
3B

Action

Legislative Committee

Analyses of Bills

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents analyses of educator preparation or licensing bills introduced in the Legislature. The analyses will summarize current law, describe the bill provisions, estimate costs and recommend amendments, if applicable. The analyses will include, but are not limited to AB 1765 (Brownley) as amended and SB 1385 (Hancock) as amended.

Recommended Action: Staff will recommend a position, aligned with the Commission's Legislative Guidelines, in each bill analysis submitted for the Commission's consideration.

Presenters: Anne L. Padilla, Interim Administrator; Office of Governmental Relations

Strategic Plan Goal: 2

Support policy development related to educator preparation, conduct and professional growth

- ◆ Inform key legislators and policy makers on issues and ideas relevant to the Commission's scope of action

Bill Analysis

AB 1765 (Brownley) Teacher Leaders: Advisory Panel

Note: The original analysis of AB 1765 appeared in the March 2012 Commission agenda (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-03/5A_agenda_insert.pdf). Subsequent amendments have changed the bill's fiscal implications.

Recommended Position: Move from “Watch” to “Support”

Sponsor: Author

Bill Version: As amended July 5, 2012

Analysis of Bill Provisions

AB 1765 would require the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to convene an advisory panel of stakeholders with expertise in the field of teacher leadership to explore the recognition of leadership roles within a teaching career pathway. The Commission would be required to consider the advisory panel's findings and report to the Governor and Legislature.

AB 1765 has been amended to require that the advisory panel on teacher leadership be convened *only* after the Department of Finance determines that private funds, in an amount sufficient to fully support the activities of the advisory panel, have been deposited with the state. In addition, the report date was changed to be within one year of the panel's convening.

Background and Commission Activity

Please see prior analysis for “Background” and “Commission Activity” (http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-03/5A_agenda_insert.pdf).

Fiscal Impact

Amendments to the bill now make the provisions contingent on private funding. If private funding is not forthcoming, the Commission would not undertake the work.

Relevant Commission Legislative Policies

Policy 4: The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates and opposes legislation that would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.

Organizational Positions

Support

California School Boards Association
Public Advocates
Riverside County Superintendent of Schools

Opposition

California Teachers Association

Reason for Suggested Position

When the Commission first reviewed this bill at its March 2012 meeting, the bill did not contain the requirement that the work be undertaken *only* if private funds were made available. At that time, the Commission took a “Watch” position on the measure because even though it supports the policy goals of the legislation, it is constrained by an uncertain revenue picture. Since that time, the bill has been amended to allow the advisory panel work to be undertaken *only* with private funds. Since the Commission is in agreement with the policy goals of the bill and the fiscal concerns have been addressed, staff is recommending a change in position from “**Watch**” to “**Support.**”

Analyst: Anne L. Padilla

Date of Analysis: July 13, 2012

Bill Analysis

SB 1385 (Hancock) After School Teacher Pipeline Program

Note: The original analysis of SB 1385 appeared in the April 2012 Commission agenda (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-04/2012-04-3B.pdf>). The bill was subsequently amended to include the amendments that the Commission requested as well as recommendations from the California Department of Education.

Recommended Position: Move from “Support if Amended” to “Support”

Cosponsors: Partnership for Children and Youth
California After School Coalition

Bill Version: As amended June 19, 2012

Analysis of Bill Provisions

SB 1385 would establish the California After School Teacher Pipeline Program to recruit qualified after school instructors from the 21st Century High School After School Safety and Enrichment for Teens program, the After School Education and Safety program, and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, to participate on a pilot basis in the California Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program (PTTP). The Commission would select up to four school districts or county offices of education currently participating in the PTTP to apply for pilot program funds. In addition to satisfying all of the requirements of the PTTP program, pilot applicants would be required to demonstrate:

1. A screening process to determine if a pilot participant’s after school instruction experience ensures participant readiness for the pilot
2. Professional support for pilot participants
3. How pilot participants will be tracked within the program

The pilot program would be funded annually by \$150,000 from the Proposition 49--California After School Education and Safety Program (up to \$3,500 per participant).

At the April 2012 Commission meeting the Commission requested that staff seek two technical amendments to the bill to strengthen the pilot program:

- Include in the list of requirements for local education agency (LEA) participants, the LEA’s need for certain certificated staff; and
- Clarify that the \$3,500 per participant grant covers some, but not necessarily all of the costs associated with the program.

The author accepted these amendments and the bill now reflects these additions.

According to Commission's Legislative Guidelines (attached), if the author accepts amendments proposed by the Commission, the bill position changes to "**Support**." However, due to additional modifications to the bill (outlined below), staff is bringing the measure back to the Commission for consideration rather than moving automatically to a "Support" position. Staff sees no issues with the additional modifications.

The author accepted amendments from the California Department of Education (CDE) to: 1) specify that the pilot funding would be through an interagency agreement; 2) state the intent that the Commission and LEA program participants minimize administrative expenses to ensure the greatest number of pilot participant grants; 3) specify that one of the purposes of the pilot is to improve the quality and retention of after school personnel; 4) include the tracking of pilot participant after school location changes; and 5) specify that the Commission should consult with the CDE during the pilot selection process.

The author also amended the bill to change the reporting date to the Legislature from January 1, 2015 to January 1, 2017. The purpose of the report is to provide an update on the program's progress, including the ability of the applicants to successfully integrate the pilot into their existing program and the number of participants in the pilot who receive teaching credentials. Amendments were also added to extend the pilot by one year to 2019-2020.

Background and Commission Activity

Please see prior analysis for "Background" and "Commission Activity" (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2012-04/2012-04-3B.pdf>).

Fiscal Impact

SB 1385 would require the CDE to transfer \$150,000 of After School Education and Safety Program grant funds to the Commission for the California After School Teacher Pipeline Program pilot. These funds are not subject to the Budget Act and are a continuous appropriation. We understand that there is sufficient revenue available to fund the pilot and administrative costs to the Commission.

Relevant Commission Legislative Policies

Policy 4: The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates and opposes legislation that would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.

Policy 5: The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.

Organizational Positions

Support

- Partnership for Children and Youth (cosponsor)
- California After School Coalition (cosponsor)
- California School Boards Association
- California Workforce Innovation Network

LA's Best
Los Angeles County Office of Education
Aspiranet

Opposition

None noted at this time.

Reason for Suggested Position

Staff is recommending a change in position from "Support if Amended" to "Support" as the Commission's proposed amendments have been accepted.

Analyst: Anne L. Padilla

Date of Analysis: July 13, 2012

LEGISLATIVE GUIDELINES OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Adopted February 3, 1995

1. The Commission supports legislation that proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.
2. The Commission supports legislation that proposes to maintain or establish high standards of fitness and conduct for public school educators in California and opposes legislation that would lower standards of fitness or conduct for public school educators.
3. The Commission supports legislation that reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation that would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.
4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates and opposes legislation that would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.
5. The Commission supports legislation that strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms that it previously has adopted and opposes legislation that would undermine initiatives or reforms that it previously has adopted.
6. The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.
7. The Commission opposes legislation that would give it significant additional duties and responsibilities if the legislation does not include an appropriate source of funding to support those additional duties and responsibilities.
8. The Commission supports legislation that affirms its role as an autonomous teacher standards board and opposes legislation that would erode the independence or authority of the Commission.

Possible Bill Positions for Commission Consideration

The Commission may adopt a position on each bill considered for action. The following chart describes the bill positions. The Commission may choose to change a position on a bill at any subsequent meeting.

Sponsor: Legislative concepts are adopted by the Commission and staff is directed to find an author for the bill and to aid the author's staff by providing background information and seeking support for the bill.

Support: The Commission votes to support a bill and directs staff to write letters of support to Legislative Committee members and to testify in support of the bill at Legislative Committee hearings. The Commission's support position will be recorded in the Legislative Committee's bill analysis. If the bill is successful in the Legislature, staff writes letters of support to the Governor.

Support if Amended: The Commission expresses support for the overall concept of a bill, but objects to one or more sections. The Commission votes to direct staff to contact the author with suggested amendments. If the bill is amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, the Commission's position automatically becomes "Support."

Seek Amendments: The Commission expresses concern over one or more sections of the bill and votes to direct staff to contact the author with suggested amendments. If the bill is amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, staff will inform the Commission at a subsequent meeting and ask if the Commission would like to adopt a new position.

Watch: The Commission expresses interest in the content of the bill but votes to direct staff to "watch" the bill for future amendments or for further movement through the Legislative process. Early in the Legislative session, the Commission may wish to adopt a "watch" position on bills that are not yet fully formed.

Oppose Unless Amended: The Commission objects strenuously to one or more sections of the bill and votes to direct staff to contact the author with suggested amendments. If the bill is not amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, the Commission may vote to adopt an "Oppose" position at a subsequent meeting. If the bill is amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, staff will inform the Commission at a subsequent meeting and ask if the Commission would like to adopt a new position.

Oppose: The Commission expresses opposition to the overall concept of a bill and votes to direct staff to write letters of opposition to Legislative Committee members and to testify in opposition to the bill at Legislative Committee hearings. The Commission's "oppose" position will be recorded in the Legislative Committee bill analysis. If the bill is successful in the Legislature, staff writes letters of opposition to the Governor.

No Position: The Commission may choose to delay taking a position on a bill and may vote to direct staff to bring the bill forward at a subsequent meeting. The Commission may also choose to direct staff not to bring the bill forward for further consideration.