

---

# 11

## Action

### *Public Hearing*

## Proposed Amendments and Additions to 5 California Code of Regulations Pertaining to Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials

---

### AGENDA INSERT

**Executive Summary:** Proposed amendments pertaining to Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials are presented for public hearing.

**Recommended Action:** Staff recommends the Commission adopt the amendments and additions of regulations concerning Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials with changes included in the insert.

**Presenter:** Terri H. Fesperman, Consultant, Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

#### Strategic Plan Goal: 1

#### Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- ◆ Grant credentials, certificates and permits as set out in regulation and statute

August 2009

---

# Proposed Amendments and Additions to 5 California Code of Regulations Pertaining to Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials

---

## Updated Tally of Responses

As of July 13, the Commission had received the following written responses to the public announcement:

<i><b>Support</b></i>	<i><b>Opposition</b></i>
5 personal opinions	6 personal opinions
6 organizational opinions	1 organizational opinion
<i>(one individual sent in new response after 7/13 so personal opinion in opposition is one less than 7/13 Agenda item)</i>	

As of August 3, the Commission had received the following additional written responses to the public announcement:

<i><b>Support</b></i>	<i><b>Opposition</b></i>
69 additional personal opinions	122 additional personal opinions
55 additional organizational opinions	7 additional organizational opinions

<b>Grand Total Responses: 271</b>	
<i><b>Support</b></i>	<i><b>Opposition</b></i>
74 personal opinions	128 personal opinions
61 organizational opinions	8 organizational opinions
<i><b>Total: 135 responses in support</b></i>	<i><b>Total: 136 in opposition</b></i>

### ***Additional Responses Representing Individuals in Support***

1. Lorie Shirley, Credential Supervisor, Imperial County Office of Education
2. Randy Murphy, Administrator, Los Angeles Unified School District
3. Virginia Yee, Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
4. Derek Ramage, Coordinator, Los Angeles Unified School District
5. Donald Hafeman, Recruitment Assistant Director, Los Angeles Unified School District
6. Vanessa Franklin, Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
7. Deborah Ignagni, Human Resources Administrator, Los Angeles Unified School District
8. Colleen Mori, Assistant Director, Los Angeles Unified School District
9. Tracy Calderon, Credentials & Contracts Supervisor, Los Angeles Unified School District
10. Sally Buchanan, Credentials & Contracts Supervisor, Los Angeles Unified School District
11. Arnold Weiner, Los Angeles Unified School District

12. Carolina Rangel, Credentials Supervisor, Los Angeles Unified School District
13. David Dill, Assistant Director SECEO, Los Angeles Unified School District
14. Monica Mora, Credentials & Contracts Assistant, Los Angeles Unified School District
15. Rozanne M. Haege, Human Resources Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
16. Luz Ortega, Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
17. Denise Robert, Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
18. Imelda Fruto, Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
19. Marjorie Josaphat, Placement & Assignments Director, Los Angeles Unified School District
20. John R. Swinford, Human Resources Certificated Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
21. Maria Salazar, Personnel Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
22. James Brumitt, Personnel Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
23. Timothy Faulkner, Personnel Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
24. Gayle B. Glazer, Personnel Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
25. Celia Domingue-Pettus, Placement & Assignments Assistant Director, Los Angeles Unified School District
26. Ezequiel Gonzalez, Field Specialist Human Resources Division, Los Angeles Unified School District
27. Karol Mills-Marburg, Personnel Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
28. Andres Equikua, Personnel Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
29. Jorge Amador, Human Resources Personnel Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
30. Carolyn Wahlberg, Personnel Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
31. Theresa Jocley, Personnel Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
32. Vicki Shenkman, Specialist, Los Angeles Unified School District
33. Shelton B. Yip, SELPA Administrator, Sacramento City Unified School District
34. Linda MacDonell, Assistant Superintendent, Orange County Department of Education
35. Stephanie Holzman, Director--Curriculum, Standards and Instruction, Orange County Department of Education
36. Patricia Sheehan, Coordinator, Orange County Department of Education
37. Judith C. Levinsohn, Coordinator BBA, Orange County Department of Education
38. Sherry Opacic, Director, Orange County Department of Education
39. Lynn Crutchley, District Intern Program Advisor, Orange County Department of Education
40. Enid Brinkman, Credentials & Retirement Supervisor, Tulare County Office of Education
41. Lanna Andrews, Associate Professor, University of San Francisco
42. Kathryn I. Benson, Human Resources Director, Pleasanton Unified School District
43. Carol Canfield, Parent
44. Charles C. Young, Parent

45. John Snavely, Superintendent, Porterville Unified School District
46. Courtney Kistler, Long Term Substitute, Anaheim Union High School
47. Caron Mellblom-Nishioka, Professor and Co-Chair of TED for Special Education, California State University, Dominguez Hills
48. Ruth McGrath, Educator (*No Affiliation Listed*)
49. Joan Thomas Heynen, Consultant & Retired Director of Special Education, East San Gabriel Valley SELPA
50. Jack Haze Kamp, Teacher/Retired Consultant, California Department of Education
51. Rita Bien Hutchins, Principal/Coordinator, Riverside Office of Education
52. Louise May, Parent
53. Kathy Kinley, Design Team Member
54. Irene W. Parker, Retired Schoolteacher
55. Delores D. Brown, Head of School, The Help Group
56. Merrilee Johnson, Assistant Superintendent, Glenn County Office of Education
57. Mary Becker, Assistant Education Director, Northpoint School
58. Kathy LeBreton, M.S., Educational Director, Northpoint School
59. Vivian St. Amant, Retired VI Teacher, CRTA
60. Jan Powell, Coordinator/Principal, Riverside County Office of Education
61. Anita Rincon, Mother of ADHD child
62. Susie Andrews, Human Resources Director, Yolo County Office of Education  
*Comment:* I am in support of the special education regulation being proposed.
63. Cecilia Vohs  
*Comment:* I strongly agree with CTC's decision in developing a position to help Speech-Language Communication Specialists
64. Jeanne Nava, Human Resources Assistant Superintendent, Tulare County Office of Education  
*Comment:* I am in support for the special education teaching and service credentials being proposed. Thanks to the committee who were on the special education work group for proposing them.
65. Roy L. Applegate, Butte County SELPA Director, Butte County Office of Education  
*Comment:* I wanted to register my support of the new regulations for the special education credentials under consideration for approval. Both the changes in regards to service for students with autism and the Communication Specialist credentials provide new flexibility for districts and county office to recruit and employ qualified staff to serve our students. We increasingly are finding it very challenging to find individuals qualified for these services and we need to have as large a pool of qualified staff possible. The new proposed regulations will help expand the reach of potential candidates for vacant positions and increase flexibility in who can serve what students in special education. Most of my colleagues in the field also support these new changes as well. Best of luck in passing through these new regulations.

66. Valerie Flatt, Senior Credential Analyst, San Mateo County Office of Education  
*Comment:* I am in support of the proposed Communication Development Credential. I believe that the addition of this authorization to the range of services that are provided to Special Needs Students in California would be invaluable to employers, and provide to students a much needed type of support that is difficult to obtain in the classroom.
67. Joan Bogaty, Program Administrator, Rossier Park Schools, Non Public Schools  
*Comment:* I am in support to the special education regulation being proposed by adding ASD to all special education credential authorizations, it assures that students identified with ASD will be served in all environments with educators who possess the skills to do so effectively.
68. Leah Garratt, Assistant Superintendent/SELPA Director, Mono County Office of Education  
*Comment:* This email is to express support of the Education Specialist: Communication Development authorization. Because we are a small, sparse frontier SELPA we struggle yearly to serve our special needs children because of a lack of Speech Language Pathologists available. I urge the commission to approve this authorization.
69. Jelyn Gaskell  
*Comment:* I was just forwarded this from my niece who is a grad student at CSU Sac in Speech, please forward this one on to your board members:

Last year I had a job cleaning up a huge mess that a fully licensed SLP from UOP with her own private practice made after 9 years at the school district. I am in online grad school still. But I have 10 years of experience in special education programs. I had to assess 80 full speech assessments and had 92 IEP's an ungodly amount of work. (I was on a waiver) (PLS4,TOLDI4,ELF4,TOLDP4,SSI-4,GMFT2,Structured ARTIC, TACL3,and more assessment were used, but I have a very excellent background in diagnostics and because of my psych assessment grad coursework and training (SJSU and UOP), I have a very deep understanding of how tests are designed and how validity construction is tested and assessment statistical parameters,etc) I worked on the weekends to clean up the mess created by the fully licensed person; and WHY did this MESS happen? Because the fully licensed credentialed SLP person who had that job was busy RUNNING HER OWN CLINIC on the side.

Here is what is really happening to school districts. First, the added hours and stress of completing the medical clinical part of the SLP license is put on and results as a reduction of work in the school districts. Then the SLP's find out that how easy it is to make all that extra money and collect a salary from the district with benefits, and not do a good job for the school districts, but they keep that job and cheat the district out of paid time!!!!

I also have watched the videos you all at SAC State (with my niece from her classes) have had to review of the clinical sessions as part of your undergrad coursework. I was appalled at what the clinical supervisor allowed to occur. There was no organization of or implementation of behavioral and social skills constructs in the clinical sessions I viewed. There is not adequate training in a university run clinical setting which bridges an SLP over into classroom management constructs at all. SLP's as part of the program need to take alot more of the educational psychology classes, particularly when working in language pragmatics and autism setting. There needs to be more developed training on developing IEP's in an SLP program that are tailored to specific disability categories. The person in the

video I was observing seriously as a grad clinical participant needs to be sent through Fred Jones seminars for training!!! Probably all of the clinical students, if this is the quality being turned out.

In fact, SLP's should be required to have a special education credential training also as part of working in a school setting. Medical clinical training has nothing to do with a school site type construct and framework, unless you are performing swallowing therapy, or working with tubes, etc. (and even that creates a liability situation and should be done in a particular setting). School site based work is oriented toward collaboration in working to make the student successful with academics and working with the teachers and counselors. Particularly when you are performing initial screenings for entrance into Special Education or IDEA/ as many SELPA's use this as an excuse to get a kid under the Special Education umbrella for other services which increases the cost to the school district for services to appease a parent that diagnostically, those services are shown to not be needed. It is the guise to appease a demanding parent, which is part of the reason this state is bankrupt and have huge education costs.

I see this credential as a very practical solution. I also think ASHA /CSHA needs to revise their undergrad and graduate curriculum and training mandates to create a solution for getting business done in school districts. School districts are suffering because of what is being allowed to occur in this state.

In other states, there are tiered credentials systems and particular requirements to match upper tiers of credentials under special education frameworks which get these jobs filled.

Yes this is very blunt and to the point, but I have worked in the trenches, and believe me, a newly graduated SLP would NOT have to been able to hack it, what I did last year to clean the huge mess up. Perform formal assessments, re-diagnose, re-assess, enter all the IEP's customized to the child's specific disability, enter all the data into the SEIS system, balance the entire caseload out by the end of the year, yes and write formal speech reports for this situation on each child studied. Even on the annuals (15) I used Dr. Secord's SCAT and CAAP system with full data and mini report, so there was statistical tracking capabilities for improvement on the goals to be met. Prior the SLP had never even entered the IEP's into the SEIS system, and if she did, she screwed up all the dates. I had to reset all the dates in the system. Any new grad student-they would have whined alot and then quit in their air of SLP arrogance which is created by their grad school telling them they are so great and now you can do any speech assignment (My niece has the attitude, but it's cute-wait till reality sets in). Last year, I found no formal assessments for Tri's for over 5-6 years on alot of the kids, no exits on the caseloads (85 in Aug.08 and I got it down to 50 by year end), inadequate therapy sessions, major absences by the SLP because she was too busy taking care of her clinic. Pretty pathetic. And she hid it all from management until she finally had so many complaints from parents and then the district asked her to leave (after 9 years of this). Then I got there and raised the roof on it. At first no one believed me what a huge mess there was. Now, everyone in the SELPA knows what happened. And it happens in all school districts in CA no matter how well they are run, they (SLP's with their own practices) get away with it. There should be a letter signed prior to employment if they have their own clinic they are to comply with certain particulars if they are going to run

their own clinic and keep the job. So the district can go against the SLP for situations like what I encountered last year. The school districts are suffering!!

So, I think it is good to have someone out of the "great realm of protected SLPdom" to go in and see what is really going on in these districts. It will be a great wake-up call on ASHA/CSHA. In fact I think you need to appoint a special audit team to go in and audit speech only in Special Ed. It is really sad what is going on.

After I started to let the Supt. know what bad shape it was in, the district underwent a self-audit and found out alot of awful things that were happening. It is all corrected, and it was a lot of work and it took alot of people to fix all of it.

So this is why I am sending this email to the School Board to read.

If you want to contact me about this, email me. Or my cell phone is xxx-xxx-xxxx. I still have a year left in my speech program, but I think I could cut it if I had to go in and clean up another place. For now though, I have accepted a job out of state for this next year, until this state gets it's act together. I have credentials in 3 states.

### ***Additional Responses Representing Organizations in Support***

1. Modoc County Office of Education, Peter Curren, SELPA Assistant Superintendent
2. CAPSES, Janeth Rodriguez, Director of Communication & Operations
3. Association of California School Administrators, Maureen O. Burness, SELPA Director
4. El Dorado County Office of Education, Betsy A. Christ, Executive Director
5. San Bernardino County Support of Schools, Bruce Kitchen, CTC/School District Liaison
6. Catherine Kearney, Ed.D., Director Teacher Development, San Joaquin County Office of Education
7. California Association of Professors of Special Education (CAPSE), Rande Webster, CAPSE President and Dominican University of California Special Ed. Programs
8. Beaumont Unified School District, Steve Hovey, Personnel Assistant Superintendent
9. Newport-Mesa Unified School District, Elizabeth I. Novack, Human Resources Assistant Superintendent

*Comment:* As the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources for the Newport-Mesa Unified School District, I am most appreciative of the work that has been done over the past several years to review and update the Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials and support the changes that are being processed.

I especially commend and support the Commission's addition of the Education Specialist-Communication Development authorization. This new authorization will provide much needed support to the students that we serve and will help to alleviate the communication development issues that hold some students from succeeding in the early grades.

10. Franklin-McKinley School District, John R. Porter, Jr., Superintendent

*Comment:* As the superintendent of the Franklin-McKinley School District, I am most appreciative of the work that has been done over the past several years to review and

update the Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials and support the changes that are being processed.

I especially commend and support the Commission's addition of the Education Specialist-Communication Development authorization. This new authorization will provide much needed support to the students that we serve and will help to alleviate the communication development issues that hold some students from succeeding in the early grades.

11. Fullerton School District, Mark L. Douglas, Assistant Superintendent Personnel Services

*Comment:* I am very pleased with the adjustments that are being recommended for Special Education Teaching and Service Credentials. I am one of many Orange County Assistant Superintendents of Personnel that is involved in making some of the suggestions that are now coming forward. I have been present at hearings in Sacramento and work sessions held in Orange County related to many of these adjustments and recommendations. I have appreciated the thoroughness of the process and the opportunity for people to voice their opinion.

I am most pleased with the recommendation for a Communication Development Credential to meet the needs of students who are not meeting the appropriate success levels in academic studies that are strongly impacted by literacy, communication, language development, and pragmatic skills. Our ability to maintain a student in their least restrictive environment and to utilize team approaches to instruction is invaluable. It was also great to see that these highly trained and qualified instructors will have expertise in mitigating the impacts on self-esteem and social interaction skills. This credential will be a very strong addition to the current expertise we have to help students reach their potential.

It has been somewhat disheartening to hear individuals from the Speech and Language community declare that no one will be able to evaluate and test students for communication concerns other than a Speech and Language Therapist. Other issues and concerns seem to be less about the student and more about keeping their services unique. I hope that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing can see through these issues and focus on the child. We all play a valuable role in the education of the students of California and we need to add this partner to the team of experts already in action.

In addition, I would also like to compliment the Commission on valuing the possible power and support a BTSA type model can play for any new teacher including special service credential holders. The mentoring and in District support is vital for success coupled with their highly specialized training.

Last but not least is the special consideration that has been given for working with the identified autism student. Autism has a wide spectrum that affects students at all levels. Having all special education teachers trained and able to work with students affected by autism will allow students to have their individual needs met within their restrictive instructional setting.

Congratulations on your outstanding efforts to make credentialing more user friendly in the field and effective in meeting the needs of students.

12. Butte County Office of Education, Marilyn Keeble, Assistant Superintendent

*Comment:* On behalf of the Butte County Office of Education, I am writing to express our support of the proposed Communication Development Authorization to the Education Specialist Credential. This authorization would provide flexibility within the service delivery models for students with communication delays. It would require preparation within the Institutes of Higher Education that specifically relates to supporting academic improvement through strengthening a student's ability to communicate.

In addition, the Butte County Office of Education supports the enhanced ability to recruit teachers as specialists in communication development. There is a documented shortage of credentialed classroom teachers and specialists to serve an increasing number of students with communication deficits.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our support of adding the Communication Development Authorization to the Education Specialist credential.

13. National School District, Katie Filzenger, Student Support Services Director

*Comment:* I am writing to express our support of the proposed Communication Development Authorization to the Education Specialist Credential. This authorization would provide flexibility within the service delivery models for students with communication delays. It would require preparation within the Institutes of Higher Education that specifically relates to supporting academic improvement through strengthening a student's ability to communicate.

As the Director of Special Education in a small urban district, I am acutely aware of the documented shortage of credentialed classroom teachers and specialists to serve an increasing number of students with communication deficits. We are challenged with this shortage each year as we plan for the needs of our students. This authorization will allow our district to recruit teachers as specialists in communication development. It will also allow us to find these teachers who have bilingual (Spanish) skills in order to meet the growing need of English learners.

I appreciate the opportunity to express our support of adding the Communication Disorders Authorization to the Education Specialist credential.

14. Rocklin Unified School District, Betty Di Regalo, Special Education/Special Services Director

*Comment:* As a Director of Special Education, I am writing to express our support of the proposed Communication Development Authorization to the Education Specialist Credential. This authorization would provide flexibility within the service delivery models for students with communication delays. It would require preparation within the Institutes of Higher Education that specifically relates to supporting academic improvement through strengthening a student's ability to communicate.

If this authorization is approved, my district would be able to hire teachers with this new authorization to serve students with language development needs, and re-assign our current district speech pathologists to work with students who require our expertise. My district would no longer be forced to contract with expensive private agencies to obtain needed speech and language pathologists.

At one time this past year, due to the critical shortage of speech pathologists, we were unable to hire or contract with agencies to provide speech services to our students. This authorization will help ensure that all children with language needs in the Rocklin Unified School District are appropriately served.

I appreciate the opportunity to express our support of adding the Communication Disorders Authorization to the Education Specialist credential.

15. Los Angeles Unified School District, Derek M. Ramage, Human Resources

*Comment:* The purpose of this correspondence is to provide support from Los Angeles Unified School District for the full adoption of the proposed amendments, deletions and additions to 5 California Code of Regulations pertaining to Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials. Specifically, the District strongly advocates for:

- inclusion of Autism Spectrum Disorder within all Education Specialist credential authorizations, providing the means to address the range of student abilities and needs in all environments, with effective educators
- alignment of state and federal standards that No Child Left Behind (NCLB) subject matter requirements in core academic subjects for all teachers, including special educators
- addition of the Communication Development specialty area credential, authorizing the delivery of communication and language services in a teaching setting focused on student success in the core curriculum
- establishment of a new route to earn a clear Education Specialist credential, supported through the collaboration of employers and teacher preparation programs

The Los Angeles Unified School District commends the Design Team and sub committee members, Commissioners and Commission staff for the time, thought and energy that has gone into the reauthorization of the Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials. These efforts will result in better prepared special educators, improved access to special education services, optimal delivery of quality instructional programs in a lesser restrictive environment, and most importantly, success for students with disabilities.

16. Association of California School Administrators, Sharon S. Robinson, Consultant

*Comment:* The Association of California School Administrators strongly supports the proposed additions and amendments to the Title 5 Regulations pertaining to the Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials. We have associated the thorough manner in which these changes have been developed and the extensive input that has been sought from the field and responses to this input.

In particular, we support the development of the Education Specialist, Communications Development Authorization. This has the overwhelming support of our membership. We see this as a needed addition to the services that are necessary to provide intensive, curriculum-based support to students who have difficulty with communications development. With this authorization, schools and districts will have an added resource with which to serve students. We encourage the approval of this authorization.

17. California School Board Association, Stephanie Farland, Senior Policy Consultant

*Comment* The purpose of this correspondence is to provide support from the California School Boards Association for the full adoption of the proposed amendments to California Code of Regulations pertaining to Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials.

Districts need, especially now, the flexibility to meet the needs of its special education population. The revised regulations provide support and flexibility for school districts in a way that is appropriate for all.

CSBA is supportive of all of the proposed changes, additions and edits. We specifically support the inclusion of Autism Spectrum Disorder within all Education Specialist credential authorizations, providing the means to address the range of student abilities and needs in all environments, with effective educators; the alignment of state and federal standards to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) subject matter requirements in core academic subjects for all teachers, including special educators; addition of the Communication Development specialty area credential, authorizing the delivery of communication and language services in a teaching setting focused on student success in the core curriculum; and, the establishment of a new route to earn a clear Education Specialist credential, supported through the collaboration of employers and teacher preparation programs.

CSBA would like to thank the Commission for the time, thought and energy that have gone into the reauthorization of the Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials. We thank the Commission for including the California School Boards Association in your efforts. These efforts will result in better prepared special educators and improved delivery of quality instructional programs for students with disabilities.

18. SELPA Administrators Association, Margaret Cherene, Chair

19. Modesto City Schools, Virginia Johnson, SELPA Director

20. West San Gabriel Valley SELPA, Gail Crotty, Director

21. Bakersfield City Elementary, Julius Steele, SELPA Director

22. Yuba County Office of Education, Rusty Gordon, SELPA Administrator

23. San Ramon Valley Unified School District, Karen Heilbronner, Director of Secondary Special Education

24. North Region SELPA, Suzanne A. Nelson, Director

25. San Luis Obispo County SELPA, Jill Heur, SELPA Director

26. Santa Ana Unified School District, Doreen Lohnes, Assistant Superintendent, Support Services

27. Merced County Office of Education, Susan Coston, Assistant Superintendent, SELPA Director

28. Morongo Unified School District, Kathi Papp, SELPA Director

29. East Valley SELPA, Anita Ruesterholtz, Administrator

30. El Dorado County Charter SELPA, Emi Johnson, Senior Director

31. Oakland Unified School District, Lisa Ryan Cole, Executive Director—Special Education

32. Placer County SELPA, Barbara Morton, Executive Director

33. Trinity County Office of Education, Karen Boltz, Assistant Superintendent and SELPA Director
34. Napa County SELPA, Tricia Howell, Director
35. Ventura County SELPA, Mary E. Samples, Assistant Superintendent
36. Folsom Cordova Unified School District SELPA, Maureen O. Burness, Assistant Superintendent—SELPA Director
37. West Contra Costa County Unified School District Special Education Department, Steve Collins, SELPA Director
38. Moreno Valley Unified School District, Peggy Reed, SELPA Director
39. Oakland Unified School District, Lisa Ryan Cole, Executive Director of Special Education
40. Anaheim City School District, Sherry Blakely, Director of Special Services/SELPA
41. San Diego South City County SELPA, Penny L. Valentine, Senior Director
42. Chula Vista Elementary School District, Deborah Wenbourne, Special Education and Pupil Services Director
43. Tulare City School District, Luis Castellanoz, Superintendent
44. San Mateo County SELPA, Pamela Ptacek, SELPA Administrator
45. Fremont Unified School District, Charlene Okamoto, Director
46. Burton School District, Dr. Gary Mekeel, Superintendent
47. Tehama County SELPA, Heidi A. Schueller, SELPA Director
48. Tulare Joint Union High School District, Howard Berger, Superintendent

*Comment (#18 through 48):* On behalf of the California Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators Association, I am writing to express our support of the proposed Communications Development Authorization to the Education Specialist Credential. This authorization would provide flexibility within the service delivery models for students with communication delays. It would require preparation within the Institutes of Higher Education that specifically relates to supporting academic improvement through strengthening a student's ability to communicate.

In addition, the SELPA Administrators support the enhanced ability to recruit teachers as specialists in communication development. There is a documented shortage of credentialed classroom teachers and specialists to serve an increasing number of students with communication deficits.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our support of adding the Communication Disorders Authorization to the Education Specialist credential.

49. Sonoma County SELPA, Catherine Conrado, SELPA Director
- Comment:* As a member of the California Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators Association, I am writing to express our support of the proposed Communications Development Authorization to the Education Specialist Credential. This authorization would provide flexibility within the service delivery models for students with communication delays. It would require preparation within the Institutes of Higher

Education that specifically relates to supporting academic improvement through strengthening a student's ability to communicate.

In addition, the SELPA Administrators support the enhanced ability to recruit teachers as specialists in communication development. There is a documented shortage of credentialed classroom teachers and specialists to serve an increasing number of students with communication deficits.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our support of adding the Communication Disorders Authorization to the Education Specialist credential.

50. Southwest SELPA, Bob Farran, Director

*Comment:* On behalf of the Southwest Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators Association, I am writing to express our support of the proposed Communications Development Authorization to the Education Specialist Credential. This authorization would provide flexibility within the service delivery models for students with communication delays. It would require preparation within the Institutes of Higher Education that specifically relates to supporting academic improvement through strengthening a student's ability to communicate.

In addition, the SELPA Administrators support the enhanced ability to recruit teachers as specialists in communication development. There is a documented shortage of credentialed classroom teachers and specialists to serve an increasing number of students with communication deficits. We fully respect our credentialed Speech Language Pathologist and do not see a conflict between these credentials.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our support of adding the Communication Disorders Authorization to the Education Specialist credential. We also appreciate your leadership in addressing the needs of the field.

51. Tulare County/District SELPA, Marilyn Rankin, Special Services Division Assistant Director and SELPA Administrator

*Comment:* As a member of the Tulare County/District Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA) Administrators Association, I am writing to express our support of the proposed Communications Development Authorization to the Education Specialist Credential. This authorization would provide flexibility within the service delivery models for students with communication delays. It would require preparation within the Institutes of Higher Education that specifically relates to supporting academic improvement through strengthening a student's ability to communicate.

In addition, the SELPA Administrators support the enhanced ability to recruit teachers as specialists in communication development. There is a documented shortage of credentialed classroom teachers and specialists to serve an increasing number of students with communication deficits.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our support of adding the Communication Disorders Authorization to the Education Specialist credential.

52. Special Education Administrators of County Offices (SEACO), Kim Hopko, Chair,

53. Sonoma County Office of Education, Ron Whitman, Special Education Assistant Superintendent

*Comment (# 52 & 53):* As a member of the Special Education Administrators of County Offices (SEACO), I am writing to express my support of the proposed Communications Development Authorization to the Education Specialist Credential. This authorization would provide flexibility within the service delivery models for students with communication delays. It would require preparation within the Institutes of Higher Education that specifically relates to supporting academic improvement through strengthening a student's ability to communicate.

In addition, the SEACO supports the enhanced ability to recruit teachers as specialists in communication development. There is a documented shortage of credentialed classroom teachers and specialists to serve an increasing number of students with communication deficits.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our support of adding the Communication Development Authorization to the Education Specialist credential.

54. Credential Counselors and Analyst of California (CCAC), Franell Prather, President

*Comment:* Credential Counselors and Analysts of California would like to thank the members of the Special Education Work Group and Design Team for their work. It is important to look at the needs of the children in the state and find the best possible ways to meet their needs. The proposed changes do just that.

Holders of Education Specialist Credentials must meet all program requirements for their credential including the bachelor's degree, basic skills, subject matter, teacher preparation program including student teaching and passage of the RICA exam. These preparation programs are approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and include approximately 30 semester units of course work to ensure that Education Specialist Credential holders are prepared to provide academic instructional services that meet the needs of the students they serve.

Adding the Autism Spectrum Disorders authorization to all new Education Specialist Teaching Credentials will expand the pool of authorized teachers to serve the needs of this ever growing student population. Adding the English Learner preparation as a requirement for the Education Specialist Credentials in 2007 was another step in the right direction.

This requires candidates to earn the Autism and English Language Learner authorization as a part of their initial preparation program, and requires additional advanced EL preparation as part of the Level II programs. This aligns with standards for the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials, further reduces the need for emergency permits and waivers, and assures that students that need the added support for English language development and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English get the services they need.

Holders of Education Specialist Credentials must now meet subject matter competency in a No Child Left Behind core academic area which prepares them to serve students in an instructional setting. Aligning the subject matter competency requirement with NCLB core academic subjects allows the newly credentialed teacher to move into a teaching assignment with a higher possibility of being NCLB compliant. Not only does this serve

the students well, it assures the employer they have hired a highly qualified candidate who will meet requirements for appropriate assignment.

The addition of the new teaching authorization in Communication Development will provide support to students that need communication and literacy skills instruction. Adding this new authorization to the other Education Specialist teaching authorizations in Early Childhood, Mild/Moderate and Moderate/severe Disabilities will alleviate the communication development issues that keep some students from succeeding in the early school grades. Establishing an authorization that specifically addresses communication, language, literacy and practical skills will be of great benefit to employers.

Credential Counselors and Analysts of California do not see this added authorization as a conflict to the badly needed Speech Language Pathology Credential, but as a compliment. Speech Language Pathology Credentials remain as the pathway for holders of these credentials to provide the clinical assessment and speech services to students with speech and language delay needs.

All teachers, whether general or special education, assess the educational needs of their students on a daily basis, ensuring that they have access to the core curriculum, and are progressing in their learning. The Communication Development teacher will be authorized to provide academic content instruction to students and assess their learning.

We support this work.

55. National University, School of Education, Britt Tatman Ferguson, Ph. D, Chair, Department of Special Education

*Comment:* National University supports the adoption of an Education Specialist: Communication Development authorization. Such an authorization would enable the educational institution to provide communication and language services to students in a “teaching situation,” such as the classroom with peers, in order to help students access and be successful in the core curriculum. A specialist with this authorization would perform services different from those of a speech and language therapist. Instead, the specialist would be able to provide other services related to skills in literacy, language and communication as well as services in diagnosis and remediation. Furthermore, current special education teachers who add this authorization could greatly enhance their ability to serve students better, as well as serve more students in need. We encourage the commission to adopt the authorization.

### ***Additional Responses Representing Individuals in Opposition***

1. Satoko N. Davidson, Teacher, Retired
2. Joseph Kanon, Speech Language Pathologist, San Francisco Unified School District
3. Brenda M. Potts, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
4. Holly Foster, Speech Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District Special Education Programs Department
5. Meredith L. Hoskins, Speech Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
6. Robin Hauge, Speech Language Pathologist, Lafayette School District

7. Jean Piette, JP, Educational Services, CE Provider Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board, Consumer Affairs, State of California and American Speech Language Hearing Association Continuing Professional Development Provider
8. Danielle Newberry, Speech Pathologist, Kaiser Home Health
9. Casey Williams, Speech-Language Pathologist, Cornerstone Therapies
10. Tracy Edwards, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego State University Special Education Programs Department
11. Jean M. Harrison, Speech-Language Pathologist, Redlands Unified School District
12. Christa Mandella, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
13. Melisa McCampbell, Speech Therapist, New Grad
14. Elissa S. Grobman, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
15. Sally Christian, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
16. Caroline Lee, SLP Grad Student, CSULA
17. Kristine Wadley, Speech Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
18. Julianne Ghiglieri-Cole, Speech Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
19. Gina Varela, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
20. Dina Mankowski, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
21. Melissa Mazur, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
22. Toni O'Connor, School Nurse, San Diego Unified School District
23. Deborah Clemm, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
24. Lorena Yee-Catano, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
25. Poorani Doonan, Speech-Language Pathologist, Private Practice/Self-Employed
26. Sally Ann Geiss, Speech-Language Pathologist & Assistant Professor, Chapman University
27. Carol Murphy, Owner—Speech & Learning Service
28. Ashley M. Rudd, Student (MS SLP)
29. Shelley H. Ross (*No Title or Affiliation Listed*)
30. Jocelyne Kalanek, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
31. Mary J. Wood, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
32. Anna Limon Sato, M.A., CCC-SLP, ABC Unified School District
33. Anita L. Gibson-Brown, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
34. Julie Alderson, Speech Language Pathologist, San Marcos Unified School District
35. Linda J. Puckett, Speech & Language Pathologist, Capistrano Unified School District
36. Donna Swanson-Perrelet, Speech-Language Pathologist, Grossmont College
37. Sally Grauer, Speech-Language Pathologist, Grauer Speech Pathology Private Practice
38. Amanda N. Petty (*No Title or Affiliation Listed*)
39. Justin Joyner, Speech Therapist, Lodi Unified School District
40. Ashley Sellards, Speech-Language Pathologist, Rincon Valley Unified School District

41. Kathleen Moore, Speech Pathology Student, CSU Sacramento
42. Tami Holtz, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
43. Jennifer Jensen, Speech Pathologist, San Diego City Schools
44. Gillen A Morrisons, Masters Degree Candidate (2010) Speech-Language Pathology, California State University Sacramento
45. Angela Desideri, Speech Language Pathologist, IAC Therapy
46. Gary Williams, SLP, San Francisco Unified School District
47. Kathy Thomas, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
48. Jean Montague, Speech Language Pathologist, Orange County Office of Education
49. Elizabeth Meier Soriano, M.A, CCC-SLP, Speech Language Pathologist, Torrance Unified School District
50. Dayna Gecht, Speech Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
51. Leslie SI Dearing, Speech-Lang Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District
52. Kyle Ent, Undergraduate
53. Christine H. Davis, Chief Speech Language Pathologist
54. Kelli Kramer, SLP Student, CSUS
55. Michelle Sullivan, Student-SLP Aug '09, University of the Pacific
56. Kristine Haukman, Speech Pathologist, UCDCMC
57. Denise Kendrix, Sr Speech language Pathologist, UCDCMC
58. Ann M. Tompkins, Speech Pathologist, UCDCMC
59. Matt Osecheck, Speech Pathologist, UCDCMC
60. Chelsea Roberts, CSUS-SLP student '09
61. Kenya Sarente, MOSC 2 Health Care, UC Davis
62. Sarah Keller, PT, UCD
63. Matt Karp, Medical Student, UCD
64. Jennifer Beane, Physical Therapist, UCDCMC
65. M. Glick, PT, UC Davis
66. Erica Goude, CRC (Clinical Research Coordinator, UCDCMC
67. Alina Nicorici, Staff Research Assoc., UCD
68. Michelle Ramirez, Speech Pathologist, UCDCMC
69. Mary Beth Bryan, Psychology Intern, UCMC
70. Ashley L. Griffith, Student CSUS
71. Leslie Griffith, Parent of learning disabled child, Realtor
72. Tyler Roberts, Husband of SLP, brother of learning disable child, and Lost Prevention Agent, Savemart
73. Dana W. Griffith, Parent of learning disabled child and Electrical Engineer
74. Lisa Finnegan, MS, CCC-SLP, UCDCMC

75. Juliette West, Speech Pathologist, UCDCM
76. Dana Farias, Speech Pathologist-MSCCC, UCDCM
77. Sandra J. Blaine, Speech-Language Pathologist
78. Jennifer Rasore, Speech Language Pathologist
79. Susanne Yao, Speech-Lang. Pathologist, Sweetwater Union High School District
80. Sandra R. Schankin, Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified Schools
81. Mikayla Dawe, MA Coordinator and SLP, (*cannot be read*)
82. Bonnie Groth, CEO, East Bay Therapy

*Comment (# 2 through 82):* The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders". The use of this misleading "Communication Development" title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education.

If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.

*Commission Response:* The Commission does not believe the title of the communication development authorization is misleading. Development, by definition, means a process in which something passes by degrees to a different stage (especially a more advanced or mature stage) or a state in which things are improving. Communication development is the use of communication to promote social development. More specifically, it refers to the practice of systematically applying the processes, strategies, and principles of communication to bring about positive social change. Communication development is achievable by instructional services. Communication disorders are speech and language disorders which refer to problems in communication and in related areas such as oral motor function or mental disorders characterized by difficulties with speech or language, severe enough to interfere academically, occupationally, or socially. Communication disorders are limited to SLP Credential holders who complete coursework in the area.

The proposed new teaching authorization in communication development will allow individuals to serve students in the category of learning disabilities who have specific needs in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. It does not authorize the holder to provide speech services and is not intended to replace the SLP Credential. The SLP credential holder will continue to provide speech services to students that have a disability that would be identified as speech and language delayed. These are two different federal disability category areas. The Commission believes that with other regulations, the implementation process must be thorough and great care taken to allow our stakeholders to clearly understand the requirements, authorization, and parameters for each amendment and addition to these regulations.

The Commission does not believe the authorization is vague. Students who qualify through the Individualized Education Program for special education services that fall in the learning disability category lacking in communication, literacy, and pragmatic skills may be taught by the holder of a communication development teaching authorization. The coursework completed in the communication development teacher preparation program matches the instruction in the classroom.

The holder of an Education Specialist Credential earns an English learner authorization to provide instructional services in the area of English language development and Specialist Designed Academic Instruction in English with specific content for working with special needs students. The holder of a Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) Services Credential is not authorized to provide instructional services to English learners nor qualify to add the authorization unless the individual also holds a Special Class Authorization on their document. The holder of an Education Specialist Teaching Credential is not authorized to complete the clinical assessment for language, speech, and hearing services but rather to assess students' access to the academic core curriculum and their progress towards meeting instructional academic goals including language and literacy for the specific grade level of the student. The Commission is adding language to clarify the types of assessments that may be completed by education specialist teachers and speech pathologists.

83. Rachel Tapper Zijlstra, Director, Sound Therapies, Inc.
84. Nicki Donadio, Speech & Language Pathologist, Poway Unified School District
85. Margarita Timoteo, Speech-Language Pathologist, Member of ASHA
86. Gina Dasco, Speech-Language Pathologist, Poway Unified School District
87. Stacy Varon, Speech-Language Pathologist, Poway Unified School District
88. Kerri Nelson, Speech-Language Pathologist, Creekside Elementary School—Poway Unified School District
89. Nicole Bennett, Member of ASHA
90. Sarah Ahmed, Speech-Language Pathologist, Poway Unified School District
91. Sonja Engstrom, Speech-Language Pathologist, Member of ASHA

*Comment (# 83 through 91):* The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders". The use of this misleading "Communication Development"

title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education.

If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.

Furthermore, while the nationwide shortage of speech-language pathologists in the public school settings poses significant challenges for school districts, creating a watered-down credential track is not in the best interest of the students. Students with speech, language, and communication disorders deserve diagnosis and treatment from highly trained and qualified individuals; that is, by master's leveled trained speech-language pathologists. Any attempt to circumvent this through the designation of a Communication Development credential is clearly not in the students' best interest in mind.

Although, I will not make a presentation to the Commission at the public hearing, I hope that my sentiments will be heard.

*Commission Response: For a response to the first three paragraphs, see the personal response in opposition comments 2 - 82. The following addresses the rest of the comments.*

Individuals earning a communication development authorization will be providing instructional services to students in the areas of mild/moderate mental retardation and learning handicap and will not be authorized to provide speech therapy services. Most individuals receiving speech therapy services fall under the category of speech and language delays which is a separate federal disability category.

92. Pamela Greenhalgh, Speech-Language Pathologist, Magnolia School District, Anaheim

*Comment:* I totally agree with what has been stated by CSHA: "The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders". The use of this misleading "Communication Development" title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education.

If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.”

Indeed, I would add that I have had extensive communication with speech-language pathologists throughout the state that are working in public schools. They are already being told that they will be REPLACED by persons with CDS credentials!! This is outrageous and it is destructive to the field of speech-language pathology and to children with speech-language disabilities. When the CTC says (and I heard Mike McKibbon say it!) that the CTC cannot be responsible for the misuse of the proposed CDS credential by school districts that plan to replace speech-language pathologists then the CTC is being totally irresponsible and the primary purpose is apparent. The CTC actually WANTS speech-language pathologists to be replaced by persons with CDS credentials! Persons with less training and experience. That is not what is best for children with speech-language disorders.

The problem is that CTC is listening ONLY to administrators and university professors regarding the issue. But administrators and university professors are looking out for their own personal interests and they do not care in the least little bit for speech language pathologists that work in the field. They never have. Administrators and university professors are not being honest about this whole issue.

The CDS credential holders with BA and BS degrees will have no field experience working with persons that have speech-language disorders. That training and experience is obtained during the speech-language pathology masters program. And the public school practicum that the CDS credential holders will obtain is insufficient. Every speech-language pathologist that works in the field knows that. In fact, the level of field training that the CDS credential holders will obtain is similar to what speech-language pathology assistants (SLPAs) receive. SLPAs need to be supervised by an SLP and for good reason. What the CTC is creating with the CDS credential is SLPAs that can work independently without the skills to do so.

What the CTC is doing in the field of speech-language pathology is wrong. The CTC needs to stop this immediately and stop having the mindset of, “don’t bother me with the facts; my mind is already made up”. The CTC needs to listen to the real speech-language

pathologists that actually work schools as speech-language pathologists as to the destructiveness of this proposed credential. Speech-language pathologists that will be REPLACED by the CDS credential holders, to the detriment of children with speech-language disorders.

I will not be able to make a presentation to the commission. Please accept this e-mail instead.

*Commission Response: For a response to the first three paragraphs, see the personal response in opposition comments 2 - 82. The following addresses the rest of the comments.*

The individuals attending the forums and meetings held by the Commission over the last two years concerning changes in special education included not just employers such as county and district offices of education but also individuals representing the speech and language community. Individuals earning a communication development authorization will be providing instructional services to students in the areas of mild/moderate mental retardation and learning handicap and will not be authorized to provide speech therapy services.

93. Adrian Mamikonian, Speech-Language Pathologist

*Comment:* I strongly disagree with the proposed regulations for the following reasons:

The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders". The use of this misleading "Communication Development" title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education.

If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.

The intense speech and language intervention provided by a speech language pathologist with 7+ years of required, very specific training simply cannot be matched using this credential. We are trained to deal with a wide range disabilities so that we may support the child's speech and language in order for them to succeed academically. If this were to

become a reality, children with speech and language disorders will most certainly “fall through the cracks” and slip further and further behind in school, reducing academic performance and placing more pressure on other professionals (such as resource specialists, who are already overworked) who are untrained in our field to try and fill the gaps. As I think about my students whom I have worked with for so many years, it is both shocking and saddening that this is even being considered. I sincerely hope that the children’s best interest is at the forefront of this decision.

*Commission Response: For a response to the first three paragraphs, see the personal response in opposition comments 2 - 82. The following addresses the rest of the comments.*

Individuals earning a communication development authorization will be providing instructional services to students in the areas of mild/moderate mental retardation and learning handicap and will not be authorized to provide speech therapy services.

The CD authorization provides specialized targeted preparation and field experiences that focus on communication, literacy and pragmatic development. The proposed solution is focused preparation to provide access to the core curriculum for communication development teachers. All special education teaching credential programs include content concerning access to the core curriculum.

94. Libby McKay-Johnson, Speech Pathologist, Fresno Unified

*Comment:* The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders".

The use of this misleading "Communication Development" title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education. If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.

I strongly object to the above cited proposed credential for numerous reasons which I will attempt to summarize in this letter. As a Speech/Language Pathologist practicing in the public schools setting since 1984 I am well aware of the challenges within our profession.

However, this proposed credential in its current form will only serve to further exacerbate the crisis for the following reasons:

- 1) The title in and of itself is confusing and overlapping and may ultimately lead to inadequate services being provided to students who are entitled by law to the services of a qualified Speech/Language pathologist.
- 2) This service gap will harm students who cannot effort to miss the early intervention services to which they are entitled.
- 3) This lack of appropriate services will lead to costly and time-consuming litigation as well as compensatory services when parents realize that their children are being short-changed.

I take a tremendous amount of pride in the diagnostic and therapeutic abilities of my colleagues. We are often better prepared to identify and treat communication disorders than any other professionals within the school setting. The underlying problem in providing services is a result of lack of funding for the university programs as well as inadequate compensation for the rigorous educational program required to become a Speech Pathologist. Those issues need to be address through incentive such as loan forgiveness program and statewide support for salaries and stipends that math the excellence required to perform the job.

I strongly disagree with this approach especially in light of the emphasis in recent years on “raising the bar” for teachers and the rhetoric about the “highly qualified” educators. Dos that argument not apply to the Speech pathologists, as well, or are we only considered “teachers” when paychecks are distributed?

I ask that you reconsider the title, scope, and purposed of this credential so that the disabled children of this state are able to receive the excellent services that they deserve. Let us take the lead, as we used to, in going above and beyond in serving our children rather than” dumbing down” therefore continuing California’s spiral into mediocrity.

*Commission Response: For a response to the first three paragraphs, see the personal response in opposition comments 2 - 82. The following addresses the rest of the comments.*

The Communication Development authorization has a preschool, K-12 and adult authorization. Nothing in these regulations preclude a child in a communication development setting from also receiving speech language services. Title 5 regulations specify the legal authorization of the credential holders. If SLPs or Education Specialists work within the authorized areas of service delivery, legal issues should not be a problem.

The Commission does not have authority over loan forgiveness or salaries for individuals. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization.

Title 5 regulations specify the legal authorization of the credential holders. If SLPs or Education Specialists work within the authorized areas of service delivery, legal issues should not be a problem.

95. Sharon Iverson, Speech-Language Pathologist, Long Beach Unified School District

*Comment:* The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders".

The use of this misleading "Communication Development" title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education. If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.

My district currently supplies 3 hrs. per day of language development for ELL students. Students who do not benefit from these services require specialized disability services which based on my review of the content of training proposed for this credential would not prepare these teachers to provide appropriate training for students with special needs.

*Commission Response:* For a response to the first three paragraphs, see the personal response in opposition comments 2 - 82. The following addresses the rest of the comments.

The holder of an Education Specialist Credential earns an English learner authorization to provide instructional services in the area of English language development and Specialist Designed Academic Instruction in English with specific content for working with special needs students.

96. Charisse Wan, Speech-Language Pathologist, Vallejo City Unified School District

*Comment:* The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders". The use of this misleading "Communication Development" title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education.

If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.

I do not agree with the new CTC Special Ed Teach credential authorization for Communication Development as a trained speech-language pathologist (SLP) who has worked in the public school settings in San Francisco and Vallejo for 30 years. While acknowledging the shortage of trained SLPs state-wide and nation-wide to service students in the school setting, other service delivery models, partnerships with universities and use of trained SLP assistants are currently being implemented. Please direct your efforts towards increasing university funding for training more professionals to enter the communication disorders field to become certificated speech-language assistants and/or pathologists.

*Commission Response: For a response to the first three paragraphs, see the personal response in opposition comments 2 - 82. The following addresses the rest of the comments.*

Increasing the pool of credentialed SLPs and SLP assistants will assist in the shortage of individuals to provide speech and language services. The Commission encourages program sponsors to submit SLP programs for review. The Commission does not have authority over funding university programs for training individuals in the areas of SLP.

97. Jackie Rampenelli, Student in Speech-Path Program, CSU Sacramento

*Comment:* The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders". The use of this misleading "Communication Development" title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education.

If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would

be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.

I cannot imagine an individual without any clinical experience or exposure to the Masters Level academics to treat my cleft-affected son in the schools! I am willing to speak on this topic if necessary.

*Commission Response: For a response to the first three paragraphs, see the personal response in opposition comments 2 - 82. The following addresses the rest of the comments.*

Individuals earning a communication development authorization will be providing instructional services to students in the areas of mild/moderate mental retardation and learning handicap and will not be authorized to provide speech therapy services. Most individuals receiving speech therapy services fall under the category of speech and language delays which is a separate federal disability category.

98. Lauren O'Hanlon, Professor and Chair, CSU Sacramento

*Comment:* The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders". The use of this misleading "Communication Development" title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education.

If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.

As the standards are currently written for the Communication Development Credential, a University academic program would have difficulty developing curriculum that streamlined the educational process since coursework would be needed in all areas already included in Speech Pathology programs except for Dysphagia and Voice (only two courses in most programs). This would be a redundant program from the Universities perspective and therefore would not be funded or supported at the graduate/credential level

*Commission Response: For a response to the first three paragraphs, see the personal response in opposition comments 2 - 82. The following addresses the rest of the comments.* The Commission staff has had a wide array of Education Specialist preparation programs that have shown an interest in offering preparation in this authorization. It is important that preparation programs understand that they are preparing Education Specialists not SLPs. Issues related to voice, articulation, swallowing, stuttering among others are specific to Speech, Language Pathology and are not part of the Communication Development Authorization (and therefore would not be part of the preparation). A large portion of the preparation for this authorization could be offered in cooperation with the other six education specialist authorizations. The unique part of this authorization (as is the case with other authorizations) is the specialty specific curriculum that will be taken by holders of the Communication Development authorization.

99. Nancy Cox, MA, CCC, Speech/Language Pathologist, San Diego City Schools

*Comment:* The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders". The use of this misleading "Communication Development" title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education.

If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.

I am writing in regards to the proposed new authorization/credential in "Communication Development." I understand that the CTC is proposing a new credential that focuses on communication, language and literacy. There already exists such a professional with these

credentials and it is called the Speech/Language Pathologist. Our job has been moving away from the clinical model and more towards communication, language, literacy and pragmatics in the regular ed environment.

I currently consult and co-teach literacy in regular ed classrooms. My job is exactly as has been described in the proposal. I have many years of experience as well as an MA in Speech/Language pathology and the Certificate of Communicative Competence. Students with IEPs as well as regular ed students benefit from my services. We strive to assist those students who might “fall between the cracks” due to communication difficulties.

Rather than create a new credential, I suggest that SLP caseloads be decreased to allow them to engage in more co-teaching, collaboration and consultation in the inclusive setting. In addition, creating another teaching position will require another office on campus. Office/working space is already tight and there is no reason to bring yet another Special Ed professional on campus.

I am alarmed by this suggestion and hope that you can communicate these concerns to the commission.

*Commission Response: For a response to the first three paragraphs, see the personal response in opposition comments 2 - 82. The following addresses the rest of the comments.*

The Commission issues teaching credentials and services credentials. The communication development teacher authorization does not authorize the holder to provide speech services; it would be a misassignment for a teacher to provide speech services and for a credentialed SLP to provide instructional services. The SLPs authorization is on a services credential. Unless SLPs hold a Special Class Authorization, they are not authorized as teachers. SLPs have not been prepared in or assessed on the subjects of the core curriculum of schools in their university coursework as Education Specialist Teaching Credential holders have. Education specialists are required by statute to take coursework in Reading techniques and are assessed through a required statewide examination. SLPs are not. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization.

Title 5 regulations specify the legal authorization of the credential holders. If SLPs or Education Specialists work within the authorized areas of service delivery, legal issues should not be a problem.

The Commission does not have authority in the area of caseloads.

100. Terri Irvine Saenz, Professor, CSU Fullerton

*Comment:* In 80047.5, it is stated that the primary disability is “speech or language impairment,” and the Special Education Specialist Instruction Credential for the Communication Handicapped is included as one of the credentials that can treat students with these difficulties. In the way that it is worded, it appears that the holders of that credential can serve individuals with speech impairments as well as language impairments. This wording would inadvertently authorize holders of the credential to serve as speech and language pathologists. It would be better to divide “speech and language impairments” into two separate sections that include “speech impairments” and “language impairments” and have this credential only be included in the authorization for language impairments. In

addition, “speech or language disorders” would generally be considered a more sensitive way of referring to “speech or language impairments.”

Ib (sic) 80048.6b8, the Special Education Specialist Instruction Credential for the Communication Handicapped is stated to provide services to individuals with “...academic communication and language needs...” That is an important distinction. Nevertheless, I believe that holders of this credential will not have sufficient academic background in language to assess students using language sample analyses and to deal with complex grammatical difficulties of children with language disorders, especially when students are English Language learners and must be assessed in languages other than English. I believe that the credential’s areas of stated expertise should be semantics and pragmatics.

The Speech-Language Pathology Services Credential could be potentially included in sections 80047, 80047.1, 80047.3, 80047.6, 80047.7, and 80047.9, as individuals with that credential serve students with these disabilities. However, this also may be inferred from 80048.9f, which states provision of services by holders of the credential provide services “...across the special education disability areas...”

*Commission Response:* Section 80047.5 is a list of credentials to provide instructional services. It does not state that the individual may also provide speech services.

The Communication Development teaching authorization is not designed nor does it authorize an individual to serve students with speech and language delays or language disorders. The proposed new teaching authorization in communication development will allow individuals to serve students in the category of learning disabilities who have specific needs in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. It does not authorize the holder to provide speech services. The SLP credential holder will continue to provide speech services to students that have a disability that would be identified as speech and language delayed. These are two different federal disability category areas. The holder of an Education Specialist Credential earns an English learner authorization to provide instructional services in the area of English language development and Specialist Designed Academic Instruction in English with specific content for working with special needs students. The holder of a Speech-Language Pathology (SLP) Services Credential is not authorized to provide instructional services to English learners nor qualify to add the authorization unless the individual also holds a Special Class Authorization on their document.

The SLP Services Credential may not be added to the list of teaching credentials in 80047, 80047.1, 80047.3, 80047.6, 80047.7, and 80047.9 because it is a services credential not a teaching credential. The credentials listed in these subsections are based on the completion of a teacher preparation program and authorize instructional services. The continuum of services listed in 80048.9(f) may be found in section 80048.9.3 which is not instructional services.

101. Steve LeGardner (*No Title or Affiliation Listed*)
102. Mary M. LeGardner (*No Title or Affiliation Listed*)
103. Jennifer LeGardner, Speech-Language Pathologist, Speech Language Pathology Group
104. Trena Mott, Speech Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District

*Comment (# 101 through 105):* 5 CA Code of Regulations Special Education, Section 80048.6(b)(8), New authorization in communication Development.

105. Amy Rice, Speech-Language Pathologist

*Comment:* As a Speech-Language Pathologist who has worked with students in the school setting for 11 years I strongly object to the Proposed 5 CA Code of Regulations Title 5 80048.6(b)(8) Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Communication Development Authorization. I agree with the statements made by the California Speech-Language Hearing Association (CSHA). CSHA clearly defines the importance and value of continuing to use Speech-Language Pathologists to serve students with communication disorders in the school setting. CSHA further explains that the APA standards for this authorization are subpar. Thank you for your time!

*Commission Response:* The value of service provided by SLPs in the federal disability category of speech-language impairments is not in question. What is proposed in these regulations is specialized instructional services for the Education Specialist Teaching Credential in Communication Development which are not authorized by the SLP services credential.

106. Susan Anich, Speech-Language Pathologist, Solano County Office of Education

*Comment:* Hello. as an SLP in the field for more almost 30 years I was most unimpressed with the new credential. It leaves out some of the most important theoretical information and “dumbs down” the entire field. If the intention of the law is to improve the incoming numbers of specialists “qualified” to work with the ever increasing autistic population, then make a credential that deals specifically with autism spectrum disorders and leave Speech and Language Therapy to the highly qualified Speech and Language Pathologists. We are highly educated and trained; which is what we need in order to work with such diverse populations in the public schools. Please do not move forward with this credential. It does not serve to solve problems in a realistic way and will not improve the quality of service with underqualified and undereducated persons.

*Commission Response:* The proposed new teaching authorization in communication development will allow individuals to serve students in the category of learning disabilities who have specific needs in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. It does not authorize the holder to provide speech services and is not intended to replace the SLP Credential. The SLP credential holder will continue to provide speech services to students that have a disability that would be identified as speech and language delayed. These are two different federal disability category areas.

107. Susan Freiman Ross (*No Title or Affiliation Listed*)

*Comment:* The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, “Communication Development”, is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special-education terminology, “Communication Disorders”. The use of this misleading “Communication Development” title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services—the speech-language pathologist.

*Commission Response:* The Commission does not believe the title of the communication development is misleading. Development, by definition, means a process in which

something passes by degrees to a different stage (especially a more advanced or mature stage) or a state in which things are improving. Communication development is the use of communication to promote social development. More specifically, it refers to the practice of systematically applying the processes, strategies, and principles of communication to bring about positive social change. Communication development is achievable by instructional services. Communication disorders are speech and language disorders which refer to problems in communication and in related areas such as oral motor function or mental disorders characterized by difficulties with speech or language, severe enough to interfere academically, occupationally, or socially. Commission disorders are limited to SLP Credential holders who complete coursework in the area.

The proposed new teaching authorization in communication development will allow individuals to serve students in the category of learning disabilities who have specific needs in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. It does not authorize the holder to provide speech services and is not intended to replace the SLP Credential. The SLP credential holder will continue to provide speech services to students that have a disability that would be identified as speech and language delayed. These are two different federal disability category areas. The Commission believes that with other regulations, the implementation process must be thorough and great care taken to allow our stakeholders to clearly understand the requirements, authorization, and parameters for each amendment and addition to these regulations.

108. Ruth B. Pont, Speech Language Pathologist, Circle of Friends

*Comment:* Opposition to CA Code of Regulations Special Education Section 80048.6(b)(8) New authorization in “Communication Development”

The title and the authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, “Communication Development” is extremely misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology-“Communication Disorders”. The use of this title “Communication Development” will delay and will result in avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorder and /or speech language pathology assessments and services – the Speech Language Pathologist. This confusion will more than likely result in lawsuits from parents if services are given by those with this new credential rather than the speech language pathologist. This will cost the districts and state untold amount of money.

*Commission Response:* Title 5 regulations specify the legal authorization of the credential holders. If SLPs or Education Specialists work within the authorized areas of service delivery, legal issues should not be a problem.

The Commission does not believe the title of the communication development authorization is misleading. Development, by definition, means a process in which something passes by degrees to a different stage (especially a more advanced or mature stage) or a state in which things are improving. Communication development is the use of communication to promote social development. More specifically, it refers to the practice of systematically applying the processes, strategies, and principles of communication to bring about positive social change. Communication development is achievable by instructional services. Communication disorders are speech and language disorders which

refer to problems in communication and in related areas such as oral motor function or mental disorders characterized by difficulties with speech or language, severe enough to interfere academically, occupationally, or socially. Communication disorders are limited to SLP Credential holders who complete coursework in the area.

109. Shellie Bader, Coordinator, Speech and Language Program, Los Angeles Unified School District
110. Claudia Dunaway, Lead Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District  
*Comment* [# 109, 110 and Laureen O’Hanlon, Professor and Chair, CSU Sacramento (already counted above in separate comment)]: **Sections to be Considered: Additional Special Education Specialty Area, pages 6 and 7 and Title 34, 8, page 33.**

**Submitted by speech-language pathologists who were members of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Special Education Credential Reform Subcommittee for the Communication Development Credential.**

1. What does “*falling through the cracks*” mean? The credential offers this colloquial phrase as the justification for its existence. We assume it refers to students with identified disabilities who are not making academic progress in their special education program. The serious questions here are “Why are they not making progress and How widespread is the problem?” Given the proposal for the communication Development credential, the answer to the first question appears to be that the mild-moderate and moderate-severe educational specialist credential standards do not properly prepare holders to deliver essential special education services in the areas of language and literacy. Are the “cracks” due to inadequate teacher preparation? Is the answer to this training problem another credential?
  - Where is the hard data that would fill the **Necessity** criterion of the Administrative Procedure Act?
2. “*Special education program directors reported that many of the students diagnosed as needed (sic) special learning disability services (sic) were communication or literacy based therefore impeding the students’ access to the core curriculum.*” What does this mean? Isn’t the primary function of all special education teaching credentials to support literacy development and access to the core curriculum? Isn’t communication (language) central to all educational development? If this knowledge and accompanying skill set were to be foundational (core standards) in all special education teaching credentials, would there be a need for a specialized credential? If student’s are “falling through the cracks”, evaluations should first look to inadequacies in the core special education instruction before instituting another credential. Has this been done? Finally, this paragraph appears to have been hastily written and contains several grammatical errors,
  - The creation of Communication Development Credential appears to violate both the **Necessity and Nonduplication** criteria of the Administrative Procedure Act.
3. “*Speech-Language Pathologists would continue to be responsible for serving students whose disabilities have a clinical or medical disposition by providing speech ‘services’ while the Communication Development teacher provides instructional services in an academic setting.*” This artificial and arbitrary distinction between “medical speech” and “academic services” is misleading. Speech-language pathologists in public school

settings provide educational speech and language services. This inaccurate wording will confuse both employers charged with determining “legal and appropriate assignments” and IEP teams when they attempt to determine which “service provider can provide the most appropriate service. “

A more accurate wording would be: Speech-Language Pathologists would continue to be responsible for serving students whose disabilities have a clinical, medical, or **developmental disposition** that impacts **educational achievement** by providing **speech and language** “services”...

- The current wording violates the **Clarity** criterion of the Administrative Procedure Act.

P 33, Title 34, No. 8

4. *“The Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Communication Development authorizes the holder to conduct assessments, provide instruction, and special education related services to individuals with academic communication and language needs in the following areas: language development, social communication, school readiness skills, literacy development, and competencies across the curriculum in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and core academic areas, to students in preschool, kindergarten, grades 1-12 through age 22, and classes organized primarily for adults in services across the continuum of program options available.”* The paragraph also describes the role, responsibility and duties of school-based speech-language pathologies who follow an educational approach when serving students with identified speech and language impairments. Once again, how will employers and IEP teams know which provider to assign? Are districts prepared to incur increased costs if both providers are assigned?

- The current wording violates the **Necessity, Clarity, and Nonduplication** criteria of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Finally, the communication development credential is CTC’s attempt to deal with the reported shortage of speech-language pathologists in the state. What are the actual numbers and reasons for this shortage? Are districts able to fill the vacant positions with contracted speech-language pathologists? More effective solutions to the shortage are to offer competitive salaries, reasonable workloads and expand SLP university training programs. **San Diego Unified and Los Angeles Unified implemented the salary/workload solutions and are fully staffed for 2009-10.**

*Commission Response: These comments represent three of the seven individuals that served on the speech pathologist subcommittee not the entire subcommittee.*

1 and 2) The children ‘falling between the cracks’ are students in both general education settings and special education settings. ‘Falling through the cracks’ refers not successful in achieving access to the core curriculum, those not able to communicate successfully in social and/or academic settings, those whose literacy skills impede their ability to achieve academically at the appropriate developmental levels.

The CD authorization provides specialized targeted preparation and field experiences that focus on communication, literacy and pragmatic development. The proposed solution is focused preparation to provide access to the core curriculum for communication

development teachers. All special education teaching credential programs include content concerning access to the core curriculum.

In the forums held by the Commission as part of the outreach encouraged by SB1209, practitioners, administrators of teacher preparers urged the commission to find better ways to serve students who were having difficulty accessing the core curriculum particularly in the areas of literacy and communication. The result was a targeted, more specialized teaching authorization.

3 and 4) The Commission issues teaching credentials and services credentials. The communication development teacher authorization does not authorize the holder to provide speech services; it would be a misassignment for a teacher to provide speech services and for a credentialed SLP to provide instructional services. The SLPs authorization is on a services credential. Unless SLPs hold a Special Class Authorization, they are not authorized as teachers. SLPs have not been prepared in or assessed on the subjects of the core curriculum of schools in their university coursework as Education Specialist Teaching Credential holders have. Education specialists are required by statute to take coursework in Reading techniques and are assessed through a required statewide examination. SLPs are not. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization.

Determining who will be responsible for treating a child or young adult who has been deemed to need services in any of the federal disability categories is now and has been the responsibility of the assigned IEP team. Having special education teachers with highly specialized preparation in communication, literacy and pragmatics issues will provide the IEP team, the child and the parents more expertise and another option to address the issues facing the child (young adult).

5) There is a misinterpretation of the reason the Commission is developing a new teacher authorization. The Commission is not prioritizing school administrator personnel shortage concerns over appropriate special education services nor lowering training and SLP competencies to create a new authorization. In its' report to the Legislature the Commission's Workgroup proposed a number of suggested ways to address the SLP shortage. The proposed new teaching authorization in communication development will allow individuals to serve students in the category of learning disabilities as identified in an IEP who have specific needs in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. The teacher has knowledge of their special education area and content area that allows students access to the core curriculum. The SLP credential holder will continue to provide speech services to students that have a disability that would be identified as speech and language delayed. These are two different federal disability category areas.

Salary schedules fall under the authority of employments and the Commission has encouraged program sponsors to develop SLP programs but it is the decision of the program sponsor to develop a program.

111. Bradley Hoyt, Ed.D., Related and Specialized Services Program Manager, San Diego Unified School District

*Comment:* As the Program Manager for Related and Specialized Services, I assign and supervise 220 Speech-Language Pathologist to serve 7,964 students with identified speech and language disorders. I have several concerns about the Communication Development credential related to these responsibilities.

1. Can the holder of a communication development credential provide the same language and literacy related language services as a speech-language pathologist? If not, specifically how do the services differ?
2. The Credential language indicates that SLPs are to provide “medical” speech services and Communication Development specialists to provide “academic” language services. This distinction seems inappropriate and too restrictive. Following this wording, the IEP teams may very well assign both the SLP and the Communication Development holders as service providers resulting in more segregated services at a higher cost. Was this the design committee’s intent?
3. What the expertise will the Communication Development specialist have in the area of augmentative and alternative communication, a common area of need for students with communication disorders?
4. Can the Communication Development specialist bill for MediCal services?
5. Is this really a “lesser credential” in training compared to the speech-language pathologist credentials?

The credential’s intent is to alleviate the shortage of SLPs statewide and prevent students from “falling through the cracks.” Since implementing a competitive salary structure in 2007-08, San Diego Unified has been fully staffed. Our entire special education staff is highly competent and we know of no systemic problems with students “falling through the cracks.”

The Communication Development credential wording is ambiguous and provides insufficient guidance to district administrators charged with hiring and assigning staff and to IEP teams who designate the service providers. This level of ambiguity may very well lead to parent action including litigation. I hope you will address these issues before finalizing the document.

*Commission Response:* 1) The Commission issues teaching credentials and services credentials. The communication development teacher authorization does not authorize the holder to provide speech services; it would be a misassignment for a teacher to provide speech services and for a credentialed SLP to provide instructional services. The SLPs authorization is on a services credential. Unless SLPs hold a Special Class Authorization, they are not authorized as teachers. SLPs have not been prepared in or assessed on the subjects of the core curriculum of schools in their university coursework as Education Specialist Teaching Credential holders have. Education specialists are required by statute to take coursework in Reading techniques and are assessed though a required statewide examination. SLPs are not. There is no change to the training or services that may be

provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization.

2) Nothing in these regulations preclude a child in a communication development setting from also receiving speech language services. The determination of services is completed by the IEP team. Title 5 regulations specify the legal authorization of the credential holders. If SLPs or Education Specialists work within the authorized areas of service delivery, legal issues should not be a problem.

3 and 5) The Commission issues teaching credentials and services credentials. The communication development teacher authorization does not authorize the holder to provide speech services; it would be a misassignment for a teacher to provide speech services and for a credentialed SLP to provide instructional services. The SLPs authorization is on a services credential. Unless SLPs hold a Special Class Authorization, they are not authorized as teachers. SLPs have not been prepared in or assessed on the subjects of the core curriculum of schools in their university coursework as Education Specialist Teaching Credential holders have. Education specialists are required by statute to take coursework in Reading techniques and are assessed though a required statewide examination. SLPs are not. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization.

4) Billing for MediCal services does not fall under the authority of the Commission.

The Commission does not authority over the are salaries which are a local level responsibility. Title 5 regulations specify the legal authorization of the credential holders. If SLPs or Education Specialists work within the authorized areas of service delivery, legal issues should not be a problem.

112. Deborah Chen, Professor, CSU Northridge

*Comment:* I am extremely concerned that the Educational Specialist Instruction Credential: Communication Development (CD) as proposed (preschool to adult) will result in **less-than highly qualified teachers of preschools with IEPs**. The majority preschool –pre-K children with IEPs have communication and language development needs. Holders of the current Educational Specialist Instruction Credential: Early childhood Special Education are highly qualified in all areas of preschool instruction including communication and language development and early and emergency literacy skills.

As teachers of record, holders of the proposed CD credential are unlikely to possess adequate competence in developmentally appropriate curriculum, instructional strategies, and other professional skills that are unique to teaching 3-5 year olds. They are more likely to have sufficient fieldwork and training in competencies to teach school age students.

A better alternative would be to implement the proposed CD credential as an added authorization to the Education Specialist Credential in Mild/Moderate Disabilities since both authorization focus on student with the same primary disabilities (Coded Correspondence No 09-09). I urge the Commission to rethink the CD credential as proposed.

*Commission Response:* The grade level authorization overlap with the Early Childhood Education and the Communication Development Specialist is only at the preschool level. The Early Childhood Education Specialist has the additional age level of birth to age 3 and authorizes services in the area of mild/moderate and moderate/severe disabilities. The holder of a Communication Development authorization will have the additional content to work with students at the preschool level needing services in communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. The overlap of the preschool grade level will assist employers with classes with a combination of students in both preschool and grades 1-3 with students needing services in communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. The program of coursework for the Communication Development authorization includes specific content for the preschool age student.

113. Carol Fenwick, M. Ed. CCC, Speech Language Pathologist, Sunnyvale School District

*Comment:* The proposed regulations do not specify what, if any, training in assessment would be provided to the holder of an Education Specialist Instruction Credential, specifically in the areas of social skills and language development. The special education training would be significantly inferior compared to the training received by Speech and Language Pathologists. Speech and Language Pathologists must undergo specific course work in these areas. During their Clinical Fellowship Year as a full time employee, they must fulfill specific clinical hours in these areas under the supervision of a master clinician. This occurs after they have graduated with a master's degree in the field of Speech Pathology.

The field of social skills instruction is still in its infancy; there is still much research to be done. Personnel who endeavor to present social skills training should be able to seek best practices based on research and have the ability to modify programs as needed for students who need these services. A Speech Language Pathologist has the optimal background and training to offer these services to students on the autism spectrum.

Speech Language Pathologists must complete 24 continuing education units in their field every two years in order to maintain California state licensure. Special Education teachers do not have this requirement.

Parents of students with language disabilities and students on the autism spectrum will and should demand that services be provided by individuals who have the training and background to meet their child's needs. These needs will not be adequately met by the holder of an Education Specialist Instruction credential.

*Commission Response:* Each Education Specialist program includes a program standard in the area of assessment to allow the teacher to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals. In response to the comments concerning assessments, the Commission is adding language to clarify the types of assessments that may be completed by education specialist teachers in section 80048.6 and speech-language pathologist service providers in section 80048.9.

The Communication Development authorization does not include an authorization for social skills but instead in social communication which is included in the content in the

program completed by the teacher. All Education Specialist complete content and earn an authorization to teach special needs students in the area of autism.

The Commission issues teaching credentials and services credentials. The communication development teacher authorization does not authorize the holder to provide speech services; it would be a misassignment for a teacher to provide speech services and for a credentialed SLP to provide instructional services. The SLPs authorization is on a services credential. Unless SLPs hold a Special Class Authorization, they are not authorized as teachers. SLPs have not been prepared in or assessed on the subjects of the core curriculum of schools in their university coursework as Education Specialist Teaching Credential holders have. Education specialists are required by statute to take coursework in Reading techniques and are assessed through a required statewide examination. SLPs are not. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization.

114. Kenneth Warde, Speech-Language Pathologist, Retired/Private Practice

*Comment:* NO, I do not agree with the proposed regulations for the below stated numerous ethical and legal reasons. This is my personal opinion as a speech-language pathologist (SLP) for more than 35 years. I wish that I could make a presentation; but I won't. I am betting that just like last year, this will be another "ruse." I came last summer prepared to present on 7/16/08, and found out that it was a bullying, interrupting, and totally unprepared McKibbin to lecture down to us like he did at the CSHA Convention in Monterey about 4 months earlier. That "public hearing" was "rigged" or intentionally "fixed." And on 8/6/09, I "smell a fix" again. So, NO, I will not make a presentation.

1. The Communication Development Specialist (CDS) Credential is the very definition of the word oxymoron. We all agree that its real name is the McKibbin Credential. The CDS title was intentionally chosen to deceive, mislead, discriminate, and commit fraud on the unsuspecting public as well as the speech and language impaired students. It is meant to confuse and obfuscate the public, parents, students and teachers that these CDS people's skills are equal to SLP's skills. SLP is obviously not within McKibbin's scope of practice. If this vague, and simplistic proposal was the best that he could do, then not only does he have an apparent pragmatic language problem; but he appears to have an expressive language problem too.

2. SLPs know what the problem is. The crux of the problem is abysmal teacher training in their colleges regarding normal language/communication development, in addition to inadequate and incomplete literacy teacher training. The best evidence regarding the efficacy of teacher training is proven by student outcomes. It is obvious that teachers "work hard." It is unfortunate for the students and taxpayers that teachers don't "work smart." Teachers don't know that they don't know. They only start complaining after they get a special needs student in their class. After questioning more than 4 dozen teachers, none of them read any research in their field and then apply it in their class. If regular and sped teachers had our rigorous language/communication education and training, then we would get fewer referrals and the CTC would not have to create the "add on" or alternative certification like the CDS Credential. This credential would give teachers a "second bite of the apple" after they have already failed the first time. And they will probably be taught by

professors who didn't train them well enough the first time. The educational system has always taken the short cut. And the CTC will allow administrators the "flexibility" to interpret what the CDS teachers can do. I predict a brazen "mission creep" by the exclusive inbred country club groups like the CTC, CSBA, ACSA, business offices, and teacher unions to attempt to use non-highly qualified (HQ) SLPs to assess and deliver (pretend) SLP services. These groups seem to have neither pride nor any shame that they by "fiat" have lowered the high jump bar from 7 feet to now only 6 inches. The McKibbin Credential supporters have no shame but only pride in their discrimination of speech impaired (SI) children by lowering the high SLP standards to those of teachers. These supporters will attempt to slink off into the night and not take responsibility for this Rube Goldberg-like "add on certification." No amount of lipstick on this pig is going to hide the open violation of parent and student rights. This McKibbin Credential is an easy answer for the weak minded.

3. As I stated last year, this is the beginning of a two tier, Jim Crow-like, separate and unequal delivery of SLP services in the schools. Just like in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), the CDS Credential discriminates against speech impaired students by dramatically lowering and changing the standards for those delivering S/L services. Caveat emptor or let the buyer beware. This is separate and unequal. And this is also "products liability" regarding the diminution of training. Has the CTC estimated the amount of money that will be spent on fair hearings? Surely the supporters of this oxymoron of a credential are aware that there will be a significant number of fair hearings. How does this credential not violate a student's FAPE rights? How does it not violate their civil rights? So, just how does this credential not violate the federal IDEA law by not hiring highly qualified SLPs to deliver competent S/L services? Unlike teachers, SLPs are in the medical related field. And one common phrase that most people know is, "First do no harm." The McKibbin Credential does harm children due to the distinctly inferior training of the teachers. It is fraud, false hope, and it wastes student's time. The CTC will say that they had to do something; or that isn't something better than nothing? No, that is an educator or teacher's simplistic and uninformed opinion not based on research. Will there be high quality evidence based research on the efficacy of this great experiment called the CDS Credential? Then will the study be duplicated and open to peer review? Will the research be of such high quality that I will read it in my (JSLHR and LSHSS) journals? Or will it be simple anecdotal drivel printed in the CTA magazine? And do you have plans to advocate implementation of the McKibbin Credential across the nation?

4. Who are SLPs? The simple answer is that first; we are advocates for our clients. Second, we are advocates for highly qualified speech and language services. And third, we are ethical and expect that those whom we work with to be ethical. I openly challenge the supporters of the McKibbin Credential to go to: [www.ASHA.org](http://www.ASHA.org) and type in the search engine, Code of Ethics. If you don't take the 10 minutes to read our ASHA Code of Ethics, you will never understand whom SLPs are. And it proves that the supporters really are pretenders. Teachers and administrators do not have a formal code of ethics. To us, we know non-highly qualified SLPs as SLPAs or speech aides. As per our code of ethics, (I F) we "shall fully inform the persons that we serve of the nature and possible effects of services rendered." (III E) "Individuals statements to the public shall provide accurate information about the nature and management of communication disorders, about the

professions, and professional services..." I hope that the supporters of this "almost an SLP" credential are prepared for real SLPs to inform the public and the parents about this fraud.

5. As taken from the Jackie Robinson memorial, "A life is not so important except for the impact that it has on other lives." And certainly the advocates for the "pretend SLP" credential should know that they will negatively impact and harm children for decades to come. Otherwise, do formal research and prove the efficacy of this "almost SLP" credential. Only a governor with a speech and language problem would hire a person like McKibbin who not only has pragmatic language difficulties; but also an expressive language problem (as judged by his vague and poor writing of this credential). This was and is obviously out of his scope of practice and area of expertise. Instead of raising teacher standards and training commensurate to those of SLPs, the CTC appears to have taken the easy way out by issuing the CDS Credential to under trained and under educated teachers.

As a reasonably high finisher in 27 Boston Marathons and a school SLP for 33+ years, I promise to use all of my knowledge, perseverance, and fortitude to shine a light on those behind this sham of a credential. For those who will eventually possess this "pretend SLP" credential, I will do my best to inform the public and expose the abysmal training of the CDS credential holders. I will advocate for more fair hearings. I will not go quietly into the darkness regarding this open discrimination.

Please do the responsible and ethical thing and make more highly qualified SLPs; and reject the CDS Credential.

*Commission Response:* 1) The Commission issues teaching credentials and services credentials. The communication development teacher authorization does not authorize the holder to provide speech services; it would be a misassignment for a teacher to provide speech services and for a credentialed SLP to provide instructional services. The Commission is proposing a new teaching authorization to provide instructional services not to provide speech services. The teacher has knowledge of their special education area and content area that allows students access to the core curriculum. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization.

2) It is the appropriate IEP team that is responsible for determining the appropriate services. Administrators are quite cognizant that the credential authorization dictates the services that can be provided and are well aware that assignments outside the authorization are subject to assignment monitoring by county offices of education

In the area of knowledge of the core curriculum of schools, the requirements for teachers are substantially higher as teachers are required to pass a rigorous exam of that knowledge while SLPs are not. Teachers must also demonstrate their knowledge of reading and literacy skills through the statewide Reading Instruction Competency Assessment whereas SLPs do not.

3) The Communication Development Authorization credential holder is not authorized to provide services in the federal disability category of speech language impaired. This would be a misassignment. The purpose of the CD authorization is to provide greater access to specialized instructional services for special needs students identified with learning disabilities in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatics. The CD authorization

gives the IEP team an additional option to provide specialized instructional services by a special education teacher who has that authorization and specialized preparation. It is likely to provide children with learning disabilities and their parents additional instructional options to meet their child's needs.

4) No place in the ASHA Code of Ethics do the words children, schools or students (other than college students) appear. The knowledge of working with children at schools is critical to schools and those who deliver services to children with disabilities.

115. Shirley Sigmund, M. A., CCC-SLP

*Comment:* I am a CA licensed speech-language pathologist, and have maintained licensure since April of 1990. My undergraduate and graduate degrees are in Communicative Disorders; my extern hours totaled over 300 clinical clock hours. I had to complete a master's project in order to satisfy the requirements for the graduate degree, and following the graduation, I had to take a national exam to demonstrate my mastery of the material in communicative disorders.

I am greatly troubled and concerned with the proposed special education teacher authorization in communication development. The responsibility set upon the special education teacher for conducting assessments for language development needs is disproportionate to the limited coursework that will be required. The remaining body of this letter will clarify my reasons for my opposition. Thank you for your time and consideration of my letter.

The title and authorization of the proposed special education teacher credential labeled, "Communication Development", is misleading and confusing when compared to long-standing and traditional special education terminology, "Communication Disorders". The use of this misleading "Communication Development" title will result in delay and avoidance of appropriate assessment and services to children with disabilities by those already set forth in federal and state laws competent to perform communication disorders and/or speech-language pathology assessments and services -- the speech-language pathologist.

The proposed communication development authorization can be applied to most children and as such is again vague and confusing, and overlaps with existing federal and state laws for both general education and special education.

If the goal of the proposed Communication Development authorization were truly to assist those children with academic issues versus disability issues, then this authorization would be a general education teacher authorization and not a special education teacher authorization. Children with English language learner academic issues are not assigned to special education programs for ELL, or academic language, or social communication services. If the intent is not to replace the speech-language pathologist serving children with communication impairments, the proposed authorizations should clarify same as to communication disorders assessments and services. Speech-language pathology is an acknowledged special education disability category. Federal and state special education and related personnel standards set forth requirements for acknowledged professions including the speech-language pathologist.

*Commission Response:* In response to the comments concerning assessments, the Commission is adding language to clarify the types of assessments that may be completed by education specialist teachers in section 80048.6 and speech-language pathologist service providers in section 80048.9.

*See the response to comments 2 - 82 for the last three paragraphs.*

116. Sharlee Mosburg-Michael, Senior Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District

117. Andrea Schindler, Senior Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District

118. Jennifer Taps, Senior Speech-Language Pathologist, San Diego Unified School District

*Comment:* As licensed school-based speech-language pathologists, we respectfully dissent to the creating and implementation of the Educational Specialist Communication Development Credential. These are among our concerns about such a lesser credential.

1. After teaching a course to graduate students seeking mild-moderate credentials at a major university, we observed that these students were unable to handle a basic, introduction-level text on communication disorders. This may be attributed to their lack of background knowledge during their undergraduate program in liberal studies. After reviewing the standards for this credential, it is not feasible for a one-year credential program to provide the training in the numerous areas required to meet the stated standards. Adequate training would include coursework in language disorders, social communication, autism spectrum disorders, language assessment, academic assessment, multiple literacy courses, language intervention, cultural and linguistic diversity, curriculum and behavior-based teaching strategies as well normal language development. In one year, students would emerge with surface knowledge at best in these areas. Individuals graduating with Master's degrees in speech-language pathology spend at least two years of undergraduate and two years of their graduate training covering the stipulated intensive courses (in addition to other courses).

2. As a result of the training requirements in normal language development and language disorders, we anticipate that graduates of such programs would have no greater knowledge of language than general education teachers. The majority of Master's level training in speech-language pathology focuses on language development, disorders, and diversity.

3. As a result of the training requirements in literacy, we anticipate that graduates of such programs would have no greater knowledge of literacy than speech-language pathologists. We frequently interview new speech-language pathology candidates who are applying to work for our district. They have demonstrated significant background knowledge in supporting both the language and literacy skills of students from birth to 22. They also emerge with experience in conducting research, monitoring progress and critical analysis of existing research in the areas of assessment and treatment. It is highly unlikely that a one-year credential program would yield similar results.

4. It is our understanding that several universities in California have applied to create speech-language pathology Master's programs, such as California State University San Marcos and Chapman University. If the state moved forward with approval, this would effectively address the stated concern of the shortage of speech-language pathologists. We have frequently been contacted by individuals interested in pursuing careers in speech-

language pathology, many of whom have Bachelor's degrees but are unable to enroll in a graduate program due to the limited number of options in the state.

5. From our experience, education has become more litigious each year, especially regarding students with communication disorders. Frequently, we are asked to describe our qualifications to attorneys, advocates and private speech-language pathologists. Communication specialists would not have an adequate answer to this question. This would result in significant cost to districts due to increased mediation, fair hearings and requests for private evaluations from licensed speech-language pathologists.

6. If the intent of this credential is to prevent students from falling through the cracks, we suggest improving the training of general and special educators such that they have basic knowledge of the relationship between language development and literacy. Their knowledge base needs to be broader rather than bringing in another specialist. This would facilitate the development of response to intervention programs and would in turn strengthen the core curriculum of every classroom. The state has moved to general credentials for mild-moderate and moderate severe programs. The establishment of a specialized communication credential is in conflict with this trend.

7. This credential does not reflect contemporary best practices in service delivery to students with language differences and disorders. The majority of Master's level training in speech-language pathology focuses on language development, disorders and diversity. The wording (see below) limits the speech-language pathologists scope of practice to "medical" and "clinical speech services." There is no mention of language services. By contrast, the Communication Development Credential holder is responsible for "academic" language services. This is an inaccurate and artificial division of roles and responsibilities. Contemporary public school speech-language pathologists follow an educational not a clinical approach and provide BOTH speech and language.

"Speech-Language Pathologist would continue to be responsible for serving students whose disabilities have a clinical or medical disposition by providing speech 'services' while the Communication Development teacher provides instructional services in an academic setting. The assessment for speech services will continue to be completed by the credentialed Speech-Language Pathologist as they are the only authorized service deliverer authorized in the speech and language impairments category (Introductory/Justification, pp 6,7.)"

CSHA members have continually argued these points and shared their strong concerns during the past two years. The CTC administration listened but gave no counterargument beyond "there is a shortage of speech-language pathologists," which is the real motivation for this credential. However, a Bachelor's level credential would not be a satisfactory solution to the shortage. The more direct solution is to offer competitive salaries, reasonable workloads and expand SLP Master's level training programs. **Our district, San Diego Unified, implemented the salary/workload solution and is fully staffed for 2009-10 (197 full-time positions).**

The creation of this lesser credential would not effectively address the shortage of speech-language pathologists. The state has not moved forward in approving new Master's level programs at interested universities. This limited, one-year training would create new and

unnecessary costs for universities, accreditation and public school implementation while providing inadequate preparation for the higher level skills described in the standards. Most importantly, it would result in diminished services to students with communication disorders.

*Commission Response:* 1) There is not a limitation of the length in years of the program or the number of credit units in a special education preparation program. Teacher preparation programs have considerable discretion on how the curriculum is delivered. These include programs that begin in the undergraduate years as well as post baccalaureate programs that could culminate in an advanced degree.

2) The Communication Development Authorization, like all other Education Specialist Teaching Credential authorizations, focus on assessment, diagnostics, and instruction of students with disabilities with a particular emphasis on providing specialized services in the area of the authorization. They authorize a number of different service delivery modes and encourage collaboration and consultation among all who deliver services to students.

3) Speech Language Pathology is a Services Credential. Only those who hold a Special Class Authorization are authorized to provide instructional services in a specific special education area. Neither the Communication Development Authorization nor any of the other six Education Specialist Authorizations are not designed to denigrate, undermine, or replace Speech Language Pathology Credentials and the services specifically authorized by that credential. The CD authorization provides an additional service option to schools and the IEP team for those diagnosed to need the specific services authorized by the credential.

4) In its report to the Legislature as well as the meetings held by the Commission, the development of new SLP programs was strongly encouraged. The Commission staff has worked closely with the universities to help them develop new SLP programs. The major difficulty has been the moratorium on new programs imposed by the national organization of SLPs, ASHA, that has delayed these and other universities' development of new programs.

5) Education Specialist Teaching Credential holders meet a specific set of requirements and qualifications as set forth by the State of California and the U.S. Department of Education. For example Education Specialists must meet the qualifications of a "Highly Qualified Teacher". SLPs do not have to meet this requirement. One of the requirements to meet the 'highly qualified' status is demonstration of the knowledge of and ability to teach the subjects they are assigned. They must also pass California's Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) that tests their knowledge of reading mechanics, assessment, diagnostic and instructional strategies among other competencies. SLP credential holders do not have to demonstrate this proficiency.

6) The Commission currently issues two documents to serve general education students in the area of literacy skills, the Reading Certificate and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential. 'Falling through the cracks' refers not successful in achieving access to the core curriculum, those not able to communicate successfully in social and/or academic settings, those whose literacy skills impede their ability to achieve academically at the appropriate developmental levels.

The CD authorization provides specialized targeted preparation and field experiences that focus on communication, literacy and pragmatic development. The proposed solution is focused preparation to provide access to the core curriculum for communication development teachers. All special education teaching credential programs include content concerning access to the core curriculum.

7) Title 5 regulations specify the legal authorization of the credential holders. If SLPs or Education Specialists work within the authorized areas of service delivery, legal issues should not be a problem.

119. Marianne Miller, M.A., CCC-SLP, San Diego Unified School District

*Comment:* As a licensed school-based speech-language pathologist, I respectfully dissent to the creating and implementation of the Educational Specialist Communication Development Credential. These are among my concerns about such a lesser credential.

After reviewing the standards for this credential, it is not feasible for a one-year credential program to provide the training in the numerous areas required to meet the stated standards. Adequate training would include coursework in language disorders, social communication, autism spectrum disorders, language assessment, academic assessment, multiple literacy courses, language intervention, cultural and linguistic diversity, curriculum and behavior-based teaching strategies as well normal language development. In one year, students would emerge with surface knowledge at best in these areas. Individuals graduating with Master's degrees in speech-language pathology spend at least two years of undergraduate and two years of their graduate training covering the stipulated intensive courses (in addition to other courses).

As a result of the training requirements in normal language development and language disorders, I anticipate that graduates of such programs would have no greater knowledge of language than general education teachers. The majority of Master's level training in speech-language pathology focuses on language development, disorders, and diversity.

1. As a result of the training requirements in literacy, I anticipate that graduates of such programs would have no greater knowledge of literacy than speech-language pathologists. We frequently interview new speech-language pathology candidates who are applying to work for our district. They have demonstrated significant background knowledge in supporting both the language and literacy skills of students from birth to 22. They also emerge with experience in conducting research, monitoring progress and critical analysis of existing research in the areas of assessment and treatment. It is highly unlikely that a one-year credential program would yield similar results.

2. It is my understanding that several universities in California have applied to create speech-language pathology Master's programs, such as California State University San Marcos and Chapman University. If the state moved forward with approval, this would effectively address the stated concern of the shortage of speech-language pathologists..

3. From my experience, education has become more litigious each year, especially regarding students with communication disorders. Frequently, I am asked to describe my qualifications to attorneys, advocates and private speech-language pathologists. Communication specialists would not have an adequate answer to this question. This would

result in significant cost to districts due to increased mediation, fair hearings and requests for private evaluations from licensed speech-language pathologists.

4. If the intent of this credential is to prevent students from falling through the cracks, I suggest improving the training of general and special educators such that they have basic knowledge of the relationship between language development and literacy. Their knowledge base needs to be broader rather than bringing in another specialist. This would facilitate the development of response to intervention programs and would in turn strengthen the core curriculum of every classroom. The state has moved to general credentials for mild-moderate and moderate severe programs. The establishment of a specialized communication credential is in conflict with this trend.

5. This credential does not reflect contemporary best practices in service delivery to students with language differences and disorders. The majority of Master's level training in speech-language pathology focuses on language development, disorders and diversity. The wording (see below) limits the speech-language pathologists scope of practice to "medical" and "clinical speech services." There is no mention of language services. By contrast, the Communication Development Credential holder is responsible for "academic" language services. This is an inaccurate and artificial division of roles and responsibilities. Contemporary public school speech-language pathologists follow an educational not a clinical approach and provide BOTH speech and language.

"Speech-Language Pathologist would continue to be responsible for serving students whose disabilities have a clinical or medical disposition by providing speech 'services' while the Communication Development teacher provides instructional services in an academic setting. The assessment for speech services will continue to be completed by the credentialed Speech-Language Pathologist as they are the only authorized service deliverer authorized in the speech and language impairments category (Introductory/Justification, pp 6,7.)"

CSHA members have continually argued these points and shared their strong concerns during the past two years. The CTC administration listened but gave no counterargument beyond "there is a shortage of speech-language pathologists," which is the real motivation for this credential. However, a Bachelor's level credential would not be a satisfactory solution to the shortage. The more direct solution is to offer competitive salaries, reasonable workloads and expand SLP Master's level training programs. **Our district, San Diego Unified, implemented the salary/workload solution and is fully staffed for 2009-10 (197 full-time positions).**

The creation of this lesser credential would not effectively address the shortage of speech-language pathologists. The state has not moved forward in approving new Master's level programs at interested universities. This limited, one-year training would create new and unnecessary costs for universities, accreditation and public school implementation while providing inadequate preparation for the higher level skills described in the standards. Most importantly, it would result in diminished services to students with communication disorders.

*Commission Response:* There is not a limitation of the length in years of the program or the number of credit units in a special education preparation program. Teacher preparation

programs have considerable discretion on how the curriculum is delivered. These include programs that begin in the undergraduate years as well as post baccalaureate programs that could culminate in an advanced degree. The Communication Development Authorization, like all other Education Specialist Teaching Credential authorizations, focus on assessment, diagnostics, and instruction of students with disabilities with a particular emphasis on providing specialized services in the area of the authorization. They authorize a number of different service delivery modes and encourage collaboration and consultation among all who deliver services to students.

1) Speech Language Pathology is a Services Credential. Only those who hold a Special Class Authorization are authorized to provide instructional services in a specific special education area. The Communication Development Authorization or any of the other six Education Specialist Authorizations are not designed to denigrate, undermine, or replace Speech Language Pathology Credentials and the services specifically authorized by that credential. The CD authorization provides an additional service option to schools and the IEP team for those diagnosed to need the specific services authorized by the credential.

2) In its report to the Legislature as well as the meetings held by the Commission, the development of new SLP programs was strongly encouraged. The Commission staff has worked closely with the universities to help them develop new SLP programs. The major difficulty has been the moratorium on new programs imposed by the national organization of SLPs, ASHA, that has delayed these and other universities' development of new programs.

3) Education Specialist Teaching Credential holders meet a specific set of requirements and qualifications as set forth by the State of California and the U.S. Department of Education. For example Education Specialists must meet the qualifications of a "Highly Qualified Teacher". SLPs do not have to meet this requirement. One of the requirements to meet the HQT status is demonstration of the knowledge of and ability to teach the subjects they are assigned. They must also pass California's Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) that tests their knowledge of reading mechanics, assessment, diagnostic and instructional strategies among other competencies. SLP credential holders do not have to demonstrate this proficiency.

4) The Commission currently issues two documents to serve general education students in the area of literacy skills, the Reading Certificate and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential. 'Falling through the cracks' refers not successful in achieving access to the core curriculum, those not able to communicate successfully in social and/or academic settings, those whose literacy skills impede their ability to achieve academically at the appropriate developmental levels.

The CD authorization provides specialized targeted preparation and field experiences that focus on communication, literacy and pragmatic development. The proposed solution is focused preparation to provide access to the core curriculum for communication development teachers. All special education teaching credential programs include content concerning access to the core curriculum.

5) Title 5 regulations specify the legal authorization of the credential holders. If SLPs or Education Specialists work within the authorized areas of service delivery, legal issues should not be a problem.

120. Karah Tovar, MS, CCC-SLP, Speech and Language Pathologist

*Comment:* **No, I do not agree with the proposed regulations to implement the special education credential labeled “Communication Development.”** This credential has a misleading title, it is vague and confusing, and it overlaps with existing federal and state laws established for general and special education.

**Personal Response:** Allowing the credential to go through as it stands would be a huge disservice to our children. This misleading title will result in children not being appropriately assessed or treated as they should be by a trained specialist with an advanced degree and the extensive background of all speech and language disorders. The broad range of communication disorders (i.e., autism, receptive and expressive language, auditory processing, articulation, fluency, etc.) are complicated to assess and treat and require the skills of a highly trained Speech-Language Pathologist. This proposed credential would deny children the benefit of being treated by appropriately trained professionals. If this credential was implemented, errors in diagnosis and treatment would be inevitable and thus result in many more costly lawsuits for school districts. Most importantly, our children deserve to be diagnosed and treated by appropriately trained professionals, experts in speech and language development – the Speech and Language Pathologist. Please do not allow this misleading credential to be implemented in the public schools. Let’s give our children the support they deserve!

*Commission Response:* The Commission issues teaching credentials and services credentials. The communication development teacher authorization does not authorize the holder to provide speech services; it would be a misassignment for a teacher to provide speech services and for a credentialed SLP to provide instructional services. The Commission is proposing a new teaching authorization to provide instructional services not to provide speech services. The teacher has knowledge of their special education area and content area that allows students access to the core curriculum. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization.

In response to the comments concerning assessments, the Commission is adding language to clarify the types of assessments that may be completed by education specialist teachers in section 80048.6 and speech-language pathologist service providers in section 80048.9. All Education Specialist Credential holders earn an authorization to serve special needs students in the area of autism.

121. Barbara J. Moore, Ed.D., CCC-SLP, Director, Special Youth Services, Anaheim Union High School District

*Comment:* This letter is written in strong opposition to the proposed Communication Development Credential. This proposed credential is both ill-conceived and wrought with confusion. But principally, the credential will not solve the problem that it purports to address. I am a special education director in a large urban school district. I object to the proposed credential for the following reasons.

- 1) The proposal comes forth in an attempt by its drafters to address the issue of shortages of licensed and credentialed speech-language pathologists. Students who have identified speech-language disorders required the services of a trained speech-language pathologist (SLP) to conduct appropriate assessment and evaluation, and to provide appropriate services. An attempt to design a credential that would somehow created a position that would authorize services for students with such needs by an individual without appropriate training is in sharp contrast to the mandates of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA 2004), which call for highly qualified personnel. We know that in situations where lesser qualified personnel provide services to students with disabilities, there is at best, no progress, and at worse, detriment to the student. How can the state of California proceed with developing a credential that would create such a category of lesser-qualification as a veiled effort to address the shortage of speech-language pathologists in this state? This attempt is unacceptable. Our students deserve more.
- 2) Currently, it is unidentified and unclear as to how a student would be determined to need services from the Communication Development Specialist. It is unclear as to whether the Communication Development specialist will be an instructor in a self-contained classroom or provide related services. Such vagueness suggests that a clear need for this position has not been established.
- 3) Originally, this credential was discussed as a possible way to deal with the language development needs of English Learners (ELs) or to provide intervention in tiers of intervention. Then it was discussed that these specialists would be providing services to students with autism, who need social skills and language development interventions. The proposed credential now appears to be for an individual who provide related services and teach in a classroom, yet it unclear how this services is different from other specialists.
- 4) Informed parents who have students with learning and behavioral needs which require the intervention of a speech-language pathologist will not agree to services provided by a lesser-qualified individual. Knowing that this is the situation, suggests the possibility that only the less-sophisticated parents may be the ones whose children will receive services from the Communication Development specialist. Again, we must be concerned about both social justice principles, as well as School district staff should not be in the position of choosing lesser qualified individuals to serve students whose parents won't complain. This is fundamentally against the core principals of our country.
- 5) Initially, the proposal did not have assessment components in it, and now, these Education Specialists would be expected to conduct assessments that require advanced training and would be outside of their expertise.

Never has choosing to water-down standards been an appropriate way to deal with shortages. The state of California has many problems right now. Creating a new credential that has no training program in place is not only not appropriate at this time of fiscal crises, but also will only create more problems; not solve them.

Thank you for your consideration of my input.

*Commission Response:* 1) The Commission issues teaching credentials and services credentials. The communication development teacher authorization does not authorize the holder to provide speech services; it would be a misassignment for a teacher to provide

speech services and for a credentialed SLP to provide instructional services. The Commission is proposing a new teaching authorization to provide instructional services not to provide speech services. The teacher has knowledge of their special education area and content area that allows students access to the core curriculum. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization. In response to the comments concerning assessments, the Commission is adding language to clarify the types of assessments that may be completed by education specialist teachers in section 80048.6 and speech-language pathologist service providers in section 80048.9.

2) Determining who will be responsible for treating a child or young adult who has been deemed to need services in any of the federal disability categories is now and has been the responsibility of the assigned IEP team. Having special education teachers with highly specialized preparation in communication, literacy and pragmatics issues will provide the IEP team, the child and the parents more expertise and another option to address the issues facing the child (young adult). The authorization for the Communication Development authorization is for grades preschool, K-12 and adults. The authorization does not list a limitations therefore the teacher may in a self-contained or departmentalized setting within the authorization of the document.

3) There is a misinterpretation of the reason the Commission is developing a new teacher authorization. The Commission is not prioritizing school administrator personnel shortage concerns over appropriate special education services nor lowering training and SLP competencies to create a new authorization. All Education Specialist Credentials earn an authorization to serve special needs students in the area of autism. Each Education Specialist Credential has a specific authorization.

4) Nothing in these regulations preclude a child in a communication development setting from also receiving speech language services. The determination of services is completed by the IEP team. Title 5 regulations specify the legal authorization of the credential holders. If SLPs or Education Specialists work within the authorized areas of service delivery, legal issues should not be a problem.

5) Each Education Specialist program includes a program standard in the area of assessment to allow the teacher to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals.

122. Katherine Schryver-Stahly, Speech-Language Pathologist, Torrance Unified School District  
*Comment:* I am writing in opposition to the new authorization in Communication Development (5 CA Code of Regulations Special Education Section 80048.6(b)(8).

This authorization calls for those holding the newly-proposed Communication Development authorization to conduct assessments in listening, speaking, communication, language development, and pragmatic skills and to provide instruction in these areas to students with IEPs, even though there is already a credential that allows these assessments and instruction to occur - the credential held by speech-language pathologists. This proposed authorization would lead to a confusing and harmful new credential that would be costly for the state to approve, both ethically and financially. The overlap that this

authorization would cause between speech-language pathologists and those holding this new credential would lead to students being denied their legal rights under federal special education law, which would result in increased litigation for school districts.

The description of this authorization is overly-broad and gives little detail as to which students would be assisted by those holding this new credential. In these financially troubling times, it is not wise for the state to duplicate an already existing credential that would call for school districts to hire additional personnel to assess and instruct a yet-to-be-determined group of students. Eligibility criteria for those seen by the speech-language pathology program, on the other hand, is established by law and is extremely specific in nature, calling for a judicious use of resources.

Please oppose this confusing, expensive, and overly broad authorization that would lead to increased personnel and litigation costs, as well as reduced quality of services for students with diagnosed language impairments.

*Commission Response:* Each Education Specialist program includes a program standard in the area of assessment to allow the teacher to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals. In response to the comments concerning assessments, the Commission is adding language to clarify the types of assessments that may be completed by education specialist teachers in section 80048.6 and speech-language pathologist service providers in section 80048.9.

The Commission issues teaching credentials and services credentials. The communication development teacher authorization does not authorize the holder to provide speech services; it would be a misassignment for a teacher to provide speech services and for a credentialed SLP to provide instructional services. The Commission is proposing a new teaching authorization to provide instructional services not to provide speech services. The teacher has knowledge of their special education area and content area that allows students access to the core curriculum. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization.

### ***Additional Responses Representing Organization in Opposition***

1. San Diego Unified School District, Clairine Cadena, Speech-Language Pathologist
2. California Speech-Hearing-Hearing Association (CSHA), Diane Collins, President

*Comment: RE: OBJECTIONS - Proposed 5 CA Code of Regulations Title 5 Section 80048.6 (b) (8) Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Communication Development Authorization Page 36: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/notices/coded/2009/0909.pdf> Proposed CCR Title 5 Section §80048.6(b)(8). The Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Communication Development authorizes the holder to conduct assessments, provide instruction, and special education related services to individuals with academic communication and language needs in the following areas: language development, social communication, school readiness skills, literacy development, and competencies across the curriculum in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and core academic areas, to students in preschool, kindergarten, grades 1 - 12 through age 22, and classes organized primarily for adults in services across the continuum of program options available.*

The California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA) represents professionals as well as families dealing with communication and related disorders.

As per the California Government Code, Section 11340 et seq. , the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), the California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA) hereby formally opposes the proposed regulation 5 CCR Section 80048.6(b)(8) for a new authorization labeled: Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Communication Development. This opposition is based upon the following APA standards of lacking clarity, being vague and confusing, being overly-broad in scope, duplicative, being unnecessary, and lacking authority.

The California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA) objects to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) prioritizing school administrators' concerns with personnel shortages over competencies required for serving children with, or at-risk of communication impairments and /or disorders. While the CTC has attempted to define a new special education teacher authorization for communication development in terms of serving academic language and social communication issues, the vagueness of the authorization description does not obscure the intent to lower training and competency standards for a class of professionals already set forth in federal and state law. This proposal will create local administrator, special education program, and parent confusion at the expense of children requiring assessments and services of more highly trained professional. The proposal conflicts with and duplicates existing federal and state laws covering these special education services and special education personnel standards, Necessity is lacking either for an additional general education authorization in literacy and academic language, or in lowering standards for an alternative to speech-language pathologist. Finally, the proposed authorization lacks authority by purporting to be a special education authorization but is based upon general education skill sets that are reserved to the legislature for general education teaching authorizations.

**CTC should rewrite and clarify the proposed credential authorization §80048.6(b)(8) communication development. If the CTC desires to create a general education credential for literacy and academic language development, CTC should sponsor legislation to that effect. If CTC desires to expand personnel for special education assessment and services to children with, or at-risk of, speech and language impairments and/or disorders, it should place such personnel under the supervision, direction and control of fully-qualified speech-language pathologists [authorized by the legislature with Education Code 44265.3(a)].**

#### **CLARITY, VAGUE AND CONFUSING**

The proposed “Communication Development” authorization description is overly-broad and confusing in its description and scope as to assessment and services of the communication and language development authorization. This proposals refers to academic language and communication skills that would apply to almost all children, and as such is overly-broad. The proposal also specifically mentions special education “related services” which is overly-broad, confusing and implies assessments and services for language and communication impairments and disorders.

This overly-broad and confusing description of the proposed communication development authorization will confuse local administrators, teacher, specialists, and parents as to the role of a special education teacher with communication development authorization versus the speech-language specialist's role, assessments, and services. This confusion will cause denials of students' special education legal rights as to an assessment of all suspected disabilities, deny appropriate recommendations for the special education Individual Education Plan, delay and deny rights to appropriate speech and language services by mandated and qualified personnel, and cause irreparably harm to students with speech and language impairments.

### **AUTHORITY LACKING; DUPLICATES and OVERLAPS EXISTING FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS**

The Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) is proposing this new credential authorization as an illegal alternative to the legally established professional discipline of speech-language pathology defined under the California Education Code for special education "related services" speech-language pathology [Education Code 56363]; under the state mandated credential for speech-language pathology [Education Code 44265.3]; as well as defined under the state licensing laws for Speech-Language Pathology [Business and Professions Code 2530 et seq.].

Is this proposed credential authority for serving academic skills of literacy, communication and language development – or is this proposed credential authority for special education related services of speech and language impairments? If the first, then general education teacher credential authority which has been reserved by the state legislature preempts the Commission's regulation authority. If the second, then existing federal and state special education laws pre-empt the Commission's regulation authority in the area of special education personnel standards and special education services.

The specific professional discipline applicable to the proposed section above would be the profession of speech-language pathology referred to in the previous paragraph.

**CFR section 300.34 "Related Services"** (a) means .... *and such developmental, corrective, and other supportive services as are required to assist a child with a disability to benefit from special education, and includes speech-language pathology services.*

### **20 USCS § 1412 (a)(14) Personnel qualifications.**

(A) In general. The State educational agency has established and maintains qualifications to ensure that personnel necessary to carry out this part [20 USCS §§ 1411 et seq.] are appropriately and adequately prepared and trained, including that those personnel have the content knowledge and skills to serve children with disabilities.

**(B) Related services personnel** and paraprofessionals. The qualifications under subparagraph (A) include qualifications for related services personnel and paraprofessionals that—

(i) are consistent with any State-approved or State-recognized certification, licensing, registration, or other comparable requirements *that apply to the professional discipline* in which those personnel are providing special education or related services;

- (ii) ensure that related services personnel who deliver services in their discipline or profession meet the requirements of clause (i) and have not had certification or licensure requirements waived on an emergency, temporary, or provisional basis; and
- (iii) allow paraprofessionals and assistants who are appropriately trained and supervised, in accordance with State law, regulation, or written policy, in meeting the requirements of this part [20 USCS §§ 1411 et seq.] to be used to assist in the provision of special education and related services under this part [20 USCS §§ 1411 et seq.] to children with disabilities.

**CFR 300.7 (a)** speech and language is considered one of the federal handicapping conditions—

**CFR 300.7 (c) (11)** "Speech or language impairment means a communication disorder, such as stuttering, impaired articulation, a language impairment or a voice impairment, that adversely affect a child's educational performance."

### **Education Code 56320 Tests & assessments**

(f) The pupil is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability including, if appropriate, health and development, vision, including low vision, hearing, motor abilities, language function, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status, self-help, orientation and mobility skills, career and vocational abilities and interests, and social and emotional status. A developmental history shall be obtained, when appropriate. For pupils with residual vision, a low vision assessment shall be provided in accordance with guidelines established pursuant to Section 56136. In assessing each pupil under this article, the assessment shall be conducted in accordance with subsections (h), (i), and (j) of CFR Section 300.532. Disabling conditions, as defined in Section 300.8 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations, or an established medical disability, as defined in subdivision (d): (K) Speech or language impairment in one or more of voice, fluency, language and articulation.

**EC 56363.** (a) As used in this part, the term "designated instruction and services" means "related services" as that term is defined in Section 1401(26) of Title 20 of the United States Code and Section 300.34 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The term "related services" means transportation, and such developmental, corrective, and other supportive services (including speech-language pathology and audiology services, interpreting services, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, recreation, including therapeutic recreation, social work services, school nurse services designed to enable an individual with exceptional needs to receive a free appropriate public education as described in the individualized education program of the child, counseling services, including rehabilitation counseling, orientation and mobility services, and medical services, except that such medical services shall be for diagnostic and evaluation purposes only) as may be required to assist an individual with exceptional needs to benefit from special education, and includes the early identification and assessment of disabling conditions in children.

**EC 56031.** (a) "Special education," in accordance with Section 1401(29) of Title 20 of the United States Code, means specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parent, to meet the unique needs of individuals with exceptional needs, including instruction conducted in

the classroom, in the home, in hospitals and institutions, and other settings, and instruction in physical education.

(b) In accordance with Section 300.39 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations, special education includes each of the following, if the services otherwise meet the requirements of subdivision (a):(1) Speech-language pathology services, or any other designated instruction and service or related service, pursuant to Section 56363

*Commission Response:* There is a misinterpretation of the reason the Commission is developing a new teacher authorization. The Commission is not prioritizing school administrator personnel shortage concerns over appropriate special education services nor lowering training and SLP competencies to create a new authorization. In June 2006, the Commission directed staff to begin the review and revision of the structure and requirements for the Education Specialist and Other Related Services Credentials. The Commission convened a workgroup to explore special education credentials and to make recommendations to the Commission for changes in both the structure and processes. The Special Education Credential Workgroup was formed in December 2006 and began its deliberations in February 2007.

The process included 16 different opportunities for public input throughout the state as well as opportunities to interact with the membership of professional organizations who had an interest in the preparation of teachers and other educators of students with disabilities. The process took more than two years. All of the concerns were charted and provided to the Commission's special education advisory groups. More than 1000 persons signed in at the meetings that were held, many considered experts in the field of special education teaching and services areas. The conversations were lively and varied. There was a considerable amount of disagreement and every attempt was made to make sure that all points of view were heard and discussed. No one organization or voice dominated the discussion. Out of the discussions came the 25 recommendations designed to reach the goals set forth by the Commission and represented in SB 1209.

The Commission is proposing a new teaching authorization to provide instructional services not to provide speech services. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization. The proposed new teaching authorization in communication development will allow individuals to serve students who have specific needs in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. The teacher has knowledge of their special education area and content area that allows students access to the core curriculum. The SLP credential holder will continue to provide speech language services to students that have a disability that would be identified as speech and language disorders. These are two different federal disability category areas. The Commission believes that with other regulations, the implementation process must be thorough and great care taken to allow our stakeholders to clearly understand the requirements, authorization, and parameters for each amendment and addition to these regulations.

The Commission currently issues two documents to serve general education students in the area of literacy skills, the Reading Certificate and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential so no new authorization is needed in this area. There is no need for

SLPs to supervise teachers with the communication development teaching authorization as the teachers will not be providing speech language services.

The proposed new teaching authorization in communication development will allow individuals to serve students who have specific needs in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. It does not authorize the holder to provide speech services and is not intended to replace the SLP Credential. The coursework completed in the teacher preparation program and the instruction will focus on communication, literacy, and pragmatic skills for students that may fall in the learning disability area. The teacher will also meet subject-matter competence in a general education subject aligned with No Child Left Behind to allow the individual to provide instructional services in the core curriculum. SLPS are not required to meet subject-matter competence unless they have a Special Class Authorization.

The Commission has stressed the difference in authorization for teaching and services credentials through the assignment monitoring process and the *Administrator's Assignment Manual*. The Manual will be updated following the approval of regulations. The communication development teacher authorization does not authorize the holder to provide speech language services; it would be a misassignment for a teacher to provide speech language services and for a credentialed SLP to provide instructional services.

The authorization statements for all Education Specialist Teaching Credentials have included the terminology 'including related services' since 1997. The only change to this wording in these proposed regulations is to add the words 'special education' to clarify that related services are in the area of special not general education. Since 1997, the related services in the teaching credential authorization has not allowed the holders to provide speech pathology services since the Commission issues a credential specifically for this area and teachers may not provide speech and hearing services. The sections listed are not applicable to licensing requirements as they refer to employment, testing, and assessments. The Commission does not cite the Education Codes or 5 Cal Code of Regulations cited in this letter as the authority for the regulations so are not using these definitions to 'other related services'.

3. Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board, Lisa O'Connor, MA, Chair  
*Comment:* **Proposed CCR Title 5, Section 80048.6(b)(8) The Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Communication Development** authorizes the holder to conduct assessments, provide instruction, and special education related services to individuals with academic communication and language needs in the following areas: language development, social communication, school readiness skills, literacy development, and competencies across the curriculum in listening, speaking, reading, writing and core academic areas, to students in preschool, kindergarten, grades 1 – 12 through age 22, and classes organized primarily for adults in services across the continuum of program options available.

Objections by the licensing Board (SLPAB) to the creation of this new credential include the following:

- The title "Communication Development" is misleading as it denotes the scope of responsibility of a professional who assesses and treats communication disorders which is currently and historically within the training and scope of practice of a speech-

language pathologist. The confusion is partially the result of an overlap with B & P codes and Ed Codes that define the responsibilities of a speech-language pathologist somewhat differently. The Board believes this overlap will cause confusion for administrators and members of Individual Education Planning teams who have the responsibility of determining which special education service provider can provide the most appropriate service in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) for the student with a disability. In order to provide “appropriate services” there must be a match between the authorized services and the knowledge and skills of the service provider. Since the training parameters for this new credential are vague and lack definition of the standards expected, children with true language needs due to a delay or disorder would in all probability receive services from a less qualified provider.

- As noted in the previous paragraph, the training for those credentialed under the new authorization is unclear. What exactly will be required in order to assure that these new credential holders have adequate knowledge and skills to treat students with communication disorders and/or language delays? On page 6 of the Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview it states: *The curriculum focuses on school-based issues and the knowledge and skills necessary for success in an academic setting and in the core curriculum.* This is a very general statement concerning the training these individuals will receive, and it lacks specificity as to what competencies will be required in order for this new credential holder to possess the knowledge and skills necessary to provide services to students who demonstrate communication and/or language disorders who might well be assigned to provide such services.
- The term “assessment” is used very broadly in the proposed regulation changes. The assessment responsibilities are unclear and undefined and would be extremely difficult to implement as there is no clear understanding of what the assessment is to accomplish. What type of assessments will this new credential holder be authorized to do? Again, page 6 of the Informative Digest/Policy Statement Overview states that the individual holding the Communication Development Authorization may “conduct assessments authorized by the credential...” Our concern is that assessments for language problems or any other disability for that matter should be identified by a licensed/credentialed specialist with real expertise in the given disorder. An individual holding this new credential should not be assessing children to identify a particular disability, but rather should be referring the student to the appropriate licensed/credentialed specialist for a thorough evaluation and determination whether or not the problem is an “academic language problem” or a true communication and/or language disorder.
- Finally, the proposed regulations do not reflect a clear understanding of the complexity of language, nor do they clearly define “language” and/or “language disorder.” The proposed regulations constantly refer to “academic language,” which also lacks definition in these regulations. We respectfully request that the Commission review the following information and take it into consideration when considering the concerns expressed in this communication regarding the proposed regulations for this new credential holder:

Oral language skills underlie written language development and have a reciprocal relationship to each other. (American Speech-Language Hearing Association (2001). Both are crucial to academic progress, social success and satisfactory job performance. Classrooms,

workplaces and everyday social activities are communication environments that are linguistically based and language driven as children and adults utilize the four features of language/literacy - listening, talking, reading and writing – to effectively manage the demands of those environments. The American Speech-Language Hearing Association has noted twenty-seven areas concerned with speech and language disorders affecting all ages and populations. ([www.asha.org/public/speech/disorders](http://www.asha.org/public/speech/disorders)) How will this new credential holder acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to deal with such speech and language disorders? Again, the training parameters are not clear!

The components of language – mechanics, phonology, semantics, syntax, and pragmatics are interrelated and interact with each other during communication acts – conversation, reading, writing, sharing ideas, and making requests or explanations. Language disorders impact a person’s language performance within one or more of these areas. National associations such as the American Speech-Language Hearing Association and the Learning Disability Association plus governmental groups such as the Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities and federal studies have listed critical language skills as being those which are necessary for successful performance in school. Students with deficiencies in these critical areas are at a high risk for developing learning problems. Further, it has been estimated that well over eighty percent of learning disabilities are language-based. This clearly indicates that language assessment and intervention must be based on sound principles that recognize:

- a) that language is an integrated system
- b) the various theories that underlie the study of how language is acquired
- c) the etiological categories that differentiate the language disordered child from his or her normally developing peers
- d) the models and purposes of assessment
- e) how to interpret the assessment data gathered
- f) methods and strategies for effective intervention planning.

The required curriculum for training these new credential holders needs to recognize the importance of these principles.

The Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board has been at the forefront of designing programs, criteria, and regulations regarding the role of Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists, aides, and assistants, adhering to the strictest ethical and legal parameters of the professions and has been charged with protecting the consumer. The importance of language development and the timely identification of language disorders in the school-based population are critical because of their close relationship to the development of overall literacy skills. To protect the general welfare of the public, who in this case refers to students enrolled in the public schools, it is crucial that the highly trained skills of Speech-Language Pathologists continue to be the vanguard of identification, diagnosis, and remediation of language disorders so that intervention can indeed facilitate successful academic learning.

## REFERENCE

American Speech-Language Hearing Association (2001) Roles and responsibilities of speech-language pathologists with respect to reading and writing in children and adolescents (position statement, executive summary of guidelines, technical report). *ASHA* supplement 21, 17-28. Rockville, MD: Author.

*Commission Response:* The Commission does not believe the title of the communication development authorization is misleading. Development, by definition, means a process in which something passes by degrees to a different stage (especially a more advanced or mature stage) or a state in which things are improving. Communication development is the use of communication to promote social development. More specifically, it refers to the practice of systematically applying the processes, strategies, and principles of communication to bring about positive social change. Communication development is achievable by instructional services. Communication disorders are speech and language disorders which refer to problems in communication and in related areas such as oral motor function or mental disorders characterized by difficulties with speech or language, severe enough to interfere academically, occupationally, or socially. Communication disorders are limited to SLP Credential holders who complete coursework in the area.

The Commission is proposing a new teaching authorization to provide instructional services not to provide speech services. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization. The proposed new teaching authorization in communication development will allow individuals to serve students in the category of learning disabilities who have specific needs in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. The teacher has knowledge of their special education area and content area that allows students access to the core curriculum. The SLP credential holder will continue to provide speech language services to students that have a disability that would be identified as speech and language delayed. These are two different federal disability category areas.

Each Education Specialist program includes a program standard in the area of assessment to allow the teacher to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals. In response to the comments concerning assessments, the Commission is adding language to clarify the types of assessments that may be completed by education specialist teachers in section 80048.6 and speech-language pathologist service providers in section 80048.9.

While SLPs are prepared to work with students with a language disorder or language delay, they are not specifically prepared to provide academic core content. In addition, they are not required, as does the Communication Development credential programs, to meet subject-matter competence in order to work with children identified with language development needs as the teacher of record unless the SLP has a Special Class Authorization. Each Education Specialist Teaching Credential candidate including Communication Development completes a program of coursework specific to the disability area that they may serve. The Commission has the authority to set standards as found in EC section 44225(a).

The CD authorization provides specialized targeted preparation and field experiences that focus on communication, literacy and pragmatic development. The proposed solution is focused preparation to provide access to the core curriculum for communication development teachers. Title 5 regulations specify the legal authorization of the credential holders. If SLPs or Education Specialists work within the authorized areas of service delivery, legal issues should not be a problem. In your letter, you state, "Further, it has been

estimated that well over eighty percent of learning disabilities are language-based “ which clearly shows a need for the Communication Development authorization for those students whose ‘language’ needs focus on communication, literacy and pragmatic development

The Commission is proposing a new teaching authorization to provide instructional services not to provide speech services. There is no change to the training or services that may be provided by a speech-language pathologist (SLP) and the Commission is adding regulations to specifically define the requirements and authorization. The proposed new teaching authorization in communication development will allow individuals to serve students who have specific needs in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. The teacher has knowledge of their special education area and content area that allows students access to the core curriculum. The SLP credential holder will continue to provide speech language services to students that have a disability that would be identified as speech and language delayed. These are two different federal disability category areas.

4. American Speech-Language Hearing Association, Sue T. Hale, MCD, CCC-SLP, President  
*Comment:* Dear Mr. Pearson: The American Speech-Language Hearing Association (ASHA) represents over 135,000 speech-language pathologists (SLP), audiologists, and speech and hearing scientists nationwide and over 9,000 members practicing in California. I am writing on behalf of ASHA and to join the California Speech-Language-Hearing Association (CSHA) in voicing strong opposition to the proposed regulation 5 CCR Section 80048.6(b)(8) for a new authorization called the Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Communication Development. ASHA opposes the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (“the Commission”) Communication Development Specialist (CDS) Credential for the following reasons.

#### **Lack of Quality Standards**

While the requirements for speech-language pathologists (SLPs) are rigorous and standards based, the standards for the CDS credential are vague and confusing. ASHA certified SLPs have a minimum of a master’s degree in communication sciences and disorders which provides the depth of knowledge to address the broad service needs of students with speech and language disorders. Masters trained SLPs complete a rigorous standards based academic and practical program to provide services in both clinical and educational settings. The CDS completes a bachelor’s degree in education or a related field and additional education/training and/or mentoring. While SLPs spend the majority of their graduate program assessing and treating individuals with a broad spectrum of communication disabilities including language disorders, the CDS will have little to no expertise or training in identifying and treating children with communication disorders including complex language-based disorders such as Autism. It is absurd to expect that the CDS will be able to acquire the skills necessary to treat these disorders through on the job and mentoring activities.

The CDS is a significantly different credential in both required coursework and field experience from an SLP. It is our opinion that the holder will not be sufficiently prepared to identify and support the educational achievement of students with language-based learning disabilities and disorders.

### **Clinical vs. Educational Model**

ASHA strongly objects to the Commission's assertion that SLPs are trained only to provide clinical/medical assessment and treatment services. The Commission states the SLP is competent to provide clinical/medical services, while the CDS can provide educationally based communication services. The education and training that SLPs receive through a four-year Bachelor and subsequent two-year Master program, as well as a supervised Clinical Fellowship, affords them the expertise to assess and provide therapy to all students regardless of their communication disorder in an education setting. In fact 50% of ASHA-certified SLPs work in educational settings in therapeutic and classroom based models. SLPs are trained to work in collaboration with classroom teachers providing services in the classroom to ensure carryover of skills and access to the curriculum.

### **Design and Development Issues**

The CDS was designed and developed without sufficient consideration of outcome and implementation. Although the Commission funded and assembled a subcommittee of the design team, including SLPs, the team met only twice and devoted fewer than 6 hours to actual credential development. Written input from subcommittee meetings was not incorporated into the final draft of the standards. Members of the subcommittee were prohibited from responding to the draft standards once they were completed and made available to the public. Input from constituents at the Commission forums were not incorporated into the language of the standards. In fact, it is unclear why funds were expended on the subcommittee when the Commission refused to incorporate any of its recommendations in the standards.

### **Flawed Input Process and Lack of Transparency**

While the Commission states that there have been numerous public meetings with multiple opportunities to provide input that, in fact, has not been the case. Over the past two years, the Commission has demonstrated a lack of transparency, disallowing certain disability groups to have a voice, hand selecting participants in the design and development process, lacking representation from professional organizations, and rebuking efforts to collaborate in the formation process between the writing groups and the "design team." It appears that the intent from the onset was to allow administrators and human resource staff the flexibility in hiring, not in ensuring, that every child with an identified disability under federal law has the opportunity to benefit from their special education program. We believe that the goal has been to decrease the number of "disability specific" credentials in order to create a more generic authorization to serve any student with an identified communication or literacy need.

### **Support and Opposition to the CDS Credential**

The Commission claims it has overwhelming support for the new credential. However, stakeholders speaking in favor of the proposal commented on the need for more service providers rather than on the merits of the Commission's proposal itself. Although viable alternatives were presented, the Commission refused to discuss or give serious consideration to alternative proposals/suggestions such as those presented by CSHA. All comments received in favor of the CDS were made by superintendents, administrators and human resource personnel, not by SLPs directly impacted by the credential.

### **Challenges to an Established Profession**

The new credential challenges a legally established professional discipline defined in federal law and under the California Education Code. If approved the credential would lower the training and competency requirements for a class of professionals already established by law and will confuse administrators, teachers and most importantly families as to the role of the CDS and SLP. Denials of services from qualified SLPs will delay and deny student rights to a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) and potentially cause an increase in costly litigation.

### **Alleviating the Perceived Shortage of Qualified SLPs in Education Settings**

The real reason for the credential, we believe, is to alleviate the shortage (although the commission has not produced accurate data to quantify the shortage) of qualified SLPs. With fourteen training programs in California, six in the neighboring states, and two in development in CA, over 400 new CSD graduates can be expected each year. The challenge is for the state and local districts in attracting new graduates to develop initiatives such as competitive salaries, student loan forgiveness, and workload solutions.

If the Commission were truly interested in ameliorating the shortage, it would have entertained other solutions such as a proposed Language- Literacy Credential designed to provide struggling students in general education with enriching activities to help them access the general curriculum thus decreasing the number of students requiring special education and reducing the demand for SLPs.

The Commission could also explore successful models such as those employed in San Diego Unified and Los Angeles Unified School District, two of the largest districts in the state. In both districts, a workload model was employed to identify caseload resulting in a full complement of SLP staff for the 2009-2010 school year.

The Commission could contact other states who have increased the number of qualified SLPs in education settings such as the successful efforts in HI, UT, and NH, where strategies have been undertaken to significantly increase the number of graduate students in CSD programs.

Both CSHA and ASHA remain committed to assisting the Commission in developing viable alternatives to the CDS to ensure that students and families receive quality services from competent professionals in order to become productive citizens in today's complex society.

In summary, we believe that the proposed CDS authorization is overly-broad and will confuse local administrators, teacher, specialists, and parents as to the role of a special education teacher with CDS authorization versus the speech-language specialist's role, assessments, and services. This confusion will cause denials of students' special education legal rights as to an assessment of all suspected disabilities, and delay and deny rights to appropriate speech and language services by mandated and qualified personnel with irreparable harm to students.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed regulations and hope the Commission will give serious and thoughtful consideration to comments provided. Should you have any questions, please contact Eileen Crowe, ASHA's Director of State

Association Relations, and the ASHA staff advocacy liaison to California at [xxx](#), or by phone at xxx-xxx-xxxx; or Janet Deppe, ASHA's Director of State Advocacy, at [xxx](#) or xxx-xxx-xxxx.

*Commission Response:* The ASHA Standards (2008) were used as a reference document by both the sub-committee and the Commission's Design team to develop the specialty specific standards for the SLP services credential. There were areas where the national standards largely referenced clinical settings and referenced clients with little attention to schools, students or children. There is also no mention in ASHA Standards of IEPs or IFSPs and preparing graduates to develop and implement these documents that are the cornerstone of assisting and instructing students with disabilities in schools. The standards in California include these subjects.

The Education Specialist: Communication Development is a special education teaching authorization. Holders of this credential are authorized and prepared to deliver instructional services to students with disabilities based on their IEP. They provide services based upon their authorization which is different than the SLP authorization.

California standards for both Speech Language Pathologist Services Credentials and Education Specialist Teaching Credentials and Authorizations have been upgraded in the area of Autism Spectrum Disorders. The Commission's Design Team recognized this as an area for improvement of both teaching and services credentials. This is a critical new area with expanded preparation for all special education credential holders.

The Education Specialist: Communication Development is a significantly different authorization in both required coursework and fieldwork from an SLP. One is a services credential; one is a teaching credential. One of the requirements to meet the 'highly qualified' status is demonstration of the knowledge of and ability to teach the subjects they are assigned. They must also pass California's Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) that tests their knowledge of reading mechanics, assessment, diagnostic and instructional strategies among other competencies and also earn an authorization to teach English learners. SLP credential holders do not have to demonstrate these proficiencies. SLP credentials are the only credential authorized to provide services to those diagnosed with speech-language impairments such as articulation, fluency, voice, stuttering and swallowing.

The subcommittee for SLPs met several times. There were seven members of the SLP subcommittee and there was not agreement on many topics within the subcommittee. Once the sub-committees had met and provided their suggestions on Specialty Specific Standards, the Design Team developed the final standards. In addition to those suggestions made by members provided by CSHA, the design team also used input from other experts including Reading Specialists holders of Education Specialist teaching credentials including Resource Specialists, SELPA directors, Holders of Mild/ Moderate and the old Communication Handicapped credentials. The draft standards for all teaching and services credentials were made available to the public for comment. No one was exempted from reviewing the draft standards. Information from all subcommittees, information at all the forums, and the responses to the draft standards were reviewed by the Design Team.

In June 2006, the Commission directed staff to begin the review and revision of the structure and requirements for the Education Specialist and Other Related Services Credentials. The Commission convened a workgroup to explore special education credentials and to make recommendations to the Commission for changes in both the structure and processes. The Special Education Credential Workgroup was formed in December 2006 and began its deliberations in February 2007. The process included 16 different opportunities for public input throughout the state as well as opportunities to interact with the membership of professional organizations who had an interest in preparation of teachers and other educators of students with disabilities. The process took more than two years. All of the concerns were charted and provided to the Commission's special education advisory groups. More than 1000 persons signed in at the meetings that were held, many considered experts in the field of special education teaching and services areas. The conversations were lively and varied. There was a considerable amount of disagreement and every attempt was made to make sure that all points of view were heard and discussed. No one organization or voice dominated the discussion. Out of the discussions came the 25 recommendations designed to reach the goals set forth by the Commission and represented in SB 1209.

The topic of the Communication Development authorization and the SLP Credential has been discussed at numerous Commission meetings. Members of the public and stakeholders on both sides of the issue made presentations to the Commission.

Education Specialist: Communication Development authorization meets the same requirements as all Education Specialist teaching credentials. Administrators, IEP teams and families understand the service delivery models that are available. There are misassignment penalties for administrators who do not. This new teaching authorization will not limit the services that are offered by SLPs to those identified by IEP team as speech language impaired.

There is a misinterpretation of the reason the Commission is developing a new teacher authorization. The Commission is not prioritizing school administrator personnel shortage concerns over appropriate special education services nor lowering training and SLP competencies to create a new authorization. In its report to the Legislature the Commission's Workgroup proposed a number of suggested ways to address the SLP shortage. The proposed new teaching authorization in communication development will allow individuals to serve students in the category of learning disabilities as identified in an IEP who have specific needs in the area of communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. The teacher has knowledge of their special education area and content area that allows students access to the core curriculum. The SLP credential holder will continue to provide speech services to students that have a disability that would be identified as speech and language delayed. These are two different federal disability category areas.

In its report to the Legislature as well as the meetings held by the Commission, the development of new SLP programs was strongly encouraged. The Commission staff has worked closely with the universities to help them develop new SLP programs. The major difficulty has been the moratorium on new programs imposed by ASHA that has delayed these and other universities' development of new programs. The Design Team did review what other states were doing including those mentioned as well as Georgia, Kansas, New

York and others with the assistance of the Personnel Center for Special Education and the California Comprehensive Center. The Commission currently issues two documents to serve general education students in the area of literacy skills, the Reading Certificate and the Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential so no new authorization is needed in this area.

5. California Professors of Early Childhood Special Education, Maureen Ballard-Rosa, Professor, CSU Sacramento and Deborah Chen, CSU Northridge (*note that Deborah Chen also sent in a personal comment in opposition*)

*Comment:* Formal statement of objection to the proposed Educational Specialist Instruction Credential: Communication Development. The California Association Professors of Early Childhood Special Education (CAPECSE) is a group of faculty from institutions of higher education throughout California who prepare personnel to work with infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities and their families. CAPECSE is committed to ensuring that personnel preparation programs provide the necessary knowledge, experience, and supervision to produce highly qualified and professional competent Early intervention/Early Childhood Special Education Professionals. CAPECSE members include Early Childhood Special Education(ECSE) faculty of: CSU San Bernardino; CSU Dominguez Hills; CSU Sacramento, CSU Northridge' CSU Los Angeles' CSU Fullerton' San Diego State U' San Francisco State U; San Jose State U; and Santa Clara University.

CAPECSE commends the efforts of CCTC to address the goals of providing improved services to California students with disabilities, increasing opportunities for quality in personnel preparation, and addressing the needs of local education agencies for hiring and retention of qualified special education personnel. However, we wish to go on record stating that our organization, CAPECSE, does not support the Educational Specialist Instruction Credential in Communication Development as currently proposed. Faculty and practitioners in early intervention and early childhood special education have consistently expressed concerns about the proposed CD credential including at public input meetings (in San Bernardino on August 22, 2007; Sacramento on July 16, 2008, and Costa Mesa on August 13, 2008).

The CD credential was initially proposed as an authorization to serve almost all students with language-communication difficulties, from infancy to adult. Individual CAPECSE members submitted timely online input with very strong concerns that the competencies required to meet the developmental/education and family needs of infants, toddlers, and preschoolers with disabilities require highly specialized coursework and fieldwork, and could not be achieved within the limitations of a two-year credential program—that must also include competencies to meet the academic, communication, and social skills needs of K-adult students. It should be noted that in response to the field's protestations, the birth to 36 month age range was eliminated from the CD credential.

The following are our major objections:

1. The proposed Communication Development credential is extremely broad both in the services and populations to be served. Based on the CTC's Coded Correspondence No 09-09, the current CD authorization (preschool to adult) allows instructional services to students with mild-moderate mental retardation, learning disabilities and autism spectrum disorders (pp. 17-18). However, it is not listed as an authorization to provide instructional

services to students whose primary disability is speech or language impairments (pp. 21-22).

2. Preparation of highly qualified teachers with a credential that authorizes services from preschool to grade K and to age 22 years is likely to take more than two years. In addition to teacher competencies in K-12 academic content and beyond, the proposed CD credential will require competencies in developmentally appropriate preschool curriculum, training basic communication skills, expressive and receptive oral language development, social/pragmatic skills, early and emergency literacy development, and working in close partnerships with families.

3. There is considerable overlap between the authorizations of the current Educational Specialist Instruction Credential in Early Childhood Special Education and the proposed CD authorization. It is unclear how the integrity of the ECSE credential will be maintained when for a similar investment of time potential teachers can acquire the CDE educational specialist credential that will authorize them to teach in almost any special education teaching position in public schools, other than with children who have low incidence disabilities.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide specific input on the complex issue of new credentials and authorization and urge the CCTC to review and revise the CD credential so that its authorization does not include instructional services to preschools with IEPs.

*Commission Response:* The Commission did take into consideration the concerns of CAPECSE and changed the age/grade level originally proposed for the Communication Development authorization.

1) The authorization for the Communication Development authorization in the categories of mild/moderate disabilities and learning handicapped is limited to the areas of academic communication and language needs in the following areas: language development, social communication, school readiness skills, literacy development, and competencies across the curriculum in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and core academic areas as listed in the proposed authorization in Title 5 section 80048.6(b)(8).

2) There is not a limitation of the length in years of the program or the number of credit units in a special education preparation program. Teacher preparation programs have considerable discretion on how the curriculum is delivered. These include programs that begin in the undergraduate years as well as post baccalaureate programs that could culminate in an advanced degree. The Communication Development authorization is aligned with other Education Specialist Teaching Credential programs which requires the teacher to complete a bachelor's degree, special education professional preparation program including student teaching, and other required coursework. All of the Education Specialist Credential with the exception of the Early Childhood Education must also satisfy subject-matter competence and pass the RICA examination. The holder of a Communication Development authorization will complete additional content to work with students at the preschool level needing services in communication, literacy and pragmatic skills.

3) The grade level authorization overlap with the Early Childhood Education and the Communication Development Specialist is only at the preschool level. The Early Childhood Education Specialist has the additional age level of birth to age 3 and authorizes services in the area of mild/moderate and moderate/severe disabilities. In discussion with employing agencies, the need for the overlap in the grade level was deemed to be necessary. The overlap of the preschool grade level will assist employers with classes with a combination of students in both preschool and grades 1-3 with students needing services in communication, literacy and pragmatic skills. The program of coursework for the Communication Development authorization includes specific content for the preschool age student.

There is overlap across disability areas for almost all the Education Specialist Credentials. Both the mild/moderate and moderate/severe disability areas may serve students in the area of serious emotional disturbance and moderate/severe disability, visual impairments, and deaf and hard-of-hearing may all serve in the area of deaf-blind.

6. Division of Long Term Care Services, State of California, Cynthia Radavsky, Deputy Director

*Comment:* The proposed language for §80046.6(a)(1) does not include state hospitals or developmental centers in the listed continuum of program of program options available as required by Education Code Section 56031, 34 CFR, Part 300.39(s)(1), and 20 UAX 1401(29) (citations attached)

We request that Section 80048.6(a)(1) to read as follows:

Authorizations for Education Specialist Instruction Credentials and the Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization.

(a) The following definitions apply to authorizations for Education Specialist Instruction Credentials and the Early Childhood Special Education Added Authorization:(1) ‘Service across the continuum of program options available’: Pursuant to Education Code Sections 56031, 56360, and 56361, the continuum includes: resource rooms or services; special education settings; general education settings; special schools; home/hospital settings; correctional facilities; **state hospitals; development centers;** non-public, non-sectarian schools and agencies as defined in Education Code Sections 56365 and 56366; and alternative and non-traditional instructional public school settings other than classrooms.

56031. (a) "Special education," in accordance with Section 1401(29) of Title 20 of the United States Code, means specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parent, to meet the unique needs of individuals with exceptional needs, including instruction conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals and **institutions**, and other settings, and instruction in physical education.

34 CFR, Part 300.39(a)(1)(i)

(a) General. (1) Special education means specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability, including – (i) Instruction conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals, and **institutions**, and in other setting;

20 USC 1401(29)

§1401. Definitions (29) Special education

The term “special education” means specially designed instruction, at no cost to parents, to meet the unique needs of a child with a disability, including – (A) instruction conducted in the classroom, in the home, in hospitals, and **institutions**, and in other setting; and(B) instruction in physical education.

*Commission Response:* The Commission concurs with the change. The change appears in the regulations below.

7. California Department of Finance, Nicholas Schweizer,

*Comment:* This email serves as the Department of Finance's written comments on the CTC's proposals to amend regulations for the Special Education Teaching and Services credentials and to amend regulations for the Career Technical Education and Business and Industry Partnership Teaching credentials. DOF staff have reviewed these proposed regulations and we are concerned that they could create reimbursable state mandates that could result in new costs to the state.

Below is our staff analyses of the issues and attached are the changes that would address our concerns. Please let me know if you have concerns with these changes. We would be happy to work with you and your staff to ensure the proposed amendments achieve the Commission's objectives and are cost neutral.

RE: Commission on Teacher Credentialing Proposal to Amend the California Code of Regulations (CCR) pertaining to the Special Education Teaching and Services Credentials

The proposed amendments and additions to the CCRs would require local educational agencies and employing school districts to participate in the development plan for an underprepared Education Specialist credential candidate. Current law does not require these activities of local educational agencies. Rather, existing law specifies minimum credential requirements and places the burden of preparation on the candidate. The Commission's proposed amendments could potentially be determined to create new requirements of local educational agencies and employing school districts , thereby creating a new state mandated local program that could result in General Fund costs.

Our suggested changes to the proposed CCRs were made with Microsoft Word's track changes tool. Our additions are underlined in green text and deletions are struck through in blue text. You will find our proposed edits in paragraphs highlighted in yellow.

*Commission Response:*

Below are the specific sections the Department of Finance asked for changes and the Commission's response. *Note: only the sections with proposed changes are listed below*

~~§80048.3(a)(7) - The recommendation from a regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a program~~ Verification of completion from Completion of a Commission-approved preparation program ~~sponsor~~ accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the preliminary credential specialty area(s) sought, as specific provided in Education code Section ~~44227~~ 44373(c), and

~~§80048.8(a)(11) - Verification of completion from~~ Completion of a Commission-approved preparation program ~~sponsor~~ accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the preliminary credential specialty area(s) sought, as specific provided in Education code Section ~~44227~~ 44373(c).

The Commission has agreed to the amendments suggested by DOF to avoid any potential claims for reimbursement of mandated costs. The subsections have been deleted as completion of the programs appears within another subsection within these sections. The changes appear in the regulations below.

---

**§80048.4(a)(5)** - ~~The recommendation from a regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a program~~ Verification of completion from ~~Completion of a Commission-approved preparation program sponsor~~ Completion of a Commission-approved preparation program sponsor accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the clear Level II credential specialty area(s) sought, as specific provided in Education code Section ~~44227~~ 44373(c), and

**§80048.8.1(b)** - ~~Verification of completion from~~ Completion of a Commission-approved preparation program sponsor accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the clear credential specialty area(s) sought, as specific provided in Education code Section ~~44227~~ 44373(c)

The Commission has agreed to the amendments suggested by DOF to avoid any potential claims for reimbursement of mandated costs. The changes appear in the regulations below.

---

**§80048.4(a)(4)** - completion of a course of study that requires each candidate to demonstrate advanced level knowledge and skills that are different than the requirements for the approved preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential. The course of study shall include an individualized preparation program plan ~~collaboratively~~ developed by the candidate, in consultation with the preparing institution and designee(s) of the employing school district, county office, or special education local planning area.

The subsection is not under review as the Commission is not proposing any amendments to this section. The change is not needed.

---

**§80048.4(a)(6)(A)** - Full-Time Teaching Experience: This is defined as teaching a minimum of 4 hours a day, unless the minimum statutory attendance requirement for the students served is less. Experience must be on a daily basis and for at least 75% of the school year. Experience may be accrued in increments of a minimum of one semester. No part-time or combination of teaching with other school employment will be accepted. All experience must be gained in public schools in California. The candidate shall be responsible for obtaining verification of this ~~This experience must be verified on the official letterhead of the district or districts by the superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of personnel, or director of human resources in which the teacher was employed.~~

The Commission has agreed to the amendments suggested by DOF to avoid any potential claims for reimbursement of mandated costs. The changes appear in the regulations below.

---

**§80048.8.1(a)(2)** - Within 60 days of employment or, in the case of an individual who is not employed, prior to beginning ~~the~~ a supported beginning teacher induction program, the candidate shall, in collaboration with the cooperating college or university, or the employer electing to employ the candidate, or the employer's designee, develop an Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) including supported induction and job related course of advanced

~~preparation created by the candidate, the cooperating college or university, and the employer or designee. Either the college or university or the employer may be the program sponsor. The IIP must meet the conditions in the subsections below;~~

The Commission has agreed to the amendments suggested by DOF to avoid any potential claims for reimbursement of mandated costs. The changes appear in the regulations below.

~~§80048.8.1(a)(2)(A)- The An approved IIP shall be approved and signed by each of the participating parties: the credential candidate, program coordinator from the Clear Credential program sponsor, and employer or designee. The IIP ~~and~~ may be revised as needed upon agreement by same parties;~~

The Commission has agreed to the amendments suggested by DOF to avoid any potential claims for reimbursement of mandated costs. The changes appear in the regulations below.

~~§80048.9(a)(5) - An individual who has ~~completes~~ completed requirements (a)(1) and (2)(B), but has not met the basic skills requirement listed in (a)(3) may apply for a one-year nonrenewable credential through a California employing agency.~~

The typographical error in this sentence has already been changed and appears in the agenda item with the correction.

***Proposed new text is double underlined and proposed deleted text is ~~double strikethrough~~.***

### **§80048.3. Specific Requirements for the Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential**

(a) The minimum requirements for the preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential for applicants who complete a professional preparation program in California shall include (1) through (87):

- (1) a baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education;
- (2) the completion of a ~~professional preparation program accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the requested education specialist category, including successful completion of supervised field study~~ Commission-approved Education Specialist program of professional preparation, as appropriate to the specialty area(s) sought as provided in Education Code Section 44373(c);
- (3) Meet the basic skills requirement as ~~passage of the California Basic Education Skills Test (CBEST)–described in Education Code Section 44252,~~ unless exempt by statute or regulation;
- (4) Verification of subject-matter knowledge either by:
  - (A) passage of examination(s) as provided ~~examination as specified in Education Code Sections 44280 and 44281, and 44282 and described in Title 5 Section 80071,~~ or by completion of a subject-matter program as provided for in Education Code Section 44310 ~~and described in Title 5 Sections 80085-80088 and 80094;~~ as appropriate for the multiple subject or single subject teaching credential; or

(B) candidates for the specialist category of Early Childhood Special Education or holders of a California clear, professional clear, or life teaching credential requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree and a program of professional preparation, including student teaching, are exempt from this subject matter competence requirement;

(5) demonstration of the study of alternative methods of developing English language skills, including the study of reading, as described in Education Code Section 44259(b)(4) and passage of the reading instruction competence assessment as provided in Education Code Section 44283;

(6) knowledge of the Constitution of the United States, as specified in Education Code Section 44335, ~~by one of the means described in Section 80415 of this article;~~ and

~~(7) The recommendation from a regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a program Verification of completion from a Commission approved program sponsor accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the preliminary credential specialty area(s) sought, as specific provided in Education Code Section 44227 44373(c); and~~

~~(8) verification of an offer of employment. The employment requirement may be met in one of the following ways:~~

~~-(A) Employment in a position requiring the Education Specialist Instruction Credential in a public school or private school of equivalent status; or~~

~~-(B) Employment in a position not requiring the Education Specialist Instruction Credential but where duties include providing direct instruction to special education students. The applicant must verify all of the following:~~

~~1. Possession of a non-special education credential that authorizes employment in the position;~~

~~2. The duties of the position are equivalent in nature to special education duties. A letter from the employing school district, county office or special education local planning area must verify the assignment, including a description of the duties and explanation as to why the position does not require an Education Specialist Instruction Credential;~~

~~3. The Coordinator or Director of the Education Specialist credential program at the college or university in which the applicant is enrolled must verify that experience is appropriate for the requested education specialist category of the preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential; and~~

~~4. The Commission staff confirms that the teaching position would be considered equivalent to a special education position, including a position such as teacher in a regular classroom where special education students are included, but not including positions such as curriculum consultant or administrator.~~

~~(9)~~(8) An individual who has completed requirements (1) through (7) above but does not have an offer of employment is not currently employed as a teacher may apply for a Certificate of Eligibility which verifies completion of all requirements for the preliminary level I credential and authorizes the holder to seek employment.

(b) Period of Validity.

(1) A preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential issued on the basis of the completion of all requirements in subsections (a) is valid for five years.

(c) The last date that a program sponsor may admit a candidate to the preliminary Level I approved program is December 31, 2010 and the program shall be completed by January 31, 2013.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 44225 ~~and 44275.3~~, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225, 44227(a), 44251, 44252, 44265, 44275.3, 44280, 44281, 44283, 44310, 44259(b)(4), ~~and~~ 44335, and 44373(c), Education Code.

**§80048.4. Specific Requirements for the ~~Professional~~ Clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential.**

(a) The minimum requirements for the ~~professional~~ clear level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential include all of the following:

- (1) possession of a preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential;
- (2) completion of the study of health education, as ~~specified~~ described in Education Code Section 44259(c)(1) ~~(4)(B)~~, ~~by one of the means described in Section 80421 of this article;~~
- (3) completion of the study of computer based technology, including the uses of technology in educational settings, as ~~specified~~ described in Education Code Section 44259(c)~~(3)~~(4)(C); ~~and~~
- (4) completion of a course of study that requires each candidate to demonstrate advanced level knowledge and skills that are different than the requirements for the approved preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential. The course of study shall include an individualized preparation program plan collaboratively developed by the candidate, the preparing institution and designee(s) of the employing school district, county office, or special education local planning area.
  - (A) A minimum of 3/4 of each candidate's program plan shall consist of coursework approved by the recommending institution of higher education, with the specific content, including planned field experiences, to be identified within the candidate's individualized preparation program plan.
  - (B) The remaining 1/4 of the unit credit for each candidate's individualized preparation program plan may consist of electives related to the areas of special education or general education selected from one or more of the following:
    1. Coursework provided by the preparing institution of higher education accredited by the Committee on Accreditation.
    2. Field experience elements within the accredited program which are in addition to academic credit given.
    3. Alternative training that provides knowledge and related skills presented by agencies approved jointly by the candidate's employing agency and the institution of higher education accredited for this program.

(5) ~~The recommendation from a regionally accredited institution of higher education that has a program~~ Verification of completion from Completion of a Commission-approved preparation program sponsor accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the clear Level II credential specialty area(s) sought, as specific provided in Education code Section 44227 44373(c), and

(6) A minimum of two years of successful experience in a full-time position in a public school or private school of equivalent status, while holding the preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential, as outlined in ~~80048.3 (a)(8) and (b)(9)~~ subsection (A) below and verified by the employing agency.

(A) Full-Time Teaching Experience: This is defined as teaching a minimum of 4 hours a day, unless the minimum statutory attendance requirement for the students served is less. Experience must be on a daily basis and for at least 75% of the school year. Experience may be accrued in increments of a minimum of one semester. No part-time or combination of teaching with other school employment will be accepted. All experience must be gained in public schools in California. The candidate shall be responsible for obtaining verification of this. This experience must be verified on the official letterhead of the district or districts by the superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of personnel, or director of human resources in which the teacher was employed.

(b) The individualized preparation program plan shall be filed with the preparing institution and may be revised as needed upon agreement by the candidate, the preparing institution, and the employing school district, county office, or special education local planning area.

(c) The last date that a program sponsor may admit a candidate to the preliminary Level II approved program is December 31, 2014 and the program shall be completed by January 31, 2019.

(d) Period of Validity.

(1) A ~~professional~~ clear level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential issued on the basis of the completion of all requirements in subsections (a) is valid for five years.

NOTE: Authority Cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225, 44227, 44251, 44259, ~~and~~ 44265 and 44373, Education Code.

#### **§80048.6. Authorizations for Education Specialist Instruction Credentials and the Early Childhood Special Education ~~Certificate~~ Added Authorization.**

(a) The following definitions apply to authorizations for All-Education Specialist Instruction Credentials and the Early Childhood Special Education ~~Certificate~~ Added Authorization: authorize.

(1) ~~service~~ 'Service across the continuum of program options available': pursuant Pursuant to Education Code Sections 56031, 56360, and 56361-, The the continuum includes: resource rooms or services; special day education classrooms settings; general education settings; special schools; home/hospital settings; state hospitals; development centers;

correctional facilities; non-public, non-sectarian schools and agencies as defined in Education Code Sections 56365 and 56366; and alternative and non-traditional instructional public school settings other than classrooms.

- (2) 'Developmental delay': Student who needs special education and related services by experiencing a delay in one or more of the following: physical development, cognitive development, communication development, social or emotional development or adaptive development.
  - (3) "Hard-of-hearing or hearing loss includes unilateral or bilateral, whether fluctuating, conductive, sensorineural, and/or auditory neuropathy": Hearing impairment or hearing loss, whether permanent or fluctuating, that adversely affects a child's educational performance but that is not included under the definition of deafness but may include problems involving the cochlea, the sensory organ of hearing.
- (b) The following authorizations refer to the disabilities defined in Title 34 Code of Federal Regulations:
- (1) The Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Mild/Moderate Disabilities authorizes the holder to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals, provide ~~special education~~ instruction, and special education related services to individuals with a primary disability of specific learning disabilities, mild/moderate mental retardation, other health impairment, and ~~serious~~ emotional disturbance, in kindergarten, grades 1 ~~through~~ - 12 through age 22, and classes organized primarily for adults in services across the continuum of program options available.
  - (2) The Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Moderate/Severe Disabilities authorizes the holder to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals, provide ~~special education~~ instruction, and special education related services to individuals with a primary disability of autism, moderate/severe mental retardation, deaf-blindness, ~~serious~~ emotional disturbance, and multiple disabilities, to children and students in kindergarten, grades 1 ~~through~~ - 12 through age 22, and classes organized primarily for adults in services across the continuum of program options available.
  - (3) The Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing authorizes the holder to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals, provide ~~special education~~ instruction, and special education related services to individuals with a primary or secondary disability of deafness or hard-of-hearing, or deaf-blindness, and hearing impairment, and services to students with a hearing loss that manifests itself in conjunction with additional disabilities including unilateral or bilateral, whether fluctuating, conductive, sensorineural, and/or auditory neuropathy, to students from birth through grade 12 age 22, and classes organized primarily for adults in services across the continuum of program options available.
- (A) Holders of Education Specialist Credentials in Deaf and Hard-of Hearing and previously issued credentials authorizing deaf and hard-of-hearing instructional

services who were employed prior to January 1, 2010 to provide instructional services in American Sign Language (ASL) to general education students may continue to provide instructional services in the area of ASL. Effective January 1, 2010, no new special education credential holders may qualify using this provision.

- (4) The Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Physical and Health Impairments authorizes the holder to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals, provide ~~special education~~ instruction, and special education related services to individuals with a primary disability of orthopedic impairment, other health impairment, multiple disabilities, and traumatic brain injury, to students from birth through grade 12 age 22, and classes organized primarily for adults in services across the continuum of program options available.
- (5) The Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Visual Impairments authorizes the holder to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals, provide ~~special education~~ instruction, and special education related services to individuals with a primary disability of visual impairment including blindness and deaf-blindness, to students from birth through grade 12 age 22, and classes organized primarily for adults in services across the continuum of program options available.
- (6) The Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Early Childhood Special Education authorizes the holder to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals and provide instructional and special educational services to children students from birth through pre-kindergarten who are eligible for early intervention special education and related services under federal and state law, to individuals with a primary disability specific learning disabilities, mild/moderate mental retardation, traumatic brain injury, other health impairment, autism, moderate/severe mental retardation, serious emotional disturbance, and multiple disabilities including developmental delay and a disabling medical condition except children with a primary disability of deafness, hearing impairment, deaf-blindness, visual impairment including blindness, orthopedic impairment, and traumatic brain injury in services across the continuum of program options available.
- (7) The Early Childhood Special Education Certificate Added Authorization authorizes the holder to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals and provide instructional and special educational services to children students from birth through pre-kindergarten who are eligible for early intervention special education and related services under federal and state law, to individuals with a primary disability specific learning disabilities, mild/moderate mental retardation, traumatic brain injury, other health impairment, autism, moderate/severe mental retardation, serious emotional disturbance, and multiple disabilities including developmental delay and a disabling medical condition, except children with a primary disability of deafness, hearing impairment, deaf-blindness, visual impairment including blindness, orthopedic impairment, and traumatic brain injury in services across the continuum of program options available.

- (8) The Education Specialist Instruction Credential: Communication Development authorizes the holder to conduct educational assessments related to student's access to the academic core curriculum and progress towards meeting instructional academic goals, provide instruction, and special education related services to individuals with academic communication and language needs in the following areas: language development, social communication, school readiness skills, literacy development, and competencies across the curriculum in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and core academic areas, to students in preschool, kindergarten, grades 1 - 12 through age 22, and classes organized primarily for adults in services across the continuum of program options available.
- (9) Individuals enrolled in an education specialist teacher preparation program on or after January 1, 2010 who complete content in autism spectrum disorders are authorized to conduct assessments, provide instruction, and special education related services to individuals with a primary disability of autism as defined in subsection 300.8(c)(1) of Title 34 Code of Federal Regulations, Subpart A, across the continuum of special education program options at the grade and age levels within the specialty area(s) of the education specialist credential held.
- (10) Individuals who complete an education specialist teacher program that includes content for teaching English learners as described in Education Code section 44259.5, are authorized to provide instruction for English language development in grades twelve and below, including preschool, and in classes organized for adults; and specially designed academic instruction in English within the subject area and grade level authorization of the Education Specialist Credential.

NOTE: Authority Cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44259.5, 44265, and 44265.5, 56031, 56360, 56361, 56365, and 56366, Education Code; 34 C.F.R. Part 300.8 (a), and (b) and Part 300.39(a)(1)(i); and 20 USC 1401(a)(3), (29), and (30).

#### **§80048.8. Specific Requirements for the Preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential.**

- (a) The minimum requirements for the five-year preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential includes (1) through (11):
- (1) A baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education;
  - (2) The completion of a Commission-approved preliminary Education Specialist program of professional preparation, as appropriate to the specialty area(s) sought; as provided in Education code Section 44373(c).
  - (3) Meet the basic skills requirement as described in Education Code §44252, unless exempt by statute or regulation;
  - (4) Subject-matter knowledge by one of the following:
    - (A) passage of examination(s) as provided Education Code Sections 44280, 44281, and 44282 as appropriate for the multiple subject credential, or for the single subject

credential in the areas of art, English, mathematics including foundational-level mathematics, music, social science, or science including foundational-level general science and specialized science;

(B) by completion of a subject matter program as provided in Education Code Section 44310 for the single subject credential in the areas of art, English, mathematics including foundational-level mathematics, music, social science, or science including foundational-level general science and specialized science;

(C) holders of a California clear, professional clear, or life teaching credential requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree and a program of professional preparation, including student teaching, are exempt from the subject matter knowledge requirement; or

(D) candidates for the specialist credential in Early Childhood Special Education are exempt from the subject matter knowledge requirement;

(5) demonstration of the study of alternative methods of developing English language skills, including the study of reading, as described in Education Code Section 44259(b)(4) and passage of the reading instruction competence assessment as provided in Education Code Section 44283;

(6) knowledge of the Constitution of the United States, as specified in Education Code Section 44335;

(7) completion of the study of health education, as described in Education Code Section 44259(c)(4)(A);

(8) completion of the study of computer based technology, including the uses of technology in educational settings, as described in Education Code Section 44259(c)(4)(C);

(9) completion of the study of English learners as described in Education Code Section 44259.5(c); and

(10) The preliminary Education Specialist preparation program must develop a Transition Plan for each candidate prior to the completion of the preliminary program that will assist the developers of the Individualized Induction Plan (IIP); ~~and~~

~~Verification of completion from Completion of a Commission-approved preparation program sponsor accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the preliminary credential specialty area(s) sought, as provided in Education code Section 44373(c).~~

(b) Period of Validity.

(1) A preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential issued on the basis of the completion of all requirements in subsection (a) is valid for five years.

Note: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44227(a), 44251, 44252, 44259, 44259.5, 44265, 44274, and 44274.2, 44280, 44281, 44283, 44310, 44335 and 44373, Education Code.

### **§80048.8.1. Specific Requirements for the Clear Education Specialist Instruction Credential.**

(a) The minimum requirements for the clear Education Specialist Instruction Credential for a candidate prepared in California include all of the following:

(1) possession of a preliminary or preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential;

(2) Within 60 days of employment or, in the case of an individual who is not employed, prior to beginning ~~the~~ a supported beginning teacher induction program, the candidate shall, in collaboration with the cooperating college or university, or the employer electing to employ the candidate, or the employer's designee, develop an Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) including supported induction and job related course of advanced preparation ~~created by the candidate, the cooperating college or university, and the employer or designee.~~ Either the college or university or the employer may be the program sponsor. The IIP must meet the conditions in the subsections below;

(A) ~~The~~ An approved IIP shall be approved and signed by each of the participating parties: the credential candidate, program coordinator from the Clear Credential program sponsor, and employer or designee. The IIP ~~and~~ may be revised as needed upon agreement by same parties;

(B) A maximum of 12 semester units (or its equivalent) of coursework or professional development can be listed on the IIP or a combination of the two as determined in the IIP;

(C) A person not employed in a school setting may complete the Education Specialist Clear Credential requirements in an educational setting that is mutually acceptable to the parties signing the Individualized Induction Plan, so long as that setting allows demonstration of effective teaching and the menu of professional development options address all credentials that are being cleared; and

(D) If an individual holds more than one general or special education credential that requires the completion of an induction program for renewal, the Individualized Induction Plan (IIP) that guides the teacher's advanced preparation shall be written to clear all general and special education preliminary credentials held.

(b) ~~Verification of completion from~~ Completion of a Commission-approved preparation program ~~sponsor~~ accredited by the Committee on Accreditation in the clear credential specialty area(s) sought, as provided in Education code Section 44373(c).

(c) Period of Validity.

(1) A clear Education Specialist Instruction Credential issued on the basis of the completion of all requirements in subsections (a) and (b) is valid for five years.

NOTE: Authority Cited: Section 44225, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225, 44251, 44259, 44265 and 44373, Education Code.