
7B

Information/Action

Fiscal Policy and Planning Committee of the Whole

Proposed Budget Change Proposals/Concepts For the 2006-07 Governor's Budget

Executive Summary: This agenda item is intended to present the proposed Fiscal Year 2006-07 Budget Change Proposals/Concepts (BCP) as related to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. If approved, the proposals/concepts will be developed into full BCPs and submitted to the Department of Finance in September, as part of the traditional FY 2006-07 budget development process.

Recommended Action: Staff is seeking the approval to develop these proposal/concepts into full BCP's that will be submitted to the Department of Finance as part of the FY 2006-07 Budget Development process.

Presenter: Crista Hill, Division Director, Fiscal and Business Services Section

Strategic Plan Goal:

Continue to refine the coordination between Commissioners and staff in carrying out the Commission's duties, roles and responsibilities.

- ◆ Conduct periodic review of the efficiency of the day-to-day operations and financial accountability of the Commission

Proposed Budget Change Proposals/Concepts For the 2006-07 Governor's Budget

Introduction

Staff will present the proposed 2006-07 Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) in the form of brief one-to-two page summaries for the Members of the Commission to take action in August 2005. The approved BCP summaries will be developed into full BCPs for submittal to the Department of Finance by the September 13, 2005 deadline.

Background

The BCPs for Fiscal Year 2006-07 include the following proposals/concepts:

- The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission), on behalf of the State of California has applied for a federal Comprehensive Center Program grant under the Comprehensive Center Program through the U.S. Department of Education Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. The five-year \$12.0 million grant would be for the establishment of a National Content Center on Teacher Quality. This Budget Change Proposal would seek authority to expend these federal funds through fiscal year 2010-2011, should the grant be awarded.

- The Commission would seek \$355,000 in additional resources to enable the Commission to resume full implementation of its accreditation system based upon a revised *Accreditation Framework* to be adopted by the Commission.

The proposed 2006-07 BCPs summaries are provided on the next pages for your review.

Staff is available to answer any questions the Members of the Commission may have.

**BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL SUMMARY
FISCAL YEAR 2006-07**

PROPOSED TITLE: **National Content Center for Teacher Quality**

SUMMARY:

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission), on behalf of the State of California has applied for a federal Comprehensive Center Program grant under the Comprehensive Center Program through the U.S. Department of Education Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. The five-year \$12.0 million grant would be for the establishment of a National Content Center on Teacher Quality. This Budget Change Proposal would seek authority to expend these federal funds through fiscal year 2010-2011, should the grant be awarded. According to the timeline identified in the application, notification of the awards is anticipated by September 30, 2005.

Issue Statement:

New research, new credentialing standards, and new teacher recruitment, preparation, and induction practices have been taking place around the nation to address urgent issues of Teacher Quality. The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) has pushed these efforts to the forefront of national attention. Nowhere have teacher quality initiatives and reforms been more extensively implemented than in the State of California and no single state or organization has more experience or more overall expertise in the entire learning to teach continuum than does California. The Commission's systemic reform of its credential structure and its alignment of teacher preparation standards with State adopted academic content standards for K-12 students makes it uniquely qualified to establish a national center on teacher quality that would assist other states in addressing teacher quality. It is for these reasons that, with the support of the Secretary for Education Alan Bersin, the Commission, and the San Diego County Office of Education (SDCOE) as a key partner, has applied for a grant from the U. S. Department of Education (USDOE) to establish a comprehensive center program that would support regional centers working with states to improve teacher quality.

Concept:

The application for the Content Center on Teacher Quality represents the combined expertise, experience and capacity of a uniquely broad-based, collaborative nationwide partnership to operate a full-service, one-stop Teacher Quality Center that will assist, through regional centers, all states and districts in the nation with the full-range of issues relating to teacher quality and to the need for Highly Qualified Teachers who can help students (especially Special Education and students at risk) meet NCLB academic achievement requirements. The goals, objectives and outcomes of the Center will be to assist Regional Centers (to be established under a separate federal grant program) and States to identify teacher quality needs; to access through technology research-based, best and promising practices for the recruitment, selection, hiring, retention, induction, support, mentoring, and professional development of teachers, teacher leaders, and administrators in accordance with NCLB Teacher Quality goals; to use benchmarking

and data analysis tools to measure progress against NCLB Teacher Quality goals from initial baseline; to participate in focused training and individualized technical assistance in each of the NCLB Teacher Quality goals areas; to develop the internal capacity to promote infrastructure, policy and practices that support NCLB Teacher Quality goals within states and districts; to learn from each other and from researchers, experts, experienced practitioners, and the USDOE through targeted national conferences and other Center-sponsored events focusing on NCLB Teacher Quality goals, and to develop the capacity as a result of their work with the Teacher Quality Center to move forward on their own once the federal funding has ended. At least 50 percent of the Center's efforts will be in the area of teacher quality as it relates to special education issues and to assisting special education students to meet NCLB academic achievement goals.

Benefits:

This grant program would enable California to gain national recognition as a leader in teacher quality. In recent years, California has strengthened teacher preparation by establishing a two-tiered credentialing system and adopting standards for teacher preparation that are aligned and congruent with the state's academic content standards for students. From the acquisition of subject matter knowledge, through the development of pedagogical skills and the enhancement of teaching practice, California has established a learning to teach continuum that is producing highly qualified teachers for our public schools. Many administrators have indicated that the new teachers emerging from this reformed system are among the best prepared and most effective teachers they have ever seen. The establishment of a National Center of Teacher Quality, would help other states develop the capacity to implement similar reforms and enhance teacher quality.

Justification:

If funded, this grant would provide the Commission with \$12.0 million in federal funds over a five year period. This BCP would seek authority to expend these funds on the activities proposed in the grant application and to contract with the SDCOE to operate the Content Center on Teacher Quality.

BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS:

The Commission will contract with the SDCOE to operate the center. For each year of the grant, the Commission will retain a portion of federal funds for costs associated with grant oversight including indirect costs, a small grant for web-hosting, and professional staff. Due to differences between federal fiscal years and state fiscal years, the expenditures for the federal funds will continue into the 2010-2011 state fiscal year. Should the grant be awarded this fall, the Commission will submit a separate request to the Department of Finance for increased expenditure authority in the current fiscal year. The estimated fiscal allocations are contained in Table 1. The estimated expenditures are contained in Table 2.

Table 1:
Estimated Appropriations of Federal Funds

Year	Grant Year	Federal Budget Year	Months	Federal Allocation	State Budget Year	State Appropriation	Carryover to BY
05-06	1	1/1/06-9/30/06	9	2,000,000	7/1/05 - 6/30/06	1,333,333	666,667
06-07	2	10/1/06 - 9/30/07	12	2,500,000	7/1/06 - 6/30/07	2,541,667	625,000
07-08	3	10/1/07 - 9/30/08	12	2,500,000	7/1/07 - 6/30/08	2,500,000	625,000
08-09	4	10/1/08 - 9/30/09	12	2,500,000	7/1/08 - 6/30/09	2,500,000	625,000
09-10	5	10/1/09 - 12/31/10	15	2,500,000	7/1/09 - 6/30/10	2,500,000	625,000
10-11					7/1/10 - 6/30/11	625,000	0
Totals				\$12,000,000		\$12,000,000	

Table 2:
Estimated Expenditures of Federal Funds

Year	Grant Year	Expenditures		Total Expenditures
		CTC	SDCOE	
05-06	1	512,583	820,750	1,333,333
06-07	2	793,479	1,748,187	2,541,666
07-08	3	716,250	1,783,750	2,500,000
08-09	4	716,250	1,783,750	2,500,000
09-10	5	785,063	1,714,937	2,500,000
10-11	6	196,250	428,750	625,000
Totals		\$3,719,876	\$8,280,124	\$12,000,000

**BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSAL SUMMARY
FISCAL YEAR 2006-07**

PROPOSED TITLE: Implementation of the Commission's Accreditation Framework

SUMMARY:

This proposal would seek \$355,000 in additional resources to enable the Commission to resume full implementation of its accreditation system based upon a revised *Accreditation Framework* to be adopted by the Commission.

Issue Statement:

The Commission adopted its current *Accreditation Framework* in 1994 based upon Senate Bill 655 (Chapter 426, Statutes of 1993). At that time, the original program evaluation process was replaced by a professional accreditation process that evaluated individual credential programs in the context of the institution as a whole. The law also established a Committee on Accreditation to implement the system and act as a professional accreditation decision-making body. The statute required the completion of an external evaluation of the system that was completed in 2003. Subsequently, the Commission, in conjunction with its Committee on Accreditation and interested stakeholders, initiated a review of the *Accreditation Framework* to consider if changes should be made in the policies and procedures that guide the accreditation system. Because the Commission was completing its review of the accreditation system and because the department was at the same time facing significant fiscal constraints the Commission voted in December 2002 to postpone state accreditation visits while the was being completed. In the intervening time, the Commission's fiscal situation has further declined. In addition, to reduced revenue, the Commission has been faced with a number of staff reductions due to the overall state fiscal crisis. Both the Governor's California Performance Review and the report from the Bureau of State Audits have urged the Commission to resume a full accreditation visit schedule. While the Commission would like to fully resume accreditation visits as soon as is feasible, the necessary funding to support the resumption of a full accreditation system is not available within the current resources.

Concept:

The Commission has asked the Committee on Accreditation and an Accreditation Study Work Group to assist in the review of the accreditation system and to consider options for revision of the system. On the basis of that work, the Commission will be adopting a revised *Accreditation Framework* in the next few months. It is anticipated that the revised system will have a stronger focus on accountability and program improvement. Ongoing activities such as the regular collection of data (including data related to candidate performance) and the use of data in making decisions about program improvement, and reviews between accreditation visits are expected to be part of the revised system.

Benefits:

Currently, only 20 institutions who are seeking initial or continuing accreditation with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) are participating in an accreditation system. The major benefit of the full resumption of the accreditation system would be to insure that all 96 program sponsors are held accountable for the quality of the programs they offer and for the competence of program graduates.

Justification:

In order to fully implement a revised accreditation system, it will be necessary for the Commission to have additional resources. Current revenues are insufficient for the Commission to carry out its powers and duties regarding an accreditation system. Accreditation is the means by which the Commission can assure policy makers and the public of the quality of educator preparation programs. It is also the means by which the Commission can ensure that teacher preparation programs are aligned to the State’s K-12 Academic Content Standards. To administer the accreditation system, the Commission staff would need to train and calibrate a cadre of volunteer reviewers, conduct accreditation visits, support the Committee on Accreditation, and coordinate review activities between site visit cycles.

BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS:

For the Commission to carryout the proposed accreditation responsibilities, it is estimated that the total cost is \$895,000 annually. Of that amount, \$355,000 is for costs associated with training reviewers, conducting 12-15 accreditation visits each year and 12-15 program reviews, and supporting the meetings of the Committee on Accreditation. The remaining \$540,000 will come from existing resources for staff time to administer the accreditation responsibilities. Table 1 reflects the estimated costs of the accreditation system.

*Table 1:
Annual Projected Accreditation System Costs*

Activity	Annual Cost	% of Cost
BIR Training	\$50,000	14 %
Program Review (4 th year)	\$65,000	18 %
Pre-visits (site visit in next fiscal year)	\$16,000	5 %
Focused, Further Information Needed, and Revisits	\$27,000	8 %
Site Visits (6 th year)	\$117,000	32 %
COA	\$80,000	23 %
	\$355,000	100%

The BCP would seek \$355,000 in additional expenditure authority for the training, conducting visits, and supporting the Committee on Accreditation projected costs.