An additional focus of the BTSA Program is to retain individuals who might otherwise leave the teaching profession by providing an organized system of support and assessment. BTSA Programs maintain retention data on current and past participants. In an independent evaluation of BTSA, West Ed reported that 93% of the participating teachers are retained through two years of teaching while in BTSA.

Accountability Processes

An Interagency Task Force composed of consultants and administrators from the CCTC and the CDE guides the BTSA Leadership Team. In addition, a statewide leadership team composed of these agency staff plus seventeen consultants work with Clusters (regional groups) of BTSA Programs. Within each cluster, the BTSA Cluster Consultants (CCs) work with BTSA Directors in developing Implementation Plans, yearly budgets, Expansion Plans, and Program Improvement Plans. Professional Development Consultants (PDCs) implement and monitor the training required to support use of the California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST). In addition, the PDCs support BTSA Programs in providing Site Administrator Training and the *Towards Equity -- A Guide to Teaching and Learning in a Multicultural Society* training. Finally, Induction Consultants (ICs) work with both BTSA programs and Institutions of Higher Education to facilitate the implementation of SB 2042.

Program accountability is maintained through formal and informal reviews that help ensure that programs are meeting the needs of beginning teachers. Each year all BTSA programs submit a Program Improvement Plan that addresses a minimum of six of the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs* (adopted by the Commission in 1997). The program analyzes local evaluation data, statewide evaluation data, and the findings from their program review. Programs participate in informal program reviews with one or more BTSA programs on an annual basis. Every four years, all BTSA Programs complete a formal program review. In a formal program review, the BTSA program completes a self-study and provides evidence for each standard. A four member team, composed of BTSA leaders from across the state, with a facilitator from the BTSA Leadership team, spends three or four days reviewing the evidence and triangulating the data to reach a decision on each of the

standards that govern BTSA Programs. After the formal program review, the Cluster Leadership Team, composed of a CC, PDC, IC and a consultant from the Interagency Task Force, provide follow-up technical assistance to the BTSA Program to support the program in meeting all BTSA Program standards that were not found to be Fully Met in the review. This technical assistance continues for a minimum of one year or until all BTSA Program Standards are fully met by the program.

Program accountability is also maintained through the data collected from participant enrollment forms and a statewide survey that provides data about program effectiveness. This on-line survey provides desegregated data back to BTSA Programs in a timely manner.

Program Benefits to Candidates

A beginning teacher participating in the BTSA Program has a dedicated colleague with whom to share concerns, successes, issues and questions in a professional relationship for two years. This support provider is trained in formative assessment, the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, the K-12 Academic Content Standards, and the needs of beginning teachers. Statewide evaluation and local program data confirm that beginning teachers who meet regularly with their support providers believe that those interactions helped the transition into teaching and made them more effective teachers. Another benefit of the BTSA Program is the support and professional development provided to enable beginning teachers to be effective in teaching pupils who are culturally, linguistically, and academically diverse. Through the implementation of the Individual Induction Plan, each beginning teacher participates in professional development based on his or her developmental needs as assessed through the formative assessment system. The overarching benefit of the BTSA Program is to improve the educational performance of California's students through improved training, information, assessment and support for beginning teachers that increases retention rates.

Conclusion

Each of the programs that are described in this report was designed to meet a specific need. Together they form a continuum of teacher development opportunities for teachers. As a group these programs represent the majority of California's effort to increase the number of qualified teachers in our schools. These programs share the following goals: attract teachers from non-traditional sources and those under-represented in the teaching workforce; improve the retention rate of qualified teachers; and create working conditions that provide a support network for teachers in their developmental years.

Each of the teacher development programs has received an appropriation to accomplish their goals. Together these programs provide dollars to Local Education Agencies to offer teacher development services. These programs provided services to more than 42,000 teachers and prospective teachers in 2001-2002.

We have learned from these programs that there are certain elements that are critically important in teacher development. A support system geared to the participant's developmental needs is absolutely necessary. Programs need to be individualized to capitalize on the experiences and qualities that teachers bring to teaching. For example, paraprofessionals bring knowledge of the community and extensive experiences working with students. Pre-interns and Interns bring experiences from other careers that can be applied to the classrooms where they are teachers of record. The BTSA experience provides the opportunity for participants to refine what they have learned in their initial preparation and become reflective practitioners. Each program has built in both individual teacher and program accountability measures.

The Transition to Teaching Pilot Project that was conducted with Oakland and San Diego School Districts showed the importance of providing for a full range of options for teacher development in order to meet the goal of a qualified teacher in every classroom. Three things have become evident from the pilot project. First, there must be a wide range of viable options available if the district is to reduce the use of emergency permits. Second, school personnel at every level, school board, district administration, and site administration, must agree that teacher qualifications do make a difference in the quality of student instruction, and must commit to policies that will result in placement of certified teachers in every class. Finally, to accomplish this there will need to be concerted efforts by districts involved in teacher development to assure that there is a structure to provide identification, advice, support and focused preparation for novice teachers at the appropriate level of development.

The experiences of the past few years have led to the identification of several challenges that we face. No state has ever attempted to implement a teacher development program the size of the one in California. Building a structure to implement these programs has been a tremendous challenge. Nearly ninety percent of the state's school districts are involved in at least one of the teacher development programs. Nearly two-thirds of the school districts are involved in at least three programs. For these districts it has been difficult to put into place the infrastructure to provide the necessary tracking, counseling, support and instructional services. Finding sufficient experienced teachers for those in the teacher development programs and to serve as master teachers for student teaching based programs, is a daunting challenge for local districts.

Teacher development programs provide a continuum of opportunities for teachers to learn and grow. Together they form an integrated, sequenced system that is aligned with the K-12 content standards and the standards developed through the SB 2042 process.

TABLE 1
OVERVIEW OF FUNDED PROJECTS 2001-2002

	Paraprofessional	Pre-Intern	Intern	BTSA
Authorizing Legislation	SB 1636 (Roberti) Statutes of 1990	AB 351 (Scott) Statutes of 1998	AB 1161 (Quackenbush) Statutes of 1993	AB 1266 (Mazzoni) Statutes of 1998
Authorizing Statute	44390-44393	44305-44308	44380-44386	44279.1-44279.7
Number of Years in Operation	7	4	8	9
Number of Projects	42	68	82	145
Number of Participants	2,268	9,871	7,146	22,253
Number of District Partners	90	611	637	887
Number of University Partners	25	33	37	approximately 60
Amount of Funding Per Participant 2001-2002	\$3,000	\$2000	\$2,500	\$ 3,375
Program Goals/Target Participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create local career ladders to enable school paraprofessionals to become certificated classroom teachers. • Respond to teacher shortages and improve instructional services to paraprofessionals. • Diversify the teaching profession. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet shortage needs of districts. B. Attract non-traditional students. C. Provide subject matter preparation. D. Provide a transition to a teacher preparation program. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet shortage needs of districts. 2. Attract non-traditional students, including career changers. 3. Provide a teacher preparation option that blends theory with practice and offers cohort and professional support. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a support network for each first and second year credentialed teacher. 2. Provide a two-year formative assessment process for all new teachers. 3. To increase the rate of retention of new teachers. 4. Developing stronger roles for IHE's in new teacher induction 5. Building a knowledge base on new teacher induction.

TABLE 2
PARTICIPANTS AND FUNDING FOR FUNDED PROJECTS 1995-2002

	Paraprofessional		Pre-Intern		Intern		BTSA	
	# Partici- pants	Total Funding	# Partici- pants	*Total Funding	# Partici- pants	*Total Funding	# Participants	Total Funding
1995-96	566	\$1.478 million	N/A		1,471	\$2 million	1,800	\$5.5 million
1996-97	569	\$1.478 million	N/A		1,888	\$2 million	2,500	\$7.5 million
1997-98	573	\$1.478 million	N/A		3,706	\$4.5 million	5,200	\$17.5 million
1998-99	580	\$1.478 million	957	\$2 million	4,340	\$6.5 million	12, 410	\$66.0 million
1999-2000	522	\$11.478 million	5,800	\$11.8 million	4,827	\$11 million	23,500	\$72.0 million
2000-01	2,268	\$11.478 million	7,694	\$11.8 million	5,679	\$21.5* million	24,500	\$87.4 million
2001-02	2,268	\$11.478 million	9,871	\$11.8 million	7,146	\$31.8* million	22,253	\$84.6 million

* A recent change in state law now allows the Commission to distribute funding for intern and pre-intern programs as needed to maximize service to individuals who qualify for one or the other program. The Commission now has flexibility in how it may distribute the total \$43.6 million funded to both programs, to allow that the proportion of these funds distributed to each program is appropriate to ensure maximum participation in each program for all eligible candidates.

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of
July 10-11, 2002*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: PREP - 4

COMMITTEE: Preparation Standards Committee

TITLE: Proposal to Explore Changes in Eligibility Requirements for the California Pre-intern Program

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:** 6/19//02
Suzanne Tyson, Ph.D.
Consultant, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** 6/19//02
Beth Graybill
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** 6/19/02
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** 6/19/02
Dr. Sam W. Swofford
Executive Director

**Proposal to Explore Changes in Eligibility Requirements for the California
Pre-intern Program**

Professional Services Division

June 20, 2002

Executive Summary

In recent months questions have emerged regarding the eligibility requirements for entrance into the Pre-intern Program. Eligibility requirements are important because they determine if various categories of teachers have access to the services of the Pre-intern Program.

This agenda item requests that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to establish a design team to study what categories of currently unserved teachers might benefit from services of the Pre-intern Program, to explore changes in policy that might be needed in order to broaden the teacher populations that are eligible for the program, and to identify state materials and training that could be developed to maintain a rigorous program for serving potential new categories of teachers.

Policy Issues to be Considered

Should the Commission explore issues related and options to broadening the participant pool of the Pre-intern Program?

Fiscal Impact Summary

Funds for a design team's work would be obtained from the existing 2002-2003 budget of the Professional Services Division. Funds needed to serve additional Pre-interns and funds needed for developmental work would be obtained through a Budget Change Proposal.

Recommendation

That the Commission authorize the Executive Director to appoint a design team to explore issues and options related to broadening the participant groups served by the Pre-intern Program.

Proposal to Explore Changes in Eligibility Requirements for the California Pre-intern Program

Professional Services Division

June 20, 2002

Background

When districts are unable to recruit credentialed teachers or interns to fill vacant teaching positions, they often rely on individuals who serve on Emergency Permits to meet their instructional needs. The Commission issued 32,573 Emergency Permits and new full credentials for 23,926 teachers in 2000-2001. In response to the need for additional qualified teachers in California schools the Commission has administered the Pre-intern Program since 1998. This program has been successful in encouraging individuals who would otherwise serve on an Emergency Permit to obtain certification and in improving the performance of prospective teachers as they complete credential requirements. In 2001-2002, 10,534 pre-intern certificates were issued to teachers who received targeted support, training, and advisement designed to assist them in ultimately obtaining a credential. Every Pre-intern Certificate issued replaces an Emergency Permit. This is significant because according to a Commission report, *Teachers Meeting Standards for Professional Certification in California: Second Annual Report*, CTC, 2001 a current trend in California is to teach as an emergency permit teacher before entering a professional teacher preparation program or during the completion of a teacher preparation program. The training and support provided for Pre-interns who take an alternative route to certification, is one way to increase the number of fully credentialed teachers and provide a larger number of students with a higher quality education.

Assembly Bill 351 (Scott, Chapter 934, Statutes of 1997) established the Pre-intern Program and authorized the Commission to administer the program and to establish program policy. AB 351 (Scott) defines a Pre-intern Program as one that provides pre-interns with "early, focused, and intensive preparation in the subject matter that they are assigned to teach and development in classroom management, pupil discipline, and basic instruction methodologies." Pursuant to the provisions of AB 351 the program currently focuses primarily on assisting pre-interns in meeting California's subject matter requirements while also providing them with basic training in classroom management, lesson planning and instructional strategies. To achieve these purposes, local education agencies that receive grants for Pre-Internship Programs must work with the Pre-intern to develop an individualized learning plan that leads to credential completion. Additionally, all pre-interns must be supervised and assisted by experienced teachers, preferably in the schools where they teach. Once they have demonstrated subject matter competency, most participants enter an intern program to complete their credential requirements.

In the past five years, the program has been modified several times to address various changes in state policy such as the Class Size Reduction Initiative which allowed districts the option of using pre-interns to help meet their increased needs for teachers. In 1999, AB 466 (Scott) was enacted to allow additional pre-internships for Special Education teachers; and in 2000, Senate Bill 1666 further amended the grant funding program to allow the Commission to combine the funds allocated for district and university intern programs with the funds allocated for the Pre-intern Program. The combined allocation for Intern and Pre-intern programs was \$43.6 million for 2000-2001. Pre-internship

programs initially provided support and subject matter preparation for multiple subject teachers and more recently expanded to include subject matter preparation for single subject and special education teachers.

Current Policy

In administering the statewide Pre-intern Program, the Commission has established the following policies.

1. To determine eligibility, the subject matter requirements for the Pre-Intern Certificate are the same as for the Long Term Emergency Permit. Both require the completion of a bachelor's degree with a minimum number of units (forty for multiple or eighteen for a single subject credential with a minimum grade of "C") in the subject of the teaching assignment. Both also require the passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST). However, the emergency permit requires that the holder take six units toward the completion of a teaching credential, while the Pre-intern Certificate requires that the holder take the appropriate subject matter examination toward completion of a credential.
2. Teachers who have completed the subject matter requirement for entry into a credential preparation program and teachers who have completed supervised student teaching are not currently eligible to participate in the Pre-intern Program.
3. Each participant uses an individualized learning plan that is developed based on each pre-intern's needs. Plans are linked to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the Commission's subject matter requirements. All plans provide a pathway to a credential.

Possible Policy Explorations

In analyzing reports from the field, policies 1 and 3 appear to be effective in recruiting, retaining, and assisting pre-interns to move forward in obtaining their credentials. Policy 2, however, may eliminate some individuals who could benefit from the support and training that the Pre-intern Program offers while they are waiting to enter an intern program. A further exploration is needed to determine how to best meet the needs of prospective teachers who are working toward a second credential or who are completing credential requirements out of sequence. Pre-intern and Intern Programs are designed so prospective teachers can learn about teaching in phases, but some candidates complete their credential requirements out of sequence with the Commission's phased design. Therefore, there are groups of credential candidates who do not neatly fit into either program. The following four categories are examples of groups of teachers who may not be adequately served in the current configuration of the Pre-intern Program. Collecting and organizing information about how to serve these teachers would clarify how to best serve them.

The first category is comprised of fully credentialed teachers with a single subject or multiple subject authorization who are teaching special education. These teachers are excluded from the Pre-intern Program under current policy because they hold a valid credential; however, they are teaching in a new area outside their authorization. A question to explore is whether the Pre-intern Program could assist these teachers in acquiring their Education Specialist Credentials. Would the pre-intern program be the proper placement to assist a fully credentialed teacher with strategies that include managing a Special Education classroom, understanding the laws regulating the Special Education Program, modifying the regular education program to meet the needs of the Special Education student, and developing

individual learning plans? If local education agencies had the opportunity to serve this group of teachers, would their efforts build capacity and resources for working with Special Education teachers in general? Building capacity at the local level, in turn, might support SB 2029 (Alarcon) should it pass. This bill would allow districts that have developed capacity to prepare special education teachers to sponsor special education intern programs.

The second category of teachers includes individuals who have completed student teaching but still need to complete subject matter requirements for their credential. Could these teachers benefit from an individualized plan that addresses their needs? These teachers are completing credential requirements out of sequence, but upon demonstration of subject matter competence, they could increase the state's pool of fully credentialed teachers. Should policy 2 be modified to allow these teachers to participate in the targeted subject matter preparation available through the Pre-intern Program?

How could the Pre-intern Program serve teachers who have completed subject matter but need one or more of the following: Constitution, RICA, CPR, or pre-requisites for entrance into an Intern Program? Teachers in this third category are also excluded from Pre-intern services by policy 2. More information is needed to understand if these teachers would be able to develop a learning plan that helps them complete the remaining requirements for entrance into an Intern Program.

District sponsors have also expressed concern for a fourth category of teachers who complete all requirements and enter a traditional teacher preparation program instead of an Intern Program. Can we extend our thinking about whether this group of teachers needs intensive support and advisement at the school site beyond what is provided by the IHE?

Recommendation

Reports from the field and other data collected on teachers attempting to complete credential work show that some are not adequately served by any program. Those teachers who are completing credential requirements out of sequence or those who have changed teaching assignments after receiving a credential may be left in difficult situations without support. In theory, the Pre-intern and Intern Programs should provide for all developmental needs of prospective teachers. An exploration of how various categories of teachers are served may help to ensure that pre-intern programs provide the necessary support and assistance to help these teachers attain full certification.

Given the examples provided in the four categories above, staff recommends that the Commission, authorize the Executive Director to select a design team to study (a) categories of currently unserved teachers who might benefit from the Pre-intern Program (b) how the eligibility requirements of the Pre-intern Program might be broadened to include a larger number of participants and (c) what additional state-developed materials and trainings need to be developed in order for programs to provide the rigor required by potential participants' individual learning plans.

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of
July 10-11, 2002*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PERF – 1**

COMMITTEE: **Performance Standards**

TITLE: **Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT): Proposed
Contract Amendment**

 X **Action**

 Information

Strategic Plan Goal:

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

- Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** _____
Mark McLean
Assistant Consultant, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Amy Jackson
Administrator, Professional Services Division

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

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

**Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT);
Proposed Contract Amendment**

Professional Services Division

June 4, 2002

Executive Summary

This item recommends that the Commission amend the SSAT contract with National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES), increasing the total contractual amount by \$1,434,949 to fund administrations of the SSAT through June of 2004. This request is made because of larger than anticipated numbers of examinees during the first two years of the SSAT administration contract. Even though this raises the maximum threshold of the contract, NES will only be paid based on the actual number of examinees.

Fiscal Impact Summary

This amendment will allow the Commission to spend more from the Test Development and Administration Account (TDAA) on the SSAT contract, as needed due to a larger volume of examinees. Increased expenses, however, will be compensated for by increased revenue from examinee fees.

Policy Issue to be Decided

Should the SSAT contract be amended to make \$1,434,949 in additional funds available to compensate the testing agency?

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the contract amendment summarized below.

- Contract Number: TCC-9041
- Contractor: National Evaluation Systems, Inc.
- Contracting Period: October 2, 2000, to August 31, 2004
- Purpose of Contract: Complete the administration of the SSAT
- Proposed Amendment: Increase the total contract amount by \$1,434,949, from \$1,800,000 to \$3,234,949
- Source of Funding: Examinee fees

Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT): Proposed Contract Amendment

Professional Services Division

June 4, 2002

Background

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

One of the examination programs used for verification of subject matter competence is the Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT). The current four-year contract to develop and administer the SSAT was awarded to National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) in May, 2000 on the basis of a competitive bidding process. The contract calls for four administrations of the SSAT each year and the contract will expire on August 31, 2004. The SSAT contract established \$1,800,000 as the total amount available to reimburse NES. SSAT administration expenses through the April 2002 testing date total \$1,526,949 with nine test administration dates remaining for the contract.

Funding for administration of the SSAT is fully supported through fees paid by examinees as required under Education Code §44298. The examinee test fee covers the Commission's costs related to the SSAT, as well as the administrative duties performed by NES. NES is responsible for collecting these fees and submitting the total amount to the Commission. The Commission then pays NES a specific amount per examinee. The amount paid to NES is based on a sliding scale related to the number of examinees who take the SSAT.

Rationale for the Amendment to the Contract

This proposed amendment would increase the amount of the contract by \$1,434,949 based upon larger than anticipated volumes of examinees. SSAT administration costs established in the contract are based upon numbers of examinees. The total amount of the contract is determined through projections of examinee volumes considering trends in examinee volumes for past years.

At the time that the contract for administration of the SSAT exams was established in 2000, the impact of initiatives developed by the Governor to assist in the recruitment of new candidates to the teaching profession was unknown. Additionally, the development of new examinations to replace the SSAT exams was delayed. The administration of those new tests, the California Subject Exams for Teachers (CSET), will begin in January 2003. Therefore, while examinee volumes were expected to decrease with the administration of new exams, the delay in development of the exams in conjunction with the increase in examinees based upon recruitment initiatives resulted in much higher examinee volumes

and expenses than projected for the contract. Examinee volumes during the 2000-2001 testing year were approximately 15% higher than anticipated for that year. Through the April 2002 SSAT administration, examinee volumes for 2001-02 are up nearly 40% compared to last year.

Projected Costs

The current twenty-five SSAT exams are comprised of three different test types: (1) multiple-choice only tests, (2) combined multiple-choice/constructed-response tests, and (3) combined multiple-choice/constructed response language tests. The SSAT subject areas and test types are as follows:

Type 1: Multiple-Choice Only Tests

Art, Biology, Chemistry, French, General Science, Literature and English Language, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Physics, Spanish, and Social Science

Type 2: Multiple-Choice/Constructed-Response Tests

Agriculture, Business, Geoscience, Health Science, Home Economics, Industrial and Technology Education, and Preliminary Educational Technology

Type 3: Multiple-Choice/Constructed-Response Language Tests

German, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Punjabi, Russian, and Vietnamese

SSAT exams for English, math, sciences, and social science will be replaced by CSET exams after June of 2003. SSAT exams for art, languages other than English, music, physical education, and preliminary educational technology will be replaced after June 2004. Considering that exams for these subjects will be phased out, Table 1 shows the volumes of examinees for each type of SSAT exam that staff projects for the remainder of the contract.

**Table 1
Projected SSAT Examination Volumes**

Exam Type	June 2002	2002-03	2003-04	Total
Type 1	2,130	9,550	2,315	13,995
Type 2	560	2,200	2,440	5,200
Type 3	85	100	115	300
Total	2,775	11,850	4,870	19,495

NES is compensated at different rates for each of the three types of exams due to the different assessment formats. The rates are established in the contract and based upon examinee volumes. Based upon the projected volumes shown in Table 1 and the associated contract costs, the total expenses for the remainder of the contract are projected to be \$1,708,000. The current balance of the contract is \$273,051. Subtracting that amount from the projected expenses for the remainder of the contract leaves an amount of \$1,434,949 by which the contract will need to be amended. NES will only be paid based on the actual number of examinees as specified in the contract.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission approve an amendment to the 2000-2004 SSAT contract to increase the total contract amount by \$1,434,949 to \$3,234,949 to compensate NES for SSAT administrations for the remainder of the contract.

