

---

# 5C

## Action

### *Legislative Committee*

#### Analyses of Bills

---

**Executive Summary:** Staff will present analyses of educator preparation or licensing bills introduced by Legislators. The Analyses will summarize current law, describe bill provisions, estimate costs and recommend amendments, if applicable. The analyses will include but not be limited to SB 5 (Padilla).

**Policy Question:** In what ways would eliminating the prohibition against a baccalaureate degree in professional education strengthen or weaken teacher preparation?

In what ways would extending the one year cap on preliminary preparation to two years strengthen or weaken teacher preparation?

**Recommended Action:** That the Commission consider and possibly adopt a position on SB 5.

**Presenter:** Anne L. Padilla, Consultant, Office of Governmental Relations

#### Strategic Plan Goal

#### *III Communication and Engagement*

- ◆ Advise the Governor, Legislature, and other policy makers as appropriate regarding issues affecting the quality, preparation, certification, and discipline of the education workforce.

March 2013

---

---

# Bill Analysis

---

---

## Senate Bill 5 (Padilla) Teacher Credentialing

**Recommended Position:** “No Position” or “Suggest Amendments”

**Sponsor:** Author

**Bill Version:** As introduced – December 3, 2012

### Summary of Bill

SB 5 would change the current time restriction on programs of professional teacher preparation from one year (or one fifth of a five year program) to two years (or two fifths of a five year program). Additionally, the bill would delete the statutory prohibition against a baccalaureate degree in professional education from satisfying the degree requirement for teacher licensure.

### Current Law

*Baccalaureate Degree:* Current law requires candidates for a multiple or single subject credential to have a baccalaureate degree or higher degree from a regionally accredited postsecondary institution and specifies the baccalaureate degree may not be in professional education. Often the major of the degree, e.g., mathematics, English, science, liberal studies (multiple subject) is the content area in which the individual will earn a teaching credential.

*Subject Matter Competence:* Currently, all prospective teachers are required to demonstrate that they are subject matter competent. If a prospective teacher’s undergraduate degree program meets subject matter standards adopted by the Commission, they are deemed to be subject-matter competent. If they do not complete an approved subject matter program, or if they are seeking a Multiple Subject Credential, prospective teachers must demonstrate their subject matter competence by passing a Commission-approved subject-matter test.

*One Year Time Limit on Professional Preparation:* California law also requires candidates to complete a professional preparation program and specifies that each program of professional preparation shall not include more than one year or the equivalent of one fifth of a five year program. Most candidates complete their teacher preparation after earning the bachelor’s degree. The law also authorizes integrated (blended) programs of subject matter preparation and professional preparation. While the law specifies that such programs are not subject to the one-year “cap,” the Commission has interpreted the law governing blended programs differently over the years and has often applied the one-year cap to these programs.

*Federal Financial Aid:* The federal Pell Grant Program provides need-based grants to low-income undergraduate and certain post-baccalaureate students to promote access to postsecondary education. The Pell Grant program limits recipients from receiving a Pell grant for the same area of study for both undergraduate and graduate study. Students may not receive Pell Grants from more than one school at a time. The grants are awarded through participating

institutions to students with financial need who have not received their first bachelor’s degree or who are enrolled in certain post-baccalaureate programs that lead to teacher certification or licensure.

**Background**

The prohibition on the education major has been in place since 1960 (Fisher Act) and the one-year limit was established by the Ryan Act in 1970. Since then, there have been numerous changes to teacher licensure and a number of content areas have been added to the preliminary preparation program. The content to prepare teachers to work with special needs students, health education and using technology in the classroom used to be part of the clear credential coursework but has now been embedded in the preliminary program. The content for an individual to understand how to teach English learners used to be an optional, additional program which resulted in an additional authorization. The Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD) coursework to teach English learners was twelve semester units separate from the preliminary preparation program. Now the preparation to teach English learners is required to be incorporated in the preliminary preparation program.

**Summary of Additional Content Required to be Included in Preliminary Teacher Preparation Programs Since 1970**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Year Added</b>	<b>Education Code Reference</b>
Enhanced content in the teaching of Reading	1998	44259 (b) (4)
Teaching English learners	1999	44259.5(a)
Competency in the use of computers	2000	44259 (b)(7)
Some Health, Mainstreaming moved to preliminary program	2001	44259
Additional theoretical content in health, mainstreaming, technology and teaching English learner instruction moved from Induction into initial preparation	2006	44259 (c)(4)
Teaching Performance Assessment	2008	44259(b)(3) and 44320.2

**Commission Activity**

Consistent with the Commission’s adopted plan to revisit and update all standards at minimum every 10 years and based on the number of issues facing the field since the original standards were developed, the Commission established the Teacher Preparation Advisory Panel (TAP) charged with looking at ways to update the elements of the Learning to Teach System so that teachers are prepared to meet the instructional needs of all of California’s K-12 students for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.<sup>1</sup> The TAP panel is expected to bring recommendations on the current nature and structure of preparation programs, including blended programs to the Commission this spring.

Concurrent with the TAP review, the Commission joined Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson in sponsoring the work of the Educator Excellence Task Force (EETF). The

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.etc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2011-12/2011-12-1H.pdf>

EETF report, *Greatness by Design*, was released on September 10, 2012.<sup>2</sup> The recommendations contained in *Greatness by Design* report included removing barriers to the undergraduate study of education, lifting the cap on credits and encouraging streamlined “blended” programs that teach content and pedagogy in tandem. The report suggested that in lifting this limit, California could provide teachers with “the more robust training teachers receive in most other states and strengthen their preparation to teach culturally and linguistically diverse learners well.” The report noted that lifting the cap could save the state resources in the long run, as teaching is more effective and outcomes improve for students.<sup>3</sup> The report further recommended that preliminary preparation programs be allowed the ability to ensure that candidates learn the required content, complete rich field experiences and demonstrate their knowledge and skills through a performance assessment.

### **Prior Legislation**

SB 1646 (Alpert, 2002) would have allowed Education majors to meet the academic degree requirement for teacher licensure and would have required the California State University to establish degree programs in Elementary Education culminating in a Preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential. The bill also would have required the Commission to encourage all University of California campuses and private postsecondary institutions, to offer baccalaureate degrees in elementary education. Lastly, the bill specified that the provisions only be implemented if the necessary federal waiver was granted to authorize students enrolled in California institutions offering a baccalaureate degree in elementary education to be eligible for federal Pell Grants. The Commission took a “Watch” position on this bill. AB 1646 died on the Senate Inactive File.

SB 81 (Alpert, 2001) required that an integrated or “blended” program of teacher preparation be designed to concurrently lead to a Preliminary Multiple Subject or Single Subject Teaching Credential and a baccalaureate degree. The Commission took a “Watch” position on this bill. AB 81 was approved by the Legislature and signed by the Governor (Chap. 896, Stats. 2003).

### **Fiscal Impact**

If sponsors of teacher preparation programs revise their program offerings, or decide to offer Education majors that are part of the preparation for a credential, costs would be incurred by the Commission for review and approval of these programs. Costs to the Commission to review new programs would be supported by the Accreditation Recovery Fee as proposed in the Governor’s 2013-14 Budget.

### **Policy Questions**

In what ways would eliminating the prohibition against a baccalaureate degree in professional education strengthen or weaken teacher preparation?

In what ways would extending the one year cap on preliminary preparation to two years strengthen or weaken teacher preparation?

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.cde.ca.gov/eo/in/documents/greatnessfinal.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> Ibid Pages 28-39

**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 which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.

**Organizational Positions****Support**

None noted at this time.

**Opposition**

None noted at this time.

**Suggested Position**

The Commission may wish to consider two positions:

**“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. This position would allow for further discussion of the policy issues, if necessary.

**“Seek Amendments”** position expresses the Commission’s concern(s) 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.

**Analyst:** Anne L. Padilla

**Date of Analysis:** February 21, 2013

---

---

# **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.