

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

*Meeting of
October 1-2, 2003*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: GS – 10 - B
COMMITTEE: Commission Committee of the Whole
TITLE: Implementation of August Agenda Item 10-A: Subject Matter Examination Requirement for Multiple Subject Credential Candidates

 x Action

 x Information

 Report

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

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

Presented By: Amy Jackson

Prepared By:

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

Approved By:

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

Approved By:

_____ **Date:** _____
Beth Graybill
Interim Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By:

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

**Implementation of August Agenda Item 10-A: Subject Matter
Examination Requirement for Multiple Subject Credential Candidates**

Professional Services Division

October 1-2, 2003

Executive Summary

The California State Board's NCLB plan requires all teachers "new" to the teaching profession at the elementary school level to take and pass a Commission approved subject matter test. Commission staff conducted meetings with stakeholders and interested parties to develop options for where the test requirement should be embedded in the current program standards and for when the requirement should be met by candidates.

Policy(s) Issue to be Considered

When and how should the Commission align requirements for a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential to conform to the requirements of Public Law 107-110: No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the state plan, and proposed regulations adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE)?

Fiscal Impact Statement

The Commission budget supports the costs of these activities, and no budget augmentation is needed to continue program activities.

Options

A. Placement of Exam Requirement

Four options are presented for the Commission's consideration regarding at which point prior to recommendation for a credential the exam should be taken. They are:

- Option 1: Require the passage of an elementary subject matter exam before completion of the subject matter program for Multiple Subject candidates
- Option 2: Require the passage of an elementary subject matter exam before admission to a professional teacher preparation program
- Option 3: Require the passage of an elementary subject matter exam prior to allowing the candidate to assume whole class instruction (student teaching) or becoming teacher of record
- Option 4: Require the passage of an elementary subject matter exam prior to recommendation for a credential

B. Timing of Exam Requirement

The Commission needs to consider when the option for placement of the subject matter exam requirement should be implemented. Timing suggestions recommended by stakeholders range from June 30, 2004 through June 30, 2006. A table of stakeholder time suggestions is provided in the item.

Implementation of August Agenda Item 10-A: Subject Matter Examination Requirement for Multiple Subject Credential Candidates

Professional Services Division

October 1-2, 2003

As the Commission aligns requirements for a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential to conform to the requirements of Public Law 107-110: No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), the state plan, and proposed regulations adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE), how should this requirements be implemented?

Background

California's teacher preparation and credentialing system currently provides those seeking to enter the elementary teaching profession two means by which to demonstrate their subject matter competency in the following areas: visual and performing arts, physical education, science, mathematics, history and social sciences, reading, language and literature, and human development.

These two means are:

- 6 passing a subject matter examination (currently the *California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET)* pursuant to Education Code Section 44280, or
- 7 completing a Commission-approved multiple subject matter (elementary subject matter) program with embedded culminating assessments.

Currently, 60% of multiple subject credentials are granted to applicants who pass the subject matter test. The remainder of applicants demonstrate subject matter competency by completing an approved subject matter program pursuant to Education Code Section 44310. For those individuals, the subject matter examination requirement has been waived by the Commission pursuant to Education Code Sections 44280 and 44310. In order to meet the NCLB "rigorous State test" requirement, elementary multiple subject credential candidates would need to pass either (1) a state approved, validated, multiple subject matter test or (2) a validated statewide culminating exam.

Commission Action

At its meeting on August 14, 2003, to align with the State Board of Education's NCLB plan, the Commission acted to require a Commission approved subject matter exam for multiple subject credential candidates (currently CSET). The Commission agreed to revisit the set of options related to where in the current program standards the exam requirement should be placed and when it should be implemented. Also, the Commission requested additional stakeholder input about these two issues. Stakeholder statements are found in Appendix A.

Summary of Stakeholder Meeting to discuss the Implementation of CCTC Action to Require Demonstration of Elementary Subject Matter Competency Through Passage of an Approved CCTC Subject Matter Exam (currently CSET)

Stakeholders were invited by Secretary for Education Mazzoni to a meeting on August 25, 2003 to discuss options for where to place the examination requirement. The meeting was co-chaired by Margaret Fortune, Commission Chair and Karen Steentofte, Chief Counsel, State Board of Education (SBE). Representatives attending the meeting included: Office of the Secretary of Education, California State University (CSU), University of California (UC), Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), California School Boards Association (CSBA), California Department of Education, and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The options discussed included requiring the subject matter exam as part of the *Elementary Subject Matter Program Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence*, as a precondition to teacher preparation, and/or revising teacher preparation *Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence*. Implementation preferences were discussed. In addition to the meeting, CCTC staff sent out requests to stakeholders and interested parties to submit their positions in writing to the CCTC. (See stakeholder written positions in Appendix A.)

Stakeholder Suggestions for Placement of the Exam

The following table displays stakeholders’ suggestions for placement of the subject matter exam for elementary subject matter candidates.

Stakeholder	Suggestions for when a candidate would have to demonstrate passage of exam	Suggested Placement of Exam Requirement
Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU)	Prior to formal Student Teaching	Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17
California State University (CSU)	“Precondition” for admission to teacher preparation program	“Precondition” for admission to teacher preparation program
University of California (UC)	Prior to formal Student Teaching	Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17 (suggested draft language...see UC position in Appendix A)
Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)	Prior to formal Student Teaching	Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17
California School Boards Association (CSBA)	Prior to formal Student Teaching	Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17
Karen Hackett, Tri-County BTSA Induction Program Director	Prior to formal/final Student Teaching...for Blended candidates, prior to Jr. Year	No suggestion given

Placement of Exam Requirement

Four options are presented below for Commission consideration. **All options require a finding pursuant to Education Code section 44312 that current elementary subject matter programs do not meet the NCLB elementary subject matter exam requirement, and therefore students are ineligible for the examination waiver pursuant to Education Code Section 44310.**

According to Education Code section 44259, the CCTC establishes the minimum requirements for the preliminary multiple or single subject credential. Under the powers and duties of the Commission according to Education Code 44225, the Commission “may establish standards and requirements for preliminary and professional credentials of each type.”

OPTION 1: Require the passage of an elementary subject matter exam before completion of the subject matter program for Multiple Subject candidates

Pass exam prior to completion of elementary subject matter preparation program.

If the Commission chooses to make the modification within the elementary subject matter program there are two possibilities:

- 1(a) The Commission could modify *Elementary Subject Matter Program Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence* to include the requirement of the exam as part of the standard.
- 1(b) The Commission could add an additional elementary subject matter program precondition to require successful passage of the subject matter exam as a subject matter program completion requirement. If the Commission chooses option 1(a) or 1(b), *Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence* would be changed to eliminate the four fifths subject matter completion option for both multiple subject and single subject teachers of record, with the exception of candidates in a blended/integrated program, who would have to meet the four fifths state subject matter completion requirement. All other professional program preconditions would remain the same.

If the Commission chooses to adopt Option 1, there would be no change concerning CCTC approval of subject matter programs. The Commission’s approved program process assures that the curriculum offered at institutions is aligned with the *Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*. Candidates who choose to attend approved subject matter programs that are aligned to the K-12 academic standards for students should experience a higher probability of success on a required subject matter exam. Candidates who do not attend an approved subject matter program must take and pass an approved subject matter exam.

Currently, the CSET is the only subject matter exam certified by the Commission. Under this option, colleges and universities could also choose to develop or identify additional rigorous, uniform, valid, and reliable exams to meet the requirements of *Elementary Subject Matter Program Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence*. Working together or individually, they could decide to:

- identify CSET or another state or national subject matter exam approved by the Commission, or
- develop an exam and submit it to the Commission for approval (until new exams are approved, Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) would use an exam approved previously by the Commission, currently CSET).

Although CSET is currently the only test available, it is not specifically named in the proposed revision. This allows maximum flexibility to add other exams when developed and approved. It also ensures that candidates who have taken and passed a previous Commission certified exam (such as MSAT, NTE, CAPP, PRAXIS) have met the requirement. In addition, it would allow the CCTC to certify exams given by other states, thus assuring portability for teachers trained out of state.

If the Commission selects Option 1, elementary subject matter programs will be required to resubmit to *Elementary Subject Matter Program Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence*. An expedited standard review and approval process would be conducted by Commission staff. A coded correspondence would be released by the Commission describing the process and the timeline for submission.

Option 1(a) Revise *Elementary Subject Matter Program Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence*

Approved institutions would be required to resubmit a response to *Elementary Subject Matter Program Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence* stating that candidates are required to pass a Commission approved subject matter exam (currently CSET). New programs would be required to respond to the newly modified standard.

Potential Positive Impact

- a. Programs could simplify their current response about the assessment process to relate only to the exam requirements.
- b. The above could result in some reduction of cost to the university.
- c. Programs could assure that candidates take the exam at the most appropriate time in their completion of the subject matter program.
- d. Blended or integrated programs would not be adversely affected.
- e. Previously approved SB 2042 elementary subject matter programs would be able to maintain an “approved” status if they require a Commission approved subject matter exam.

Potential Negative Impact

- a. Institutions may decide not to seek approval for an elementary subject matter program. Candidates may not receive preparation that is aligned with the K-12 academic standards.

- b. Could discourage candidates from entering teacher preparation programs.

Option 1(b) New Elementary Subject Matter Program Precondition

Institutions would be required to add the passage of the elementary subject matter exam as a requirement for completion of the subject matter program by adding a program precondition to this effect. A response to the new precondition would be required from institutions, including those previously approved under SB 2042.

Potential Positive Impact

- a. Programs would only need to respond to a precondition to assure that the exam requirement was met, and would not have to rewrite *Elementary Subject Matter Program Standard 6: Assessment of Subject Matter Competence*.
- b. The above could result in less cost to the university.
- c. Programs could assure that candidates take the exam at the most appropriate time in their completion of the program.
- d. Blended or integrated programs would not be adversely affected.
- e. Elementary subject matter programs would be able to maintain their “approved” status.

Potential Negative Impact

- a. Institutions may decide not to seek approval for an elementary subject matter program. Candidates may not receive preparation that is aligned with the K-12 academic standards.
- b. Could discourage candidates from entering teacher preparation programs.

Draft language for Standard 6 and the new precondition of Option 1(a) and Option 1(b) are found in Appendix B.

OPTION 2: Require the passage of an elementary subject matter exam for admission to a professional teacher preparation program.

Pass exam prior to admission to a professional teacher preparation program.

The Commission could require passage of the elementary subject matter exam (currently CSET) prior to admission to a Multiple Subject Credential program as a program precondition.

Program sponsors preparing multiple subject candidates would be required to amend responses to both *Professional Teacher Preparation Program Precondition 5 (Admission)* and *Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence*. This resubmission process would be an expedited process.

Positive Program Impact

- a. Assures subject matter proficiency before candidates would be able to begin the professional teacher preparation program.
- b. Would assure that interns and other teachers of record are fully subject matter competent prior to assuming whole class instruction.

Negative Program Impact

- a. It could eliminate blended/integrated subject matter/professional preparation programs as prescribed in Education Code Section 44259.1 (a).
- b. Gives the responsibility for verification of subject matter requirement to the professional teacher preparation program.
- c. Could discourage candidates from entering professional teacher preparation programs.

Although CSET is currently the only test available, it is not specifically named in the proposed revision. This allows maximum flexibility to add other exams when developed and approved. It also ensures that candidates who have taken and passed a previous Commission certified exam (such as MSAT, NTE, CAPP, PRAXIS) have met the requirement. In addition, it would allow the Commission to certify exams given by other states, thus assuring portability for teachers trained out of state.

Draft language for a new precondition and revised program Standard 17 is found in Appendix C.

OPTION 3: Require the passage of the elementary subject matter exam prior to allowing the candidate to assume whole class instruction (student teaching) or becoming teacher of record.

Pass exam prior to whole class instruction (student teaching) or becoming teacher of record.

The Commission could require passage of a subject matter exam prior to allowing the candidate to begin student teaching or intern teaching.

This option would provide Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) flexibility for determining when to require the exam. IHEs could adopt a time certain requirement for passage of a subject matter exam (currently CSET) at any time prior to student teaching. For example, an IHE might want to establish that passage of CSET is part of the IHE's admission requirement.

Program sponsors would be required to respond to a new Professional Teacher Preparation Program Precondition concerning subject matter proficiency and to the modified Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17. This resubmission process would be an expedited process.

Potential Positive Impact

- a. Assures subject matter proficiency before beginning whole class instruction, but allows student teaching based programs to integrate some subject matter and professional preparation coursework.
- b. Would insure that interns and other teachers of record are fully subject matter competent prior to assuming whole class instruction.

Potential Negative Impact

- a. It could limit institutional flexibility in blended/integrated programs.
- b. Gives the responsibility to the professional teacher preparation program for verification of the subject matter requirement.
- c. Gives responsibility to the professional teacher preparation program to assist candidates in meeting the subject matter requirement.

Although CSET is currently the only test available, it is not specifically named in the proposed revision. This allows maximum flexibility to add other exams when developed and approved. It also ensures that candidates who have taken and passed a previous CCTC certified exam (such as MSAT, NTE, CAPP, PRAXIS) have met the requirement. In addition, it would allow the CCTC to certify exams given by other states, thus assuring portability for teachers trained out of state.

Draft language for the new Precondition and revised Standard 17 are found in Appendix D.

OPTION 4: Require the passage of an elementary subject matter exam prior to recommendation for credential.

Pass exam prior to recommendation for a credential.

The Commission could require passage of the subject matter exam prior to recommending a candidate for the credential. This option allows maximum flexibility for all professional teacher preparation programs.

This option could require the program sponsor to provide a response to the revised program completion precondition. The resubmission process would be an expedited process.

Potential Positive Impact

- a. Provides maximum flexibility for program sponsors – especially student teaching based programs.
- b. Allows full implementation of integrated/blended programs as prescribed in Education Code Section 44259.1 (a).
- c. Requires the least modification of responses to current standards and preconditions.

Potential Negative Impact

- a. Candidates could complete a program and student teaching and NOT be able to pass an exam, and would not be recommended for a credential.
- b. Gives responsibility to the professional teacher preparation program to assist candidates in meeting the subject matter requirement.

Although CSET is currently the only test available, it is not specifically named in the proposed revision. This allows maximum flexibility to add other exams when developed and approved. It also ensures that candidates who have taken and passed a previous Commission certified exam (such as MSAT, NTE, CAPP, PRAXIS) have met the requirement. In addition, it would allow the Commission to certify exams given by other states, thus assuring portability for teachers trained out of state.

Draft language for the new precondition and a revised Standard 17 are found in Appendix E.

Additional Discussion

If the Commission takes action on a placement option that requires the revision of Title 5 regulations, commission staff could be directed to bring back Title 5 language for consideration at a future commission meeting. Staff would conduct a thorough review of all related education codes, including SB 2042, blended programs (44259.1), and types and content of exams (44282), and subsequently bring revisions forward for consideration and action.

Blended Programs

Candidates who enter an approved multiple subject blended program will have to take and pass an exam. Programs will need to advise candidates when to take the exam. Candidates need to be prepared for the content in the exam and be offered support if they do not pass a section of the exam. Candidates will want to take the exam early enough in their program to allow for time to retake the exam if necessary.

Commission staff will, upon direction of the Commission, bring forward technical guidelines for currently approved blended programs and for new blended programs. If subject matter programs no longer require Commission approval, then new blended programs would only need to submit responses to the six blended standards and the new SB 2042 teacher preparation standards. Programs could be required to explain how subject matter and pedagogy are "blended." Multiple Subject Candidates would need to obtain a bachelor's degree, complete teacher preparation, complete student teaching and pass a subject matter exam.

Effective Date of Adopted Exam Placement Option for Credential Purposes

Pursuant to NCLB, passage of a subject matter exam became an employment requirement for all elementary teachers in Title I schools on July 1, 2002. By the end of the 2005-06 school year, all

elementary teachers in all programs will have to take a Commission adopted exam. Whichever option the Commission chooses to adopt, the effective date of the change needs to be determined. Factors to consider include anticipation of increased numbers of multiple subject test takers; the number of administrations planned for the exam; and how to notice multiple subject candidates who recently completed an approved subject matter program or who are currently enrolled in an approved program.

Staff anticipates a large increase in the volume of test takers. The increase in volume may begin with the fall administration of the CSET: Multiple Subject. At this time, potential "new" test takers include:

- Emergency Permit teachers
- Pre-Interns
- Candidates who completed an approved program as of July 1, 2002
- Candidates who are newly enrolled in approved programs, including blended program candidates
- Education Specialists
- Veteran teachers who did not take an exam and do not want to go through the embedded HOUSSSE option.

Volume could increase by the thousands as soon as fall 2003, certainly over the next academic year, and into the following years, as candidates and teachers attempt to meet the 2005-2006 requirement that all elementary teachers take and pass a subject matter exam.

Staff is in contact with the CSET contractor, National Evaluation Systems (NES), to continue planning for a potential increase in test volume. Two administrations are planned for the fall of 2003. A September and November administration have been or will be held at multiple sites across the state. Under the current contract, NES is obligated to offer the exam six times a year. Under the new test structure, first administered in January 2003, candidates take three sections: Language Arts and Social Science; Mathematics and Science; and Visual Arts, Physical Education and Human Development. Candidates may take one, two, or all three sections of the test at an administration. Staff is exploring options with the contractor for additional administrations, additional sites, and the potential of returning test results to candidates in an expedited manner. In addition, an on-line Multiple Subject practice exam is now available to assist candidate in preparing for the CSET Multiple Subject exam.

Potential Implementation Timeline for Aligning Elementary Subject Matter Credential Requirements to State Board of Education NCLB Employment Requirements for Elementary Teachers

The possible timeline for requiring an elementary subject matter exam for candidates ranges from June 2004 to June 30, 2006.

Any decision regarding implementation of the adopted option must necessarily balance the requirements of NCLB and its implementation date of July 1, 2002, with the needs of the

Commission's stakeholders, particularly program sponsors, credential candidates, and school districts. In addition, it is necessary to note that although the requirement of a test may be postponed for purposes of qualifying for a credential, after July 1, 2002, all multiple subject candidates will be required to pass a multiple subject exam for employment purposes.

Stakeholder Suggestions for when to Implement Exam Requirement

The following table displays stakeholders suggestions for when to require passage of a subject matter exam for elementary subject matter candidates.

Stakeholders	Suggestions for When to Implement Exam Requirement
California School Boards Association (CSBA)	June 2004, or ASAP
Association of California School Administrators (ACSA)	Spring/Summer 2004
University of California (UC)	August 1, 2004
Karen Hackett, Tri-County BTSA Induction Program Director	Fall 2004
California State University (CSU)	Spring 2005
Susan Meyer and Judi Conroy, Directors, teacher credential program, University of California, Irvine	June 30, 2006
Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU)	July 1, 2006

Appendix A

NCLB Correspondence

INDEPENDENT CALIFORNIA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES RESPONSE

1100 Eleventh Street, Suite 10
Sacramento, Ca 95814
Phone: 916-446-7626
Fax: 916-446-9648

Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities

September 4, 2003

Dr. Sam Swofford
Executive Director
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Ave
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Implementation of Subject Matter Requirement

Dear Sam,

Thank you for your email on the 26th of August and the request for feedback on the required demonstration of approved subject matter competency through passage of an approved CCTC subject matter exam.

We would encourage the greatest extent of flexibility in passage of the examination while in a teacher education program. If the test is required prior to taking any teacher preparation courses, the undergraduate candidates will not be able to begin their teacher preparation program until after they graduate. It makes sense to be flexible and have passage of the test by the time the candidate begins their student teaching. Therefore, we do support the proposed revision in Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17, elements (a) and (b).

In light of the numerous changes that continue to occur, we would support the starting date of July 1, 2006 for implementation of this new testing requirement. Many institutions have just completed new liberal studies programs, as well as new teacher education programs. The later implementation date allows for a transition period that takes into account the needs of current candidates, as well as, school districts in complying with NCLB. For example, students who are currently in their introductory education courses and who are completing their state approved subject matter preparation programs would finish the credential process by the spring of 2006. These students would then have enough time to take the test and receive a passing score prior to their teaching assignment. Students hired in Title I schools prior to this date should be advised to take the exam regardless of the transition date.

Two additional concerns have arisen within this discussion with our Schools of Education. First, some programs may have student teaching embedded throughout their programs. Some feel that it would be unfair, particularly because of the higher cost of education, to pull teacher candidates from their student teaching experience because they cannot pass the examination. Expressed was a desire for increased flexibility and therefore not prohibiting programs to require passage of the CSET (or determined examination) as a condition for admissions. Although we support the need to demonstrate content knowledge mastery before student teaching, we stress the importance of flexibility on when to take and

pass the test because institutions vary. In addition, we urge the Commission to seriously consider the implications of such changes on integrated and blended programs and advise the field in a timely manner.

Second, we assume all MS candidates need to take the approved examination. Therefore, it will be difficult to help students see the advantage of taking a multiple subject matter approved undergraduate program as compared to another major and then taking the examination. What would be the advantage of an "approved program?" What about the possibility of no state approved programs? Much disappointment has been

expressed over the demonstration of subject matter competency through an examination, and an examination only. The examination only route contradicts the purpose and rationale of subject matter programs and therefore may not be able to validly and reliably identify subject matter competence, as well as multiple assessment measures embedded in approved waiver programs. Lastly, it is critical that the Commission communicates directly to the field and to current candidates on the new testing requirements and notifies all interested parties immediately of the changes that are occurring. When statutory changes are adopted, we recommend that the new exam be offered much more frequently and be attentive of the needs of both quarter and semester systems. Thank you for this opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Brown
President

cc: CCTC, Commissioners
Amy Jackson, Administrator, Professional Services Division, CCTC

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY RESPONSE

From: Young, Beverly
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2003 1:57 PM
To: Spence, David; tgarcia@ose.ca.gov; Swofford, Sam; rbelisle@cde.ca.gov; mfortune@sthope.org
Cc: ksteentofte@cde.ca.gov; Armstrong, Mary; Jackson, Amy; Imookcft@aol.com; robison9@ix.netcom.com; prutcker@cta.org; SFarland@csba.org; Ramirez, Sara; sgriffith@acsa.org; athena.waite@ucr.edu; brown@aiccu.edu; ninamoore@ucop.edu; Arthurlene Towner (E-mail); Billie Blair (E-mail); Bonnie Konopak (E-mail); Dorothy Lloyd (E-mail); Irma Guzman Wagner (E-mail); Jacob Perea (E-mail); Jean Houck (E-mail); Joan M. Karp (E-mail); Lionel Skip Meno (E-mail); Michael Lewis (E-mail); Patricia Arlin (E-mail); Paul Beare (E-mail); Philip Rusche (E-mail); Phyllis Fernlund (E-mail); Roberta Rikli (E-mail); Stephen King (E-mail); Stephen Lilly (E-mail); Susan Higgins (E-mail); Susan Meyers (E-mail); Jamie Dote-Kwan (E-mail); Joan S. Bissell; Lon Kellenberger
Subject: CSU response to CCTC proposal regarding subject matter competency
Importance: High

Colleagues,

Since receiving the CCTC proposal, we have sent it out to our campus education deans for review and feedback. While this quick process cannot replace full discussion and considered consultation, we did receive responses from a number of our campus programs.

In short, CSU education programs believe strongly that new processes for verification of subject matter according to federal requirements belong in an accreditation precondition, not in a program standard. We believe that, as the largest preparer of teachers in the state, our deans are in the best position to make that recommendation based on their experience not only in the credentialing process, but based on a thorough understanding of the accreditation issues, governing codes, and processes. We do not believe that any of the other stakeholders bring the same expertise to this particular area of judgment.

That said, if the CCTC chooses to go ahead with the proposal to include subject matter verification as part of a professional preparation program approval standard, the CSU programs will, of course, comply. The great majority of CSU deans feel that candidates should take and pass CSET prior to program admission. If this is not adopted by the CCTC as statewide policy, the CSU will consider its adoption as part of our Executive Order governing common admission standards. Demonstration of subject matter should take place as proximal as possible to the subject matter acquisition, and prior to the candidate's beginning professional preparation---most especially in fairness to the candidate. It is our hope that the CCTC will not allow institutions to let candidates

expend time and money to proceed down a path to a credential that they will be unable to attain, due to non-passage of CSET.

For undergraduate or blended programs of professional preparation, the CSU recommends that CSET passage be required before admission to the student teaching phase of the program. This will allow the candidate to have completed the majority of subject matter preparation concurrently with most professional preparation before taking the test.

In both of these cases, the CSU would continue to follow a policy of "exceptional admit" for candidates who demonstrate great potential, but have difficulty with one of the admission requirements, including passage of CSET. A specific timeline and policy would be developed for conditional admission for these students, in either post- bac or blended programs.

In order for CSET to be required for all MS candidates, by law it becomes necessary for approved subject matter programs to no longer exist as they currently do. Rather than force the CCTC to issue a finding that CSU programs were out of compliance with state approval, the CSU system would voluntarily withdraw or ask for temporary suspension of CSU programs of subject matter programs for multiple subject credentials. This will have the same impact as a CCTC finding, and will hopefully only be required on a temporary basis.

As to the effective date, it seems that the main reason for speed is to clarify the issue for candidates, since the SBE proposal is already adopted and requirements for testing hinge on that proposal, not the CCTC action. We agree that the change should be made as quickly as is feasible. Campuses have suggested a variety of dates, with various impacts on current credential students as well as those in the undergraduate pipeline. We would like to further discuss the alternatives that may be possible, and determine what is the best timeframe to adopt to help these students. In the meantime, our campuses will make sure that students are advised as to the NCLB requirement and its impact on their employment situation. Since this is being discussed as an admission requirement, it seems that an effective date must be at least 12-18 months out, to allow for adequate advisement for those entering the program. We would assume that current students will be allowed to complete their programs under the current credential requirements, but be advised as to the importance of CSET passage to their employment.

Finally, the CCTC proposal raised questions in three important areas. We hope these can be clarified before the proposal is redrafted and moved ahead. The questions are related to the following:

First, a clarification that this change applies to subject matter for multiple subject programs only. Standard 17 applies to both multiple and single subject programs, and without language to specify, is interpreted to apply to both. We are assuming that this is not the case, and would appreciate that clarification.

Second, there is a great deal of concern about the change proposed to 17(b), and what that is intended to accomplish. What is the anticipated impact on interns? For example, who will verify intern candidates abilities as specified here? Some feel that this language will eliminate internships. What is the inclusion of the TPEs at this point meant to achieve? Clarification on this item would be helpful also to the discussion.

Finally, there continues to be great discussion regarding the elimination of CBEST, as quickly as possible. While we understand that this cannot be accomplished without legislative change, and that the CCTC has directed staff to explore such a test consolidation, it would be helpful for the field to know what CCTC is expecting regarding CBEST as CSET becomes a requirement, and how the timeline might be adjusted accordingly.

The California State University welcomes the opportunity to provide comment and recommendation as to this new state action. We look forward to the continued discussion of this issue in draft form before it becomes an action item for the Commission in October. Thank you.

Dr. Beverly L. Young
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Teacher Education and Public School Programs
California State University System
401 Golden Shore Dr., 6th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
(562)951-4747 (562)951-4982 fax
Byoung@calstate.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RESPONSE

University of California Comments Regarding NCLB Implementation of Subject Matter Requirements:

The University of California supports the proposal to require the passage of a CCTC certified exam prior to student teaching. Since Standard 17 applies to both multiple and single subject candidates, we are concerned that the proposed changes might inadvertently restrict single subject requirements beyond the provisions in federal law. We would suggest the following language to avoid confusion between the multiple subjects and single subjects subject matter requirements and to ensure alignment with the NCLB provisions (recommended changes are underlined).

Recommended Changes for Standard 17(a):

17(a) Prior to being given daily responsibility for whole class instruction in a K-12 school, each multiple subjects candidate fulfills the state basic skills requirement and verifies subject matter knowledge through a CCTC certified exam.

Single subject candidates recommended for a credential must fulfill the subject matter requirements in accordance with Article 3, Sections 6110 and 6111 of California's NCLB plan.

17(b) [UC concurs with the proposed change to 17b]. Prior to assuming daily responsibility or becoming the teacher of record for whole class instruction in a K-12 school, each candidate must demonstrate a fundamental ability to teach in the major domains of the Teaching Performance Expectations.

University of California Comments Regarding Timing of Implementing the Exam Requirement in Accordance with NCLB:

The University of California would support implementation of the revised Standard 17 effective August 1, 2004 in order to assist districts with hiring NCLB qualified teachers as soon as possible. We suggest that all candidates recommended for a credential prior to August 1, 2004 be credentialed under current licensing regulations.

University of California Comments Regarding Other Implications of NCLB:

There are a number of unintended consequences and issues affecting all stakeholders in the State's educational community that should also be addressed as we move towards complying with NCLB. The following outlines our concerns in four critical areas.

- ✓ Students who received financial support (APLE, Cal Grant T, GTS and GTF) that requires teaching service in a Title I school in order to waive repayment will be unable to fulfill that service if they completed their subject matter requirement via a subject matter preparation program. These students met all of the admissions and credentialing requirements under current law and committed to the service

requirement. Their inability to fulfill their service requirement, through no malfeasance on their part, would cause serious financial problems for these graduates.

- ✓ Will candidates who have internships (or student teaching placements) beginning Fall 2003, but who have not yet passed the exam, be pulled out of Title I schools? Applying the revised Standard 17 retroactively would not only cause problems for the schools expecting to have candidates in their classrooms but also for the candidates completing their programs in a timely manner.
- ✓ The contractual issues affecting multiple subjects teachers who were hired on or after July 1, 2002 and have not yet passed an exam are critical. Will these teachers be fired?
- ✓ Candidates credentialed on or after July 1, 2002 met all the requirements under current law as advertised in university catalogues. We are concerned about the legal and ethical impact of labeling these teachers not highly qualified and not allowing them time to become “highly qualified” thus hindering potential employment opportunities.

In order to address these issues we would suggest a grace period until August 1, 2004 to allow time for affected individuals to take and pass the exam. In the meantime, these individuals would be considered “highly qualified” and able to teach in a Title I school. We recognize that implementation of a grace period would require further negotiation at the federal level. Providing some kind of grace period would also allow districts/schools to avoid contractual problems.

We commend the State Board and CCTC for working together to address the challenges raised by NCLB. UC appreciates the opportunity to work with you and other stakeholders in the State to solve these critical issues.

Nina P. Moore
University of California
1111 Franklin St., 7th Fl.
Oakland, CA 94607
PH: (510) 987-9423
FAX: (510) 987-9612
CELL: (510) 593-0148
nina.moore@ucop.edu

ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS RESPONSE

From: Sherry Skelly Griffith
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2003 6:53 PM
To: Swofford, Sam
Cc: lmoockcft@aol.com; robison9@ix.netcom.com; prutcker@cta.org; sfarland@csba.org; sramirez@calstate.edu; athena.waite@ucr.edu; brown@aiccu.edu; ninamoore@ucop.edu; byoung@calstate.edu; dspence@calstate.edu; ksteentofte@cde.ca.gov; rbelisle@cde.ca.gov; Armstrong, Mary; Swofford, Sam; mfortune@sthope.org; Jackson, Amy; tgarcia@ose.ca.gov; kstapfwalters@acsa.org; dmeyers@acsa.org; bwells@acsa.org; kmccreery@acsa.org; apetrossian@gusd.net; gmanthey@acsa.org
Subject: Re: Implementation of Subject Matter Requirement

Dear Ms. Fortune, CTC Staff, State Board, Ms. Garcia, Department of Education, and Education Agency and Organization Representatives:

RE: ACSA's Response to CSET Implementation Issues

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the options under consideration we discussed August 25 regarding how and when to implement CSET.

We have polled a number of our ACSA committees and have received input from district and county superintendents and assistant superintendents, curriculum leaders, principals, and the Chair of ACSA's Curriculum, Instruction and Evaluation Committee, Linda Kaminsky. Additional input will be forthcoming from our Human Resources Committee, however I wanted to provide a summary of input received thus far to meet the September 3 deadline.

There was full consensus from administrators that prior to being given daily responsibility for whole class instruction a teacher candidate should verify subject matter knowledge through a CCTC certified exam (i.e. CSET). Therefore, the language proposed to amend Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17 is reasonable. ACSA also wants to see as many tests as possible certified (MSAT, Praxis, etc.).

ACSA would also propose that if Program 17 is amended CBEST would be eliminated as a basic skills test requirement at the time CSET is implemented as the subject matter competency test. Reducing unnecessary testing burden should be a high priority. ACSA also support providing teacher candidates some funding for the costs of taking CSET (potentially Title VI funds).

There is also general consensus that candidates be given numerous opportunities to take and pass CSET. There was some concern raised about IHE's limiting entry into teacher credentialing programs based on failure to pass CSET. A district

superintendent expressed concern that this would have a chilling effect on the number of candidates willing to commit to the profession. There is also support however, that an undergraduate degree in the subject to be taught should prepare teacher candidates to pass CSET.

In regards to when to implement the CSET requirement for a credential, there was no perfect timeframe recommended by school administrators. Some administrators want the requirement in place immediately so that credential candidates and new hires have every chance possible to take CSET. Some administrators want to see the state wait until 2005-06. There was support for Spring/Summer 2004 as a practical compromise. Spring/Summer 2004 allows teacher candidates to be given a reasonable advanced notice but also provides time prior to hiring for the traditional school year. If the Spring/Summer timeframe was chosen however, it is important that the SBE proposed regulations extend the "transition phase" professional development requirement for those hired after July 1, 2002 to 2005. ACSA also believes a grace period would need to be provided if a teacher candidate was hired in Spring/Summer 2004 but had not yet taken and passed CSET so that districts could hire with that flexibility.

Thanks again. Please let me know if we are to attend the September 3 meeting or if that meeting has been canceled.

Sincerely,

Sherry Skelly Griffith
ACSA Governmental Relations
Ph (916) 329-3805
sgriffith@acsa.org

CALIFORNIA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION RESPONSE

From: Stephanie Farland
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2003 4:03 PM
To: Jackson, Amy
Subject: Implementation of Subject Matter Requirement

Hi Amy,

As you know, CSBA prefers that we not use passage of the CSET as a requirement for acceptance into a credential program. We are very concerned about choking off our already precarious teacher pipeline. We are comfortable with the option that requires passage of the CSET prior to student teaching. I believe the passage rates of the CSET make a good argument for this option. Passage rates for the CSET improve on the second try by 25%. If we allow candidates to enter into a program despite failure on their first attempt at the exam, they will more than likely pass on the second or even third attempt.

Our first choice was to not have CSET as a requirement at all. Seeing as we didn't win that battle, we can live with this proposal.

As to when this should be implemented, the sooner the better for school districts who are trying to comply with the requirements of NCLB. As for students currently enrolled in credential programs, it seems that if we are changing the rules on them mid-game, we should do it now so they have the support they need to meet the new exam requirement. They are more likely to get that support while still enrolled in a program than after they leave.

Please let me know if you have any questions concerning my comments.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Farland

Policy Analyst
California School Boards Association
3100 Beacon Boulevard
West Sacramento, CA 95691
916.669.3356 (ph)
916.371.3407 (fax)
sfarland@csba.org

Program Response

From: Karen Hackett
Sent: Wednesday, September 3, 2003 11:05 AM
To: Jackson, Amy; sgriffith@acsa.org
Cc: Sallyw@sutter.k12.ca.us
Subject: CSET Exam

Sherry/Amy,

I agree that teacher candidates should have as many opportunities as needed to take and pass the CSET.

I also believe in order to give universities time to implement this plan Fall 2004 would be soonest they could deliver this requirement (and even then there would probably be some candidates currently in a program that would need time to be "grand-fathered" in to this requirement).

With SB2042 and Blended Programs (teacher preparation) I am unsure if a clear understanding of when student teaching at the Institutes of Higher Education (IHE's) level will occur is prevalent. As IHE's have stated in their new approved SB2042 documents teacher candidates will be in classrooms as soon as their sophomore year and will be doing some student teaching their junior year. I believe that a cut off time (earlier than prior to beginning their final student teaching experience - if said student teaching is in the student's senior year) needs to occur prior to the teacher candidate's junior year in an IHE. My concern is that allowing candidates to continue in a blended education system past their junior year if the CSET exam has not been passed may be setting these teachers up for failure - and a degree that will not allow them to teach. Candidates who continue in blended programs into their junior and senior years should have passed the CSET. Those that cannot pass this test should be counseled into a different profession earlier enough in their education to making a meaningful choice about additional options.

If you have any questions please feel free to call me. Thank you.

Karen Hackett
Tri-County BTSA Induction Program Director

Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Office
970 Klamath Lane
Yuba City, CA 95993
(530) 822-2938
Fax: (530) 822-3086

Program Response

From: Susan M. Meyers
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2003 9:24 AM
To: Jackson, Amy
Cc: nmoore@popserv.ucop.edu; Dave Brant; Judi Conroy
Subject: CSET Requirement for a MS Teaching Credential

Dear Amy,

As directors of the teacher credential program here at the Univ. of California, Irvine, Judi Conroy and I would like to express our views as to the timeline of implementation of the CSET requirement for a MS teaching credential. This seems like a complex issue given the need that districts have for hiring NCLB compliant new teachers and the situation that many of our recent graduates and current candidates find themselves in who have completed subject matter preparation programs. It also affects current undergraduates who are completing those programs who intend to enter teacher preparation programs in the near future. In all fairness to candidates, we believe that the deadline for the CSET requirement should be delayed as long as possible.

Thank you for soliciting our views.

--

Susan M. Meyers
Director, Multiple Subject Credential Program

Program Response

From: Mary Ann Sinkkonen
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2003 1:45 PM
To: Swofford, Sam
Cc: McKibbin, Michael; Edward Kujawa
Subject: verification of subject matter competence

Sept. 10, 2003

Dear Dr. Swofford:

As we approach the early Oct. meeting of the CCTC and the discussion related to verifying subject matter competence, I decided it might be helpful for you to have input from the field. Although I have written before on this subject, I decided there is more to contribute.

Specifically, with approved Blended Programs and Standard 6, Assessment of Subject Matter Competence, how might that be considered with regard to the federal requirements? Is a test the ONLY way to verify competence? How might the content of an institutions' approved process in Standard 6 be considered? How might CCTC approach the decision with expansive thinking as how competence can be verified.

Multiple Subject candidates in California not only take CBEST but also RICA. What do those tests tell us about competence?

As we recruit under-represented populations, we often find that the cost of testing is prohibitive. The cost of securing the Certificate of Clearance is often challenging then we have the CBEST and RICA. Tuition breaks and tuition grants help but when it comes to financing the taking of these tests, it is truly difficult for many of our under-represented candidates. Now, the possibility of yet another test looms before all of us.

I hope it is helpful to the CCTC to hear from the field.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Sinkkonen, Ed.D.
Assistant Professor/Coordinator
Blended Liberal Studies/Teacher Education

Candidate Response

From: moniqueknoll@aol.com [<mailto:moniqueknoll@aol.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2003 4:05 PM
To: Henkelman, Maureen
Subject: Re: (no subject)

I have been taking MSAT or CSET waiver classes for a year. Many of us have spent \$10,000, if not more on these classes. It is ridiculous for the CCTC not to accept these waivers at this time. If they want to bar future teachers from taking those classes fine, but we were given the approval by the state of California and have a lot of time and money invested. In addition, the law says that we must have vigorous approved testing... Well, we do have vigorous testing in all the subject content areas every month during mid-terms and finals. I don't see why the CCTC can't approve those tests for those that have already gone through it. Furthermore, vigorous coursework is approved for middle and high school, and not elementary, and I want to know why. I am doing everything in my power to make some noise on Oct. 2. I am pushing for National University, FTA, and CTA to represent us. I believe that the people it will effect the most (those of us in waiver programs), have the right to be heard before the CCTC votes.

Monique Knoll

Candidate Response

September 3, 2003

Margaret Fortune, Chair
CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Agenda Item GS-10-D

An unfair decision needs to be re-thought and changed concerning the CA State Board of Education's plan to phase-out waivers regarding the MSAT Waiver Program.

MSAT Waiver Program (MSMPP): The college students who made the decision to pay for the extra year of classes, learn and pass the material, and sign the 5 year state recognized contract rather than take the MSAT exam, need in all fairness to be exempt from being re-tested.

Give the individuals who completed the MSAT Waiver Program what they were promised.

If a student passed the MSAT test before 8/03, they are currently exempt from paying for and taking the new CSET test. The MSAT Waiver Program students need to be afforded the same CSET test exemption as the individuals who took and passed the MSAT test. Again, they signed the 5 year state recognized contract!

Thank you for your help on this issue.

Sharon McCollum
11260 Bootes St
San Diego, CA 92126

Candidate Response

September 2, 2003

To Whom It May Concern:

I recently received my certificate of completion of the Multiple Subject Matter Preparation Program from Cal State University Fullerton. Two years ago I was informed that instead of having to take the test formerly known as the MSAT, I could take various classes to substitute for the test. I was extremely excited that I would have the opportunity to take classes versus taking a test so I spent an extra year of my time and money to take these classes. I completed my waiver classes and graduated in June of 2003 with a B.S. degree. I enrolled in the credential program with a positive attitude and a sense of ease knowing that I simply had to prepare and take the RICA exam. Unfortunately, to my surprise I discovered my waiver classes are no longer accepted in school districts in place of the CSET. I just found out in August that I must take the test in addition to the waiver classes. When I first found this out I felt extremely upset, frustrated, angry, and deceived that all of the extra work I put into the MSMPP program will now delay my dreams of becoming a future teacher. By no means were the MSMPP classes I took useless. I gained an extreme amount of knowledge on various subjects and I definitely benefited from taking those classes. However, it is unfair to me and many other future teachers that we were lead to believe one thing and now we are faced with a different reality. If I had been informed that I would need to take the CSET test even after I had fulfilled the waiver program, perhaps I would have chosen a different route. I would have graduated a year earlier and saved thousands of dollars in fees if I had chosen the test only.

As of today, I am in a rigorous teaching credential program at CSUF. I am constantly reading, doing case studies, reading assessments, and observing in a classroom. It is difficult for me to take time out of my schedule to study for a test that I was not originally supposed to take. If I would have been informed earlier about this change I could have arranged my time more appropriately.

According to the "No Child Left Behind Act", it emphasizes that in order to be quality teachers, teachers need to pass the CSET. I do not agree with this statement. Like I said earlier I felt the classes I took better prepared me than any test could. I was performing hands on activities and interacting with young children on a regular basis. I learned various strategies and activities that I can use in my future classroom in becoming an effective teacher. By taking this standardized test you simply have to read a study guide and cram everything you've learned into your head. It is only based on memorizing important facts, dates, and concepts. As a teacher I know you must be knowledgeable and accountable about the subject matter you teach,

however, that is only half of what a teacher needs to know to be classified as a "good" teacher. Teachers need to be sensitive to every student's needs, aware of their various cultures, foster learning in a creative manner, enthusiastic of the subject matter and so on. The list could go on for another ten pages. I have gained and now possess many of these qualities due to my MSMPP classes.

If you feel that passing the CSET will only produce exemplary teachers then the only ones who will suffer in the future will be the students. I feel that it is only fair that if the people who solely took the CSET, now must take the MSMPP waiver classes to benefit them as well as their future students.

I know that education is ever changing and that life sometimes is not fair. I did not write this letter to simply complain to you, but rather let you know that you are affecting thousands of people's lives. Many of us have the passion and cannot wait to become teachers. We are just as capable and educated as others who have passed the CSET (if not better). Please rethink the decision for the people who took their time and money out to complete this program. If you do not overturn this decision I will take the test with a positive attitude, and if I do not pass on the first time I will continue to take it until I pass. I know with or without this test I will be an excellent teacher.

Sincerely,
Jessica Orton

Candidate Response

Leslie R. Johnson
303 W. Whiting Avenue
Fullerton, CA 92832

September 1, 2003

Dear Ms. Fortune,

Re: Agenda Item GS-10-D)

An unfair decision needs to be re-thought and changed concerning the CA State Board of Education's Plan to phase-out waivers regarding the MSAT Waiver Program.

MSAT Waiver Program (MSMPP): The students who made the decision to pay for the extra year of classes, learn and pass the material, and sign the 5 year state recognized contract rather than take the MSAT exam, need in all fairness to be exempt from being CSEST tested.

This hard earned MSAT Waiver should not be tossed aside as a wasted invalid decision. It was made in good faith by many students in an effort to learn more thoroughly about each subject. It cost more in tuition, book and material fees, as well as extra time and effort.

Give the individuals who completed the MSAT Waiver Program what they were promised.

If a student passed the MSAT test before 8/03, they are currently exempt from paying for and taking the new CSET test. The MSAT Waiver Program students need to be afforded the same CSET test exemption as the individuals who took and passed the MSAT exam.

Sincerely,

Leslie R. Johnson
Preschool Teacher
Tiny Tot's Imagination Station

Candidate Response

August 29, 2003

Ms. Fortune,

I realize most of your letters will contain content concerning the Commission's decision to discontinue waivers and how it will adversely affect various school districts. However, the letters included in this envelope address a different concern; one that will affect the Multiple Subject Waiver graduates. Despite the different graduation dates, we all have something in common. Each of us feel we are being unfairly forced into taking the CSET exam.

When we entered the Cal State Fullerton MSMPP (Multiple Subject Matter Preparation Program) we signed a contract. This contract stated the program was, "**recognized by the California Commission for Teacher Credentialing**" and upon completion our certificate would, "**document your subject matter competency.**" This is the exact reason of passing the MSAT exam; to document your subject matter competency. And as I understand, the CSET holds the same objective as well. Therefore, if students graduated the same year as I, and I passed the MSMPP waiver expectations while they passed the MSAT, shouldn't we BOTH be exempt from taking the CSET. ..not just the MSAT graduates?! Myself and many other people do not understand your basis and reasoning for this decision. I think it is extremely unfair and I hope you reconsider.

Also included in this envelope are several letters further explaining their opinion towards the new decision to force us into taking the CSET exam. Copies of all the "misleading" documents we received while in the program are included as well. After reviewing each of the contents, I hope you realize that we are equally competent as the MSAT students (if not more). Thank you for taking us into consideration.

Sincerely,

Brie Johnson

Candidate Response

September 2, 2003

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Jessica Roseborough. I completed a B.A. degree in Liberal Studies in May 2003 at California State University, Fullerton. At the same time, I met the requirements for the MSMPP waiver. The waiver consisted of several difficult classes that pertained to the teaching profession, such as: Math, Art, Dance, Kinesiology, and Grammar. There was not only a struggle to increase my knowledge of the subject matter, but also a financial struggle. Taking those classes taught me much more about how to teach than a single test could ever accomplish. To say that each waiver candidate has to take the CSET is to say that our time, money, and efforts do not mean anything to legislators.

America's future rests in the hands of its educators. A single standardized test is not going to improve California's teaching capabilities. Thank you for taking the time to consider our plight, and participating in the democratic process to change future lives for the better.

Sincerely,

Jessica L. Roseborough

Candidate Response

September 3, 2003

Dear Margaret Fortune,

I am writing in regards to Agenda Item GS-10-D, which requires all credential candidates to pass the CSET before they receive their credential.

I am a current student in UC Davis' multiple subject credential program. I graduated from Sonoma State last year where I took courses in MSAT Waiver Program. Individuals who completed the MSAT Waiver Program should be given what they were promised. Students who completed a MSAT Waiver Program paid for an extra year of classes, learned and met all the requirements for the classes, and signed a five year state recognized contract.

Credential candidates who have already completed an MSAT Waiver Program before August 2003 should be exempt from paying for and taking the CSET exam. Please change Agenda Item GS-10-D to exempt MSAT Waiver Program graduates. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ambi Gardner

Candidate Response

September 2, 2003

Margaret Fortune, Chair,
California Commission on Teaching Credentialing

I am writing to voice my concern about the recent proposal to phase out emergency permits and waivers. While earning my Bachelor's Degree, I took an additional 39 units to waive me from taking the MSAT. I felt the information I gained from these additional classes would be far more valuable to my future as a teacher than taking a test. Now that I have entered the credential program at California State University, Fullerton, I was informed that I am required to take the CSET despite my completion of the MSMPP. It surprised me to hear this proposal would not exempt the entering credential students who had already completed the MSMPP. It seems to make more sense to grandfather in this year's students and have the following year start the CSET requirement.

With all of the added costs this school year, i.e. the tuition increase, it was very disheartening to hear about another expense I would be held responsible for. Taking the additional units to complete the MSMPP cost me considerably more than taking the MSAT but I felt that those classes were an investment in my future. As I mentioned before, I believe the waiver classes were invaluable to my career and given the chance to take them again, I would in a heartbeat. However, having an additional cost is not easy for everyone, especially since we have to complete the test this year.

The first lesson we were taught upon entering the program was that to become a teacher, we must "be flexible." I understand that this proposal falls under that need for flexibility, however, I know I speak for many of my peers in my plea to have this proposal reexamined. The credential program is a rigorous one and finding time to prepare for this test, both mentally and financially, will be difficult. Thank you so much for your time in reading this and considering these concerns.

Sincerely,

Karen Parrish

Candidate Response

September 1, 2003

Margaret Fortune, Chair,
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing,
1900 Capitol Avenue,
Sacramento, CA 95814

It has come to my attention that the MSMPP waiver will not be valid in meeting the federal requirements for becoming a credentialed teacher. I am very upset and feel as though I was miss lead. I feel that I received a highly accredited education and that the waiver courses were very impacting. I attended MSMPP evaluations and saw many counselors to guide me along this program. We had no fair warning that this was a temporary program. We were being mislead and deceived into thinking the MSMPP waiver was guaranteed and valid for up to five years of graduating. We were told in writing that the MSMPP was “a state approved subject matter preparation program that substitutes for the MSAT”. The waiver was an extra 84 units and cost me tuition, books, and time not working. I was awarded my MSMPP last year and feel very strongly that my accomplishments should be valid.

Thank you for your time,

Jennifer Kathleen Pewthers

California State University

B.S. Child and Adolescent Studies

Candidate Response

I am an LAUSD teacher, though I started out as a substitute. I have been teaching for over five years, and am currently in my sixth year. I have 17 years of foreign country experience, of which 10 years have been accepted by the district. I currently have a preliminary single subject teaching credential under my belt, and am in the process of retrieving multiple subject teaching credential. In June I registered in the MSAT/CSET waiver program at National University. With the recent policies, as I am sure you are well updated on, the waver program has been impeded by the "No Child Left Behind" program. I asked my counselors at CSUN, and was informed that I can still be waved from taking the CSET. But, rummer has it, amongst my peers, that we are all automatically ineligible. In consternation, I now look for a third, and hopefully decisive voice. Please clarify this matter, since I can still continue on taking my waver courses.

Appendix B

Proposed Draft Language for Options (1a) and (1b)

Option 1(a) Proposed Elementary Subject Matter Program Standard 6 presented August 14, 2003

The subject matter program includes a rigorous, uniform, culminating summative assessment. Each prospective multiple subject candidate is required to demonstrate compliance with Public Law 107-110: No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), through passage of a subject matter examination as certified by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Required Elements for proposed *Standard 6: Culminating Assessment of Subject Matter Competence*:

- 6.1 Each candidate is required to demonstrate subject matter competence to a comparable statewide standard across the range of subject matter required by Education Code Section 51210 and incorporated in the *Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve* and state *Curriculum Frameworks*, focusing on grades K through 8. Areas of study include reading, language and literature; history and social science; mathematics; science; visual and performing arts; physical education; and human development.
- 6.2 The culminating summative assessment is rigorous and appropriately covers the range of subject matter defined in Program Standard 2 and the content specifications for the *Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential*.
- 6.3 The uniform, systematic procedures that govern the culminating summative assessment includes a defensible process for evaluating performance (according to the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing, 1999*), an assessment score appeal process, and a procedure for prospective teachers to repeat portions of the subject matter assessment.
- 6.4 The sponsoring institution ensures that each teacher candidate is notified of the culminating assessment requirement and that thorough records are maintained of each prospective teacher's summative assessment scores.
- 6.5 The sponsoring institution acts on assessment evaluation findings, ensuring a uniform and equitable assessment of prospective candidates' subject matter competence. Where indicated by the findings of the evaluation, the sponsoring institution makes changes to curriculum programs, processes, or procedures to assist students in meeting the passing standard of the culminating subject matter assessment.

Option 1(b) Requires and Additional Elementary Subject Matter Program Precondition

Each program of elementary subject matter preparation will verify passage by each candidate of the Commission approved subject matter examination for elementary teachers.

Option 1(1a) or (1b) Revises Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard 17 Program Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence

Qualified members of the professional teacher preparation program determine and document the satisfactory qualifications and developmental readiness of each candidate prior to (1) being given

instructional responsibilities with K-12 students and (2) being given daily whole-class instructional responsibilities in a K-12 school.

Program Elements for Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence

- 17(a) Prior to being given daily responsibility for whole class instruction in a K-12 school, each candidate fulfills the state basic skills requirement, and also verifies completion of subject matter competence, with the exception of candidates in a blended/integrated program, who must meet the four fifths state subject matter completion requirement.

Appendix C

Proposed Draft Language for Option 2

(Revised Professional Teacher Preparation Program Precondition)

- (5) Program Admission.** The sponsor of a multiple or single subject teacher preparation program assesses each candidate's standing in relation to required subject matter preparation during the admissions process. The program admits only those candidates who meet one of the following criteria. *Reference: Education Code Sections 44227 (a).*
- For Multiple or Single Subject programs, the candidate provides evidence of having passed the appropriate subject matter examination(s).
 - ~~The candidate provides evidence of having attempted the appropriate subject matter examinations(s).~~
 - ~~The candidate provides evidence of registration for the next scheduled examination.~~
 - For Single Subject programs, the candidate provides evidence of having completed a Commission approved appropriate subject matter preparation program.
 - For Single Subject programs, the candidate provides evidence of continuous progress toward meeting the subject matter requirement.
 - For Single Subject programs, the candidate provides evidence of enrollment in an organized subject matter examination preparation program.

(Revised Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard)

Program Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence

Qualified members of the professional teacher preparation program determine and document the satisfactory qualifications and developmental readiness of each candidate prior to (1) being given instructional responsibilities with K-12 students and (2) being given daily whole-class instructional responsibilities in a K-12 school.

Program Elements for Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence

- 17(a) Prior to being given daily responsibility for whole class instruction in a K-12 school, each candidate fulfills the state basic skills requirement, and also verifies completion of subject matter competence, with the exception of candidates in a blended/integrated program, who must meet the four fifths state subject matter completion requirement.

Appendix D

Proposed Draft Language for Option 3

(New Professional Teacher Preparation Program Precondition)

- (6) Subject Matter Proficiency.** The approved teacher preparation program sponsor determines that each candidate meets the subject matter requirement before student teaching, with the exception of candidates in a blended/integrated program, who must meet the four fifths state subject matter completion requirement. *Reference: Education Code Sections 44259 (b) (5).*
- For Multiple Subject programs, the candidate provides evidence of having passed the appropriate subject matter examination(s).
 - For Single Subject programs, the candidate provides evidence of having passed the appropriate subject matter examination(s).or having completed the appropriate Commission subject matter preparation program, or a course of study deemed equivalent by the program sponsor.

(Revised Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard)

Program Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence

Qualified members of the professional teacher preparation program determine and document the satisfactory qualifications and developmental readiness of each candidate prior to (1) being given instructional responsibilities with K-12 students and (2) being given daily whole-class instructional responsibilities in a K-12 school.

Program Elements for Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence

- 17(a) Prior to being given daily responsibility for whole class instruction in a K-12 school, each candidate fulfills the state basic skills requirement, and also verifies completion of subject matter competence, with the exception of candidates in a blended/integrated program, who must meet the four fifths state subject matter completion requirement.

Appendix E

Proposed language for Option 4

(Revised Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standard)

Program Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence

Qualified members of the professional teacher preparation program determine and document the satisfactory qualifications and developmental readiness of each candidate prior to (1) being given instructional responsibilities with K-12 students and (2) being given daily whole-class instructional responsibilities in a K-12 school.

Program Elements for Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities in the Fieldwork Sequence

- 17(a) Prior to being given daily responsibility for whole class instruction in a K-12 school, each candidate fulfills the state basic skills requirement, and also verifies completion of subject matter competence, with the exception of candidates in a blended/integrated program, who must meet the four fifths state subject matter completion requirement.

(Revised Professional Teacher Preparation Program Precondition)

- (7) **Completion of Requirements.** A college or university or school district that operates a program for the Multiple or Single Subject Credential shall determine, prior to recommending a candidate for the credential, that the candidate meets all legal requirements for the credential, including but not limited to: *Reference: Education Code Sections 44259 (b) and 44283 (b) (8).*
- The possession of a baccalaureate or higher degree other than in professional education from a regionally accredited institution;
 - The passage of the California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST);
 - The completion of an accredited professional preparation program;
 - The completion of the subject matter requirement; (for Multiple Subject candidates, the passage of the elementary subject matter examination)
 - The demonstration of knowledge of the principles and provisions of the Constitution of the United States;
 - Passage of the Teaching Performance Assessment;
 - For Multiple Subject candidates, passage of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA).

