A History of Policies and Forces Shaping California Teacher Credentialing

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Ensuring Educator Excellence

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Blackburn, Constance	Teacher Representative
Dean, Steven	Teacher Representative
Evans, Marlon	Public Representative
Freathy, Mark	Teacher Representative
Gahagan, Charles	Teacher Representative
Hines, James	Teacher Representative
Littman, Leslie	Designee, Superintendent of Public Instruction
McInerney, Carolyn	School Board Member
Oropeza-Enriquez, Irene	Administrative Services Representative
Sun, Ting	Public Representative
Wright, Hilda	Teacher Representative
Vacant	Non-Administrative Services Credential Representative
Vacant	Faculty Member
Vacant	Public Representative
Vacant	Public Representative
Ex-Officio Members	
Martin, Shane	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Perry, Janis	California Postsecondary Education Commission
Sloan, Tine	University of California
Young, Beverly	California State University
Dale Janssen	Executive Director

Vision Statement

Ensuring high quality educators for California's diverse students, schools and communities.

Mission Statement

The mission of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing is to ensure integrity and high quality in the preparation, conduct and professional growth of the educators who serve California's public schools. Its work shall reflect both statutory mandates that govern the Commission and research on professional practices.

A History of Policies and Forces Shaping California Teacher Credentialing

February 2011
Sacramento, California

Edmund G. Brown, Jr.
Governor of California

Table of Contents

Preface……..v

Chapter 1
The California Context: Conflict and Continuity
***Dennis S. Tierney*…….....1**
To the distress of many, California has a unique political and social history, particularly when public education is involved. In this introductory chapter, the author attempts to capture the uniqueness of the California experience and to set out seven policy strands that have engaged policy makers in public education in this state.

Chapter 2
California's First 100 Years: Establishing State Responsibility for Quality of Teachers (1850–1950)–*Irving G. Hendrick*……..17
The responsibility for certifying teacher qualifications and competence has not always been a state function. Early in California history, that responsibility was held by schools and districts. The author discusses the movement to increase professionalism in teaching through state standards and uniform governance and describes the rising influence of normal schools, teacher education faculty and, particularly, the University of California.

Chapter 3
A Political Firestorm Surrounds the Fisher Credential Reform (1950–1961)–*Sidney A. Inglis*……..32
In the 1950s, growing national dissatisfaction with the public school curriculum and the preparation of teachers fed directly into the political ambitions of a young Democratic legislator, State Senator Hugo Fisher, Armed with his party's and the Governor's support, Fisher pressed for stronger subject matter preparation of all teachers-- elementary and secondary--and reduced emphasis of their pedagogical preparation. In this chapter, the author draws upon primary documents including interviews with key players to tell the story of the first wave of California credential reform.

Chapter 4
California's Fisher Act Unravels (1961–1965)
***Sidney A. Inglis*……...58**
The Fisher Act of 1961 painted the canvas of credential structure in broad strokes. It delegated to the State Board of Education the task of refining these concepts by defining its key terms--like "academic" and "non-academic"--and shaping its regulations. The task met with the ambitions of several activists Board members, who seized the opportunity to work outside the reach of the "educationists." In doing so, however, they came up against the strong political forces of the press, the professional organizations with specialized interests, and college teacher education faculty. The author's account is supported by interviews with key players shortly after these events.

Chapter 5
Development of the Ryan Credential Reforms (1966–1970)
***Sydney A. Inglis*……..97**
Leo J. Ryan, the driving force behind the Ryan Act of 1970, was an informed and astute politician. He worked hard to educate himself and his legislative colleagues on innovative and imaginative educational thinking of the late 1960s. He knew when to concede without compromising his principles. He understood how to coalesce the national drive for greater professionalization of teaching, the local press for a supply of qualified teachers who could be flexibly assigned, and the political pressures of special interest groups and party politics.

Chapter 6
California Establishes an Independent Standards Board Responsible for Teacher Licensing (1971–1980)–*Richard K. Mastain*……..148
In addition to making significant changes to the credentialing requirements, in a historic step, the California Legislature, in the Ryan Act of 1970 created the first independent standards board in the nation, the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing. The purpose was a step toward establishing teaching as a recognized profession. The author recounts some of the early actions of the Commission as it assumed its responsibilities.

Chapter 7
The Educational Reform Movement of the 1980's (1981–1988)
***Ralph A. Brott*……...232**
This section chronicles the major events and issues leading to the enactment of the Marian Bergeson, Gary Hart, and Teresa Hughes educational reforms in 1988. The complexity of the reform ideas and the stands of various organizations leave little subtlety. However, putting the ideas together and gaining enough consensus among stakeholders to pass a major reform bill was remarkably difficult. The author seeks to outline the major notions, events and forces acting on teacher credentialing reform.

Chapter 8
Fulfilling the California Promise (1988–1996)
***Dennis S. Tierney & Philip A. Fitch*…….....287**
During this period of time, there was an expansion of the Commission's role and responsibilities. Resources were available allowing for additional staff, as well as additional mandated roles for the Commission. The development of program standards, accreditation procedures, automated licensure procedures, and credentialing practices led to a partial fulfillment of the promises and expectations for the independent educator licensing board established in 1970.

Chapter 9
The Critical Role of Teacher Preparation in the School Accountability Movement of the 1990s (1996–2003)
***Linda G. Bond*……...…....339**
The Commission was increasingly visible as an agent of school reform through the preparation of teachers. This coupled with an accelerated demand for teachers as a result of class size reduction, led to increased attention to teacher accountability led to the SB 2042 teacher preparation reform.

Chapter 10
The Survival and Revitalization of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (2004–2010)
***Philip A. Fitch & Lawrence W. Birch*……..…....366**
The Commission deliberated on substantive issues such as accreditation, standard setting and revision. However, the existence of the Commission was challenged, yet again, in a report by the Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) that recommended that the Commission be replaced and its functions be assumed by the State Board of Education. At the same time Senator Jack Scott sponsored omnibus legislation that gave the Commission additional responsibilities. As the Commission implemented the legislation, there was emphasis on improved communication with stakeholders. An on-line credential application system was introduced that significantly reduced the time and paper involved in credential processing. The Commission also supported a number of changed processes involving the use of technology.

Preface

This publication consists of ten chapters about the Commission on Teacher Credentialing written during a period of over twenty years. The initial chapters were written during the late 1980s and the later chapters written during the 1990s. The intention at the time was to publish the book during the mid-nineties, however the project was not completed at that time.

At a later date, a decision was made to prepare an additional chapter that would contain information about the turn of the 21st century and first few years of the century. At that time, a draft of the book was placed on the Commission's website, but the book was not printed. Since that time, one additional chapter has been prepared bringing the book up to date through 2010.

The Commission is indebted to those who have contributed to the writing of this book. Each chapter was written using the individual style of each author. The comments and opinions expressed throughout this history are attributable only to the authors who contributed to this work. There was no attempt to use a single format for the presentation of the ideas felt to be most important by each author. Minimal editing has been done, primarily to maintain continuity and to preserve accuracy of information. Each chapter should be considered as an individual unit. Taken as a whole this book presents important historical background about teacher certification in California as well as a history of the first forty years of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Authors

Dennis S. Tierney

Dr. Tierney was a university professor and researcher before joining the staff of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. At the Commission, he served as a consultant in teacher preparation and as an administrator. One of his primary responsibilities was the Commission's accreditation process.

Irving G. Hendrick Dr. Hendrick was a historian, educational scholar, and administrator with the University of California, Riverside. He was an early member of the Commission. Later, he was a member and chair of the first Committee on Accreditation at the Commission.

Sidney A. Inglis Dr. Inglis had a long and distinguished career as a consultant in teacher preparation and as an administrator at the Commission. He was on the staff during some of the early years in the development of the Commission.

Richard K. Mastain Dr. Mastain was on the professional staff of the Commission and served as the administrator of programs and program review for a number of years. He was appointed to be the Executive Secretary during a critical period in the life of the Commission.

Ralph Brott Dr. Brott was a researcher in education at the University of California, Berkeley, where he completed his doctorate. He was a secondary teacher and middle school principal and was a Commission observer for several years.

Philip A. Fitch Dr. Fitch has been involved with the Commission during most of its existence. In the early years, he was a university professor, but served as a visiting staff member designing the original program evaluation system. Later, he served as an ex-officio Commission member and then joined the staff as a consultant in teacher preparation. He served for six years as Executive Director.

Linda G. Bond After working for a number of years as a legislative staff member in education policy and Executive Director of the Commons Commission, Ms. Bond joined the staff of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. While there, she served as a policy advisor and directed the Office of Governmental Relations.

Lawrence W. Birch Dr. Birch was a university faculty member in teacher preparation during the early years of the Commission. He joined the Commission staff as a consultant in teacher preparation and later was an administrator. His primary responsibilities were with the Commission's accreditation system. He served as Director of the Professional Services Division for five years.

Chapter 1
The California Context: Conflict and Continuity

Dennis S. Tierney

A history of California teacher licensure may strike the casual reader as a topic fit only for graduate students of educational policy or those interested in state-level legal esoteric. Such an assessment is quite wrong. The following chapters trace the evolution of Californians' public attitudes toward the role and purpose of public schools, the rise of centralized government control of education through the development of a full-time professional legislature, a fundamental ambivalence about the knowledge and skills necessary for a person to be successful as a classroom teacher, and an enduring uncertainty about the proper place to garner that knowledge and skill.

That these chapters tell a story of both conflict and continuity should be no surprise. Americans, Californians among them, have not, as yet, agreed upon some of the essential questions that undergird the function of the public schools. Through the lens of public policy debates over teacher licensure, the reader will see clearly the ways that these issues have been and continue to be played out in California.

That this book should concern itself only with the history of teacher licensure in California may strike some readers as another example of California's dubious claim to be different from other states or further evidence of its preoccupation with self. Again, that perception would be incorrect.

For some time, California has been perceived as a "bellwether" state, and frequently has been the source of many socio-cultural trends and innovations. While such a distinction often distresses editorial writers and social commentators, there is substantial evidence that not only is California different from other states, but also that California continues to serve as the "miner's canary" regarding socio-political change in America. One need only mention California's property tax cutting measure of 1978, Proposition 13, to give credence to the state's impact on other communities and their governments. The state's 1996 electoral repudiation of affirmative action may also presage a national shift in public opinion. If one wishes to know what the rest of the country

may be wearing, watching, or wishing, one need only investigate what California is up to today. The array of issues that have occupied California policy makers regarding teacher licensure described and analyzed in this book also have occupied policy makers around the country and this trend is very likely to continue.

California: A State of Mind

California, in early legend, was depicted as an island. Looking at the region's geography, it is easy to see why that legend began and persisted to become, eventually, a metaphor for California's unique social, political and economic character.

By virtue of mountain ranges and great deserts on its eastern flank and a vast Pacific Ocean to the west, California is quite isolated from the rest of the continental United States. Even as European colonization in the 15th and 16th centuries had reached other parts of the New World, California and its native population was, for all practical purposes, long out of reach. It remained so until the late 1700s when the Spanish, having arrived first by sea in the prior century, pushed north from Mexico through California's southern and central portions, subjugating the area natives, and establishing missions and other outposts. Eventually, these and the Russian settlements in the north-coastal part of the region yielded to the phenomenal 19th century westward expansion across North America which was, in no small measure, accelerated by the 1848 discovery of gold in California territory. In a matter of a few months, the European population of the region tripled to some 80,000 persons (concomitantly, the native population was decimated). California statehood followed quickly in 1850, but much of the country that lay beyond and between the 31st state and nation's important eastern population, commerce and government centers remained outside the Union for some time to come. (Nevada became a state in 1864, Colorado in 1876, North and South Dakota in 1889, Idaho and Wyoming in 1890, Utah in 1896, and Arizona and New Mexico not until 1912.)

Once arrived in California, the settlers hailing from other states, territories, or parts of Northern Europe--there were also huge influxes of people from Asia, primarily laborers of Chinese decent - discovered that water was seldom abundant in the lands easiest to farm or where the California climate was most salubrious. Earthquakes provided an

episodic counterpart to periodic extremes of drought and flood. And even completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1867 did not abolish altogether California's isolation. Even within the state, regions are separated by mountains and deserts and Northern and Southern California were not linked by railroad until 1903.

Northeastern California remains isolated to this day. It is often easier to reach Modoc County (the most northeastern county in the state) by driving through the adjacent state of Oregon than it is to drive there directly from Sacramento, California's capital. Satellite images of the United States, taken at night in the 21st century, show a large dark space (the basin and range country between the Sierra Nevada and the Rocky Mountains) still separating California from the rest of the nation.

A New Eden

And yet, California was, and still is, perceived to be a place of stunning beauty and unusual potential. This combination of remoteness on the Western littoral of the North American continent and its marvelous climate and physical beauty nurtured the inclination of the American settlers who fought their way west to create a new society, a new culture in California. This new culture was an uneasy marriage of the immigrants' hopes and dreams of a new life, a remaking of self, with a physical environment that suggested a "new Eden" Underlying these quasi-utopian notions was the desire to make large sums of money out of real estate speculation. Publicists, hired by the railroads and major land companies to attract investors and buyers, alternated their sales pitches between the image of the hacienda days of the "Californians" with their great cattle ranches, and the image of California as the American Tuscany replete with seaside villas and citrus and olive groves. This wide-spread, concerted effort to "sell" California to the rest of the nation resulted in a series of population booms fueled also by the rise of several major industries particular to California (notably the agribusiness, aircraft, and movie industries) and the impact of two world wars (Starr, 1985).

Each boom was followed by a low- or no-growth period when the state tried to accommodate and assimilate the rapid expansion of the previous boom. Each boom was larger in impact than the previous one. The growth in the 1880s, following the completion of railroads into

Southern California, was the first substantial increase in population since California became a state. A second boom came during and immediately after World War I, fueled by war-time growth and the general prosperity of the 1920s. The third great boom came as a result of the economic expansion during World War II when many from other parts of the country relocated to California to take jobs here. That, in turn, set the stage for the explosive post-WW II growth period. Many members of the armed services who had been stationed or passed through California remembered the state's climate, the physical beauty, and the region's sense of possibility, and either stayed on or moved in droves to the "Golden State" in the years from 1946 through 1960.

The next boom came as a result of economic and political upheavals in other parts of the world, beginning with the end of the Vietnam War. Because of California's historic links to Central America and to Asia, the new immigrants to the United States in the 1970s and 1980s--from East and Southeast Asia, Mexico and Central America--congregated in California. This boom continues to reverberate through California today.
The result of these geo-historical, economic, and socio-political trends is the California of today; the state that draws the attention, the envy, and the dismay of the rest of the nation. California today has the largest population of the 50 states and is projected to grow at a high rate for the next 20 years. It has been estimated that the state needs to build one new elementary school every day to keep up with its school population growth. California has almost one-third of all immigrants to the United States and will shortly join Hawaii as a state where no single racial or ethnic group constitutes a majority. Its public schools already have achieved that distinction.

The California economy, even after the deepest recession since the Great Depression of the 1930s, ranks, by itself, among the top ten economies of the world. This list of superlatives and realities has served, and continues to serve, as a boundary force, marking off the arena in which policy decisions are debated and resolved. This set of forces is apart from partisan politics or sound bites. Like the primeval forces of wind and water, the geographical, the population of California now encompasses over 100 languages, and includes residents from English speaking students and that number is rising.

How is the development of California teacher education policy shaped by these characteristics, and what are the forces that continue to impact policy formulation? Beyond the particular historical roots of California's public character, the events highlighted above speak to several key themes, stated and unstated, that appear in the chapters to follow. These themes have had and continue critical influence over this state and its education policies.

Demographics

First and foremost, demography is the real engine that drives decision making in public education and, therefore, in teacher education. Schools are shaped fundamentally by the number of children produced in the state and, therefore, the sheer forces of numbers trump all other decisions about the public schools. Schools, of course, have no control over the number of students they must educate. Federal immigration policy, federal, state, and local land development policies, federal and state water procurement decisions, economic deliberations at all levels, and international crises can accelerate or impede the number of children needing public schooling. Moreover, the public schools never turn away a child from the schoolhouse steps. All children are accommodated when they present themselves for admission. If a classroom is not available, space is created out of hallways, cafeterias, and libraries. If the child's special needs cannot be met at the local school, another school is found to address those needs, regardless of cost. If a fully prepared teacher is not available, the school hires a less than fully prepared person to serve as a teacher or hires an interested adult if a partially prepared person is unavailable. Typically, in times of general teacher shortages, the state engages in some alternative or emergency response until the demand for teachers is met or declines.

Beyond the sheer impact of increasing numbers of children, demographics also creates challenges within the state. Much of the growth in schools is also affected by the affordability of housing. Increases in housing costs within a community can depress the number of children coming into the local schools by making it too expensive for families with school age children to purchase homes. California has seen the creation of single generation communities where the children who grew up in a community cannot afford to buy a home in that same

community as adults. They must travel further out to new suburbs where homes are affordable. This, then, creates single generation school districts where a newer school district is experiencing rising enrollments while an older district is simultaneously experiencing declining enrollments. Urban districts have seen the rise of population density as several family groups or extended families move into apartments and homes to save money. This notion of “in-fill” population growth creates pockets of students in older sections of cities historically not requiring service by public schools. Finally, the last population increase California has experienced consists of the most culturally and linguistically diverse group ever to migrate to the state. In addition to the historic migratory patterns between California and Mexico, the influx of economic and political refugees from all over the world has provided the schools with a particularly demanding instructional challenge.

California has the most diverse student population to ever attend public schools and this trend will continue for the foreseeable future. Ironically, this latest, and most diverse, boom is occurring when many of the school facilities in California are at or beyond their life-span. Thus, many districts that survived the inflationary years of the 1970's and 1980's by reducing maintenance budgets are facing the twin demands of aging facilities and additional facilities at a time when raising funds locally is extremely difficult.

Supply and Demand Issues

Although few of the authors directly address the importance of California’s periodic population booms, the issue of maintaining licensure standards in the face of immediate and pressing demand for teachers looms in the background of many of the policy discussions presented in their chapters. Indeed, the entire issue of linking the increased quality and effectiveness of our public school system to the quality and effectiveness of the teachers employed in that system appears to be strained periodically by the need to staff those public school classrooms immediately. Throughout the period covered by this history of licensure, many policy makers, critics and commentators, and professional educators repeatedly called for increases in the preparation standards for teachers. While teachers were frequently perceived as the essential part of the problem of poor public schools, virtually every plan

for improving the public schools focused on raising the standards of the profession, thus making teachers the center of the problem and the solution. There were, of course, periodic efforts to create "teacher-proof" curricula, and calls for setting state-wide standards, or more recently, national standards of student performance, but the bulk of the reform efforts ultimately put the teacher at the center of the solution. Sadly, about the time many of these reform efforts gained public support, student enrollment seemed to grow again, generating a need for teachers that exceeded the normal supply.

In turn, an increased the number of teachers employed through emergency credentials and permits, bringing into the system individuals who did not have the training called for in the proposed or recently adopted standards. Moreover, these emergency teachers often remained in the system after the crisis had passed, rather than being replaced by fully qualified personnel. They were often seen as equally effective as teachers which raises deeply troubling questions about the relationship between the standards that are claimed to be crucial to improvement of the system and the accepted norms of teacher performance. California has yet to solve this conundrum when student enrollment increases significantly, the number of teachers employed on emergency or sub-standard permits increases, while at the same time the state's licensing agency is engaged in an ongoing effort to raise the standards of quality and effectiveness for teacher preparation programs. Further, when there is an economic downturn and the funding for schools decreases, necessitating teaching staff reductions, the more recently prepared teachers are the first to be laid off. Additionally, enrollments in teacher preparation programs tend to decrease.

Pedagogical and Subject Matter Preparation Issues

The issue of maintaining or increasing the quality and effectiveness of classroom teachers also includes an unresolved debate regarding the appropriate balance between the subject matter preparation for teaching and the pedagogical preparation for teaching. Much of the policy debate in the middle chapters of this history revolves around the ascendancy of subject matter preparation over pedagogical preparation. The post-war critics of education, reacting to supposed superiority of Soviet science over American scientific performance as expressed by Sputnik, asserted

that the problem could be traced to the progressive education movement and the dominance of education professors in the preparation of teachers. These critics pointed to the life adjustment curriculum of the previous decade, and lamented the decline of strict subject matter driven curricula. Their solution was to press for decreases in the number of education courses required for teachers (some critics proposed abolishing all education courses) and a concomitant increase in the subject matter preparation of the teacher. Embedded in this view was a persistent belief that strong subject matter preparation and a concern for children or youth is sufficient preparation for teaching.

For these critics, the importance or value of pedagogy was quite small. They presumed that the techniques of teaching could be grasped through common sense or on the job, but subject matter knowledge was best learned in a university setting under the direction of faculty from those disciplines. Additionally, the critics argued that the pedagogical preparation that was required was of poor quality as well. Education courses were excoriated in print as having no theoretical base or having no practical application or neither element.

Credentialed teachers contributed to this dismissal of pedagogy as they frequently testified in front of policy groups about the deficiencies of their teacher education programs. Faculty colleagues within academe often joined in the chorus of disapproval over pedagogical studies. Education programs and departments seemed to have low status within the colleges and universities. Many of the critical books and essays about teacher education came from arts and science faculty. At several research universities during the last four decades, serious proposals to abolish all education programs were debated.

This persistent distaste for formal pedagogical preparation is a continuing theme in teacher licensure policy debates. Those policy makers who acknowledged the need for some pedagogical training tended to argue for very limited exposure to purely pedagogical course work and equated any field experience with traditional campus courses. Simultaneously, the claim was made that higher standards for teachers were needed to improve the performance of the public schools, and that these higher standards would attract more qualified candidates to the profession. While California led the nation in requiring post-

baccalaureate preparation for teachers, it also led the nation in abolishing the undergraduate degree in education.

Even as the complexity of the classroom has increased and research clearly indicates the need for instructional skill and sensitivity that goes far beyond common sense, many policy makers between these two areas of knowledge might look like. Policy makers, and the general public, seem unconvinced that teaching is a true profession, requiring advanced technical training to be effective. Even those who might acknowledge that love of subject and love of children continue to discount the need for pedagogical training in favor of more subject matter preparation. California has yet to solve this conundrum or even come to agreement about what useful balance insufficient ingredients for successful teaching seem reluctant to require more than the equivalent of a year of teacher education course work before full licensure. Moreover, there continues to be on-going debate over the most appropriate location of such training. The combination of the enduring low status of education programs on college and university campuses and the general belief that experience is the best teacher has generated a tension between theory and practice, the lecture hall and the field site, that is not found in any other profession.

Collaboration Issues

Even in the years when teacher education was a well-regarded activity of colleges and universities, many institutions did not have sufficient space in their own laboratory schools to provide practice teaching assignments for all their students. Local school sites were needed to meet the practical needs of these institutions. This utilization of local school sites was economically advantageous to the institution of higher education and provided a steady stream of prospective teachers to the local district. In some cases, the districts were able to release teachers for other duties through the use of student teachers. The role of the cooperating or master or directing teacher was sometimes well defined but more often the duties and responsibilities of such a person were communicated informally. The duties of this teacher, however communicated, did provide a means to allow university supervisors to monitor large numbers of student teachers.

An emphasis of the master teacher over the university supervisor meant that the culminating activity of the teacher education program

often was most closely monitored by an individual with the least involvement in the program. This disjunction between the campus-based course work and the school-based field experience often exacerbated the perceived split between theory and practice. It also seemed to make it more difficult to foster new, innovative methods of instruction as the most critical field work was not always done in supportive or knowledgeable settings.

The later chapters of this book describe and analyze efforts to end this split and to support new methods of collaboration in the preparation of teachers. A number of reform efforts beginning in the late 1980s point to models of teacher preparation that actively involve university faculty in the life of K-12 public schools and actively involve K-12 faculty in the life of university programs of teacher preparation. The efforts of the California New Teacher Project (1988-1994) and the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program that followed it focused on creating a connected path of instruction and induction into teaching.

Both postsecondary institutions and school districts have important roles to play in the total preparation of a classroom teacher. Each one brings a particular knowledge base to the total curriculum, and the expertise of both parties is necessary to the full education of the teacher. What are required; however, are the joint planning, joint delivery, and joint evaluation of the total program. This, in turn, requires organizations to modify practices and policies. It forces the lowering of institutional barriers and the changing of institutional beliefs.

Although few in education resist such calls for collaboration, it is not yet clear that all institutions can implement the changes needed to make this level of collaboration routinely successful. It may be that new rewards and sanctions will be needed to alter the climate of collaboration between postsecondary education and the public schools. Here, too, California must forge new policies across organizations to ensure that those who collaborate are rewarded in appropriate ways. The ability and preference of organizations to engage in authentic, systemic collaboration in times of severe budget constraints and rapidly changing environments is not at all certain. All too often, collaboration is seen as a luxury rather than a necessity.

Standards Movement

The last three chapters of the book take up a new movement in American education. In reform report after reform report, a common theme was to call for standards by which schools and their graduates would be judged. Demands for accountability tended to focus on improved student test scores, but other voices called for the establishment of clear statements of what students should know and be able to do. In this manner, assessments could be devised that would clearly show which schools, or for some critics, which teachers were performing and which were not performing. This coincided with a growing preference for criterion referenced tests. These examinations provided students or schools with a score compared to an established mark rather than performance compared to other groups or individuals taking that same examination.

The development of these standards has largely been controlled, for the most part, by national professional organizations representing the discipline or curricular area. This, in turn, fueled by global economic concerns, has pushed for the development and adoption of national standards in every subject area. If standards of performance and knowledge are to be nationally developed, then the curriculum offered to students, in all fairness, needs to be national in scope as well. Such notions raise serious questions about the autonomy of school districts and the preservation of regional culture and mores.

As schools are held to standards, whether local, state, or national in origin, policy makers quickly move to discussing standards for teachers. Much time has been spent in California, beginning in the early 1980s, in determining what minimum knowledge and skill was necessary for effective classroom teaching. Standards have been developed for professional pedagogical knowledge and for subject matter knowledge. Although not clearly linked together, one of the issues embedded in the drive to develop standards for teachers has been an increasing dissatisfaction with current assessment practices for granting teaching credentials.

Assessment Issues-Program vs. Individual

In the earliest years of California teacher licensure, as Hendrick notes in chapter two, local and county licenses were often issued on the

basis of a candidate passing an examination. As the state exerted its control over teacher licensure, the notion of candidate-based assessment faded away. It was replaced by a program-approval model that was focused on organizational input and structure. Teacher education programs were authorized by the state on the basis of the organizational structure and the official curriculum proposed by the college or university. Graduates of those approved programs were presumed to have garnered sufficient knowledge and skill through participation in that program to warrant the issuing of a credential.

The Ryan Act of 1970 represented the first shift toward basing the earning of a credential on the performance of the candidate seeking the credential. In that legislation, passage of a standardized test of subject matter knowledge was given equivalence to the completion of an approved program of academic study. Additionally, in the early years of the Ryan Act, it was possible to earn an administrative services credential (required for service as principal or other school administrator) by taking and passing a standardized examination.

While candidates still must complete an approved program to earn a credential, some options do exist within the legal requirements for the credential to permit the passage of examinations in lieu of courses. In the field experience requirement, there is no commonly available examination to take in lieu of completing supervised field work.

There is growing interest in moving teaching more toward the examination system used in law and medicine. The emphasis within the teacher reform effort is increasingly on individual assessment for licensure rather than programmatic assessment. This interest in candidate-based assessment can be seen in some of the reform efforts mounted in the 1970s in Georgia and other states in the South. The competency-based teacher education models that claimed to have identified the key competencies needed for effective teaching led to the development of competency-based methods of assessment.

In the late 1980s, another teacher reform effort, based on improving the status of teaching through voluntary national certification of excellence in teaching, focused on the development of performance-based assessments, similar to those developed for certain specialties in medicine. Additionally, the push toward student accountability during the 1990s has created an understandable push toward teacher

accountability. Some of the drive for candidate-based assessments for teacher licensure is based on distrust of postsecondary education's ability to hold to high standards. Some of the drive is based on the American belief in standardized examinations as upholding the concept of a meritocratic society. Some of the drive toward candidate-based assessment is linked to the concept of using assessments as the lever to enforce high and rigorous standards at those postsecondary institutions where teachers are prepared.

As with the other background issues to this history of teacher licensure, California faces complex assessment dilemmas in the next few years. The public's desire for increased accountability is not likely to subside. As student accountability moves further away from notions of "seat time" as a measure of competence, so too will teacher accountability be discussed in terms of individual competence rather than completion of an approved program of study. California has taken an important step toward an accountability system based upon individual candidate competence by requiring a teaching performance assessment to be completed before a credential may be issued. What is unclear is whether policy makers in California are prepared over time to support the cost of such a performance oriented, candidate-based assessment system. In California, size, in population and land area, creates orders of magnitude that translate into all reforms costing large amounts of money. With an average of 12,000 to 14,000 brand new teachers entering the work force each year, the cost of maintaining a high quality candidate-based assessment system is substantial. With declining resources in periods of fiscal downturn, and the rise of other pressing educational demands in the state, it is somewhat problematic to anticipate whether or not California will be able to sustain a strong candidate-based assessment for teacher licensure.

Locus of Policy Decisions

While chapter two shows how quickly the state took over the licensure of teachers and later chapters focus largely on the legislative efforts to improve teacher certification and licensure, the locus of policy decisions in this area has not been, and is not now, always within the California Legislature.

It would not be an exaggeration to argue that education and the quality of public schools have been the topic of more commissions, task forces, blue ribbon committees, and select committees than any other aspect of government. This claim testifies not only to the centrality of the public schools in a democratic society, but also the degree to which non-experts believe they have effective ideas for improving the schools. Indeed, the very success of the public schools in educating the vast majority of the American public to high school graduation has created the situation of a nation of educational pundits by virtue of 12 years of exposure.

Thus, the impetus for reform in education and teacher education frequently comes from outside the profession and outside the typical policy arena. In too many cases, the less the individual actually knows about education, teaching, testing, or curriculum, the more likely his or her ideas are to be seen as honest and viable. Education may well be the last general civic enterprise where expert knowledge is routinely ignored in favor of amateur views. In many cases, these calls for reform are not based on empirical data, but rather on sweeping appeals to the public's deepest fears. For example, the progressive educational movement was charged with multitude of deficiencies and instructional disasters by the critics of the 1950s. Yet, the students taught during the height of the progressive movements (approximately 1920-1940) were the same individuals who fought in World War II and then created the greatest economic boom in modern history.

The deep irony of the so-called “Sputnik science crisis” is that the United States had launched the world’s first nuclear-powered submarine within months of the Soviet satellite launch. The design and construction of the Nautilus was an engineering and scientific accomplishment much greater than boosting a metal basketball with a transistor radio inside into space, but no one thought to acclaim our public schools for helping achieve a dominance in high technology engineering and aerospace efforts.

Additionally, the students who experienced the first “new math” programs in the late 1950s and early 1960s have managed to lead the world in a rapidly changing economy dominated by advances in computers, electronics, and telecommunication. While we continue to wring our hands over the failures of our public schools, the American

economy out-performs other economies, new innovations continue to pour out of our universities, research labs, and industrial parks, and many of these innovations come from college drop-outs. Either educational programs have no appreciable effect on their students, thus rendering our concerns about them moot, or the claims against these innovations or the underlying institutions that support them are based on insufficient evidence.

It has never been easy to make public policy through rational analyses, particularly in education. The rise of "wedge politics", the desire for a risk-free society, the influence of lobbying groups, the emphasis on sound-bite political campaigns, and the increasing power of organizations focused on social and moral issues, all combine to make educational policy making, including teacher licensure policies, increasingly volatile and unpredictable. The enactment of term limits for members of the California Legislature has increased the volatility level since the Legislature's institutional memory has been diminished through forced turnover of membership. Sustained patterns of policy direction typically require multiple pieces of legislation and acquired knowledge of governmental affairs. Many of the educational reforms of the 1980s and 1990s would likely not have been possible without the efforts of members of the Legislature having years of experience in making legislation and having a deep knowledge of many aspects of the educational enterprise in California. Such knowledge and legislative skill does not develop overnight and is much less likely with term-limited legislators.

As California adjusts to the altered political landscape and its preference for policy making through propositions, the actual locus of decision making in the field of education and teacher education will remain unclear. It is, however, quite clear that the number of participants in the policy making process will continue to increase. This increase in participants may blunt the rapidity and intensity of educational reform efforts as consensus will be more difficult to achieve. It may also foster greater swings in the direction and shape of reform efforts as varied groups vie for control of the policy mechanisms and decline to support the efforts of previous governmental leaders.

Conclusion

The elements mentioned at the outset of this chapter--public attitudes toward the role and purpose of public schools, centralized government control of education through the development of a full-time professional legislature, ambivalence about the knowledge and skills necessary for a person to be a successful teacher, and an enduring uncertainty about the proper place to garner that knowledge and skill--are part of each chapter of this book as is the particular geo-historical and socio-economic aspects of California's development. From time to time, one or more of these elements will rise to the narrative surface. The rest will lie below the story being told, but they influence teacher licensure in important ways. The individuals who played their parts in this history were undoubtedly aware of some or all of these elements. The decisions they made and the actions they took should be charted in light of the undercurrents of these elements.

Throughout the period described in this book, people of goodwill disagreed strongly about the right path to improved schools. Each, however, was motivated by a desire to see the public schools of the state do a better job of preparing the children and youth of California. Each was committed to finding the right combination of policy directives that would produce high quality schools. Whether one agrees with their ideas or not, it is important to ascribe to them all a devotion to the common good and a belief in the public school system. The majority of the participants in these chapters also held an enduring belief in the efficacy of licensure. The state was historically, and is now, seen as having an abiding need to control who was and is permitted to teach school children. Once schools required children to attend under penalty of law, the fitness and knowledge of the individuals employed to teach these children became a matter of significance.

Arguments about the particular nature of that preparation or who should control the preparation abound. What is constant is the belief that teachers must be prepared formally and that those who work with children and youth must meet and maintain certain standards of moral fitness and professional performance. The chapters that follow provide a powerful and engaging story of the varied efforts to bring this enduring belief to full fruition.

Chapter 2
California's First 100 Years: Establishing State Responsibility for Quality of Teachers (1850-1950)

Irving G. Hendrick

Most of the important issues concerning the preparation and credentialing of teachers in California have arisen repeatedly over the past 140 years. Early and late there have been disagreements about which group of educators--or the state--should exercise primary control over teacher quality and entry into the profession. Early on there have been disagreements over the efficacy of teacher examinations as a requirement for teacher credentials, and disagreements over the relative value of pedagogical knowledge and academic content knowledge as paramount objectives for credentialing teachers. Perhaps all of this was inevitable. Since public education had emerged in America primarily as a state responsibility, in the absence of any generally apparent need to enforce agreed-upon standards of technical competence, it followed that the states and their citizens would assert responsibility over the qualifications of public school teachers. But how best to pursue that responsibility became the subject of continuing controversy, debate, and policy shifts.

Just as important as the training and credentialing of teachers to the issue of teacher quality has been the hiring of teachers by local school districts. Notwithstanding some periodic increase or decrease in state authority and responsibility for teacher certification, local hiring decisions have consistently made the critical difference in the quality of teaching. Local authorities have always held the key in selecting teachers. No matter what test a teacher submitted to, or what kind of a certificate a teacher held--be it a county certificate or a state credential--local school districts, i.e., those units of authority closest to the scene, have always held the greatest direct control over what happened in terms of teacher qualifications, working conditions, and compensation.

The role of state officials in credentialing teachers followed almost inevitably from the state's need to provide teachers for the newly mandated system of common schools. Within two years of statehood the legislature required that every teacher "to recover wages for services

rendered, must have a certificate of qualification from the Superintending Committee of the School in which services were rendered." (1: 1891)

Above everything else, the enterprise of preparing and credentialing teachers has been an intensely pragmatic affair. There has been a need on the part of state government to assure the public that teachers are at least minimally qualified to render teaching service in the state's interest. At the same time, the need to supply many teachers-and do so at minimal cost to taxpayers--has assured that the standards would not be too high. Many of the controversies over the decades concerned how to keep a steady stream of teachers present in the schools, and do so in the presence of dramatic growth in the school population, and do so in the absence of clear evidence that a particular amount or kind of teacher preparation produced better results than a different kind and amount of preparation. Besides arguments over the amount and nature of a teacher's formal preparation, there were arguments over who should be permitted to make the determination about what that preparation should consist of. For example, should individual school districts, the counties, colleges and universities, the profession, or the state hold most of the influence in defining what pattern of preparation teachers should be held to?

Most of the story over teacher credentialing to date is a story about dealing with issues of control and the substance of preparation. Side issues and strategy shifts over the years demonstrate how state government has coped with the larger issue of teacher qualifications. Direct responsibility by the state, shared responsibility with counties and teacher preparing institutions, and neglect are all part of that story.

In the earliest decades of statehood, local communities held the strongest claim on teachers and their qualifications. Teachers enjoyed a closeness to their pupils and communities which they gradually lost under the press of industrialization and urbanization. The only qualification for teaching in those years was a willingness to teach and an ability to pass the scrutiny of a local school committee, as was the case with many nineteenth century professions, a college education was not a requirement. Local school committees were not infrequently made up of illiterate persons who were not above applying capricious standards in favor of hiring their friends and relatives for the low status job of teacher. Yet, no matter how low the salary or how low the status, the occupation always held an attraction for someone. Often it was attractive to women

whose own nineteenth century identities were closely associated with child rearing. State law during the early years made no restrictions on the level or subject that a teacher could teach and local school committees were not about to enforce any restriction themselves. An obvious consequence of minimal preparation of teachers and easy access to the occupation was low status and little teacher independence from school committees in the management of schools.

Initially, low standards of qualifications implied no mandated level of educational attainment for teachers. Certainly no formal teacher training or certification requirements existed during the 1850s, although State Superintendent, Paul K. Hubbs, did organize teacher conventions in 1854 and in 1856, for the purpose of informing and inspiring teachers. In 1861, State Superintendent Andrew Moulder attracted 250 teachers to a three-day State Teachers Institute dedicated to enhancing their pedagogical skills.

Featured topics at the event included a speech stressing the need for uniform state textbooks, a gymnastics demonstration, a discussion of school discipline, and a lecture on "Methods of Teaching." Similar events were held in 1862 and 1863.

Modest attempts to initiate state teacher training and certification requirements occurred during the 1850s and 1860s. State Superintendents Andrew Moulder and John Swett persuaded the Legislature to establish a state board of examiners to license teachers in 1859, and a state normal school to train them in 1862. Even after establishment of a state board of examiners, the testing and licensing of teachers followed no set pattern.

Earliest responsibility rested with local districts. Then, beginning with legislation written by Swett which won legislative approval in 1863, the State Board of Education became fully responsible for examinations of teachers at all levels. The triumph of state authority was more apparent than real, however, as local school boards continued to hire and rehire teachers according to criteria they approved. There was, even as early as the 1860s, some modest advantage for teachers to pass the state examination--as contrasted with a county examination. While the locally prepared examinations were generally valid for just one year, the examinations established by the state authorized service for two, three, or four years, depending on the teacher's score. From the 1860s forward

into the twentieth century, the counties exercised authority to issue certificates to elementary teachers, an authority that was expanded under the second constitution of 1879, to include "grammar-grade" (secondary) certificates as well.

The efforts of State Superintendents John Moulder and John Swett, particularly Swett, helped to centralize a measure of authority in certifying teachers in the hands of state authorities. In a sense, the victory of the state superintendents constituted a victory for the teachers as well. Teachers had been humiliated by the capricious practices of local school officials and desired assurance that their certificates would be valid for life, or at least beyond the impulsive judgment of local school politicians. The State Board, unsurprisingly, worked to concentrate authority at its own level and did so by controlling examinations. Regrettably, it soon became apparent that both local and state corruption reigned supreme in the examination of teachers.

Questions on the state teachers' examination leaked out of Sacramento on one notorious occasion and created a major scandal. On Friday, November 29, 1878, the San Francisco Evening Bulletin printed the questions that were to appear on the examination scheduled for the following day. The city editor of the Evening Bulletin, posing as a teacher, had successfully secured the questions, thereby exposing corruption in the state's certification system. The scandal gave delegates to the second constitutional convention added incentive for placing the examination of teachers and the granting of certificates under local control.

The county examinations authorized in the second constitution for testing teacher fitness were hardly more successful--or less corrupt--than the state examinations had been. But five years of examination sales under state authority hardly inspired confidence in the State Board of Education and its authority. Under the second constitution of 1879 (2: 1879), all teacher examination authority was returned to city and county school boards.

Satisfaction with the local system of examinations was short lived. Much of California's educational literature from the 1880s reflected a growing dissatisfaction with teacher examinations of any kind. In June 1887, the State Board of Education urged county board members to abstain from coaching candidates preliminary to their examinations.

Little attention was paid to this request, and two years later the Legislature made it a misdemeanor for a board member to prepare candidates. (3: 1889) While it is difficult to see any good coming from the legacy of corruption in teacher examinations, one might imagine--if only a bit cynically--that teaching credentials were coveted at least enough to stimulate cheating. Perhaps teachers were gaining a measure of status as a result of being certified. The state's loss of authority was more important than any new status coming to teachers. The State Board of Education retained a measure of authority over the granting of Educational and Life Diplomas, but only on the recommendation of cities and counties. Yet, the 1880s were to witness the high water mark in local authority. Over time, from the 1890s to the present, the state, through the Legislature and Board of Education, regained control and eventually became dominant in setting requirements for teachers.

As a general rule, it has seemed that the increase of profession like standards, e.g., higher levels of education for teachers, came from education leaders themselves. Often a state superintendent of public instruction, a professional organization, or an elite study commission would take the lead. Generally speaking, shifts in entry requirements or bases for authority and control came in each instance after significant public outcry over a perceived abuse. Stated differently, in the absence of public controversy, state public education leaders generally were able to direct the course of reform and evolving professional standards.

The early renaissance of state authority over teacher qualifications during the legislative session was accompanied by an interesting and long term symbiotic relationship between teacher preparation institutions and the State Board of Education. Indeed, that legislation did much to initiate a close relationship between the normal schools, the University of California, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Greater state control over certification came after 1893, when the Legislature empowered the State Board of Education to issue grammar-grade certificates and life diplomas to normal-school graduates. (4: 1893) In the same year the State Board, acting in its capacity as trustees for the state normal schools, began to exercise a measure of control over the pedagogical preparation of teachers coming in from out of state. The Legislature clearly was moving to establish its own authority. Happily, there was also some desire on the part of school districts to increase

teacher standards, and to do so by insisting not on the passing of an examination, but rather on completing a normal school program. Not surprisingly, local school officials sometimes objected to their loss of control over teacher preparation.

Nevertheless, the trend toward state authority was reinforced in 1897, when the State Supreme Court ruled in *Mitchell v. Winnek* (5: 1897) that the Legislature could prescribe the requirements for teacher certification. The issue had been in doubt because the constitution had given county superintendents and boards control over teachers' examinations and teaching certificates. In effect, the ruling opened the door to a strange dualistic pattern of teacher licensure. Counties were still permitted to issue certificates, but all regularly licensed teachers were required to possess a state "credential" before the county could issue a "certificate." Except for a few emergencies, substitute, and other short-term teaching authorizations that required only a certificate, the county certification process involved little more than registering state credentials. Importantly as well, when the state again resumed its influence and control of defining teacher credentialing standards at the turn of the century it placed its support behind normal school and university courses, not examination performance.

Beginning in 1901, newly prepared teachers needed to graduate from an "approved program" at a normal school or university in order to be eligible for a "life diploma", the most permanent and desirable form of teacher certification. County school boards could still issue six-year Grammar grade certificates on the basis of examinations, but this form of authorization was valid only in the county where it was issued. The State Board, on the other hand, assumed complete responsibility for high school certification, thereby substantially reducing the rights of the county boards.

Taking stock of the teacher preparation and credentialing dynamic at the turn of the century, one can observe several large principles being played out. As the state grew in population, complexity, and wealth, the Legislature and State Board of Education were becoming better able to assert their will over local units of government. That notwithstanding, local school districts were still more important to the actual implementation of policy than was state authority. After all, local school

officials actually hired the teachers. Often they needed to hire many of them, and at minimal cost.

The growth of formal institutions of education, including universities and normal schools, resulted in a symbiotic relationship developing between state education officials and higher education personnel. Given bad experiences on all fronts with teacher examinations, state education officials reasoned that the advance of state authority should be accompanied by higher levels of teacher education. State education officials, including the forty-five member State Educational Commission of 1900, wanted to empower the University of California to define appropriate standards for high school teachers. The major political phenomenon coming from the Commission Report was that teachers demanded the state to use its regulatory powers to control the conditions by which cities and counties could issue teaching certificates.

Accompanying that development was realization that the State Board needed to require trained or professional teachers. (6: 1989) The Board was given responsibility for establishing minimum standards for teachers, and it did so by determining which teacher preparing programs were equivalent to graduation from the University of California with a recommendation from the faculty. Interestingly, from the perspective of contemporary history, enhancing standards of teacher quality also implied enhancing normal school and university training standards, as well as eliminating local and county examinations.

The results were dramatic. Over a 17-year period between 1899 and 1916, the number of state credentials issued on the basis of a teacher's level of training completed increased by nearly a factor of 5, while the number of credentials awarded on the basis of examinations declined by a factor of 9. (7: 1989) In order to insure that the University of California give appropriate and adequate attention to pedagogy, the State Board was authorized to require all college and university credential graduates to take the minimum amount of pedagogy prescribed by the State Board. Herein lays the beginning of the state attending to what it saw as the well being of the profession by requiring some course work in pedagogy prior to issuing a credential. Thus, if support for pedagogical studies could not be won on the University campus because of resistance from the liberal arts faculty, at least it could be mandated by the state. (8: 1900)

By 1905, California became the first state to require a fifth year of college work for secondary teaching credentials, and by 1906 the fifth year included a full year of graduate study. For nearly 30 years, California was the only state to require a fifth year for secondary teaching credentials. Importantly, the State Board was now in the business of prescribing the quantity and nature of a teacher's pedagogical training. Had the University of California been willing to assume leadership for the professional training of teachers, likely it would have been given that responsibility, at least for a while. While the actual number of pedagogical courses--or semester-hours--required for secondary teachers did not change substantially between 1905 and the early 1960s, the nature of the prescribed work did change. A 1906 ruling required that a minimum of one-third of the prescribed work in pedagogy should consist of practice teaching in a well-equipped training school. (9: 1945)

In 1914, the number of semester-hours in prescribed pedagogy was increased from 12 to 15 for secondary teachers. At the same time, the State Board required each candidate to take at least one graduate course in a subject he or she expected to teach. (10: 1914) During the next several years the number of semester-hours in education prescribed by the State Board was to rise as high as 21, and by 1921 it had settled at 18 where it remained until 1951, when it was increased to 22.

An interesting development involving the State Board's support for, indeed its promotion of, professional training occurred in 1914. In that year the Board presumed to transfer methods courses from academic departments to the Education Department at the University of California. This was done for the declared purpose of encouraging "the development of real professional schools of education with dignity at least equal to those of law, medicine, engineering, and theology." (11: 1916) Thus, it was the state, led by state educational leaders, that encouraged, indeed practically required a reluctant University of California faculty and administration to create a Department and then a School of Education at Berkeley.

Meanwhile, as part of the centralizing the credentialing authority at the state level, the normal school principals met regularly with the State Board. These meetings were accompanied by a flurry of rules and regulations establishing and tightening state credentialing standards. By

1917, the Legislature had given the State Board complete control and responsibility over the normal schools with an accompanying mandate to unify and raise their standards. (12: 1989) Assisting the State Board in that work was a new Commission on Credentials. State mandated professional requirements for teaching credentials was merely one example of how state reformers showed interest in mandating socially sensitive programs. The elimination of child labor from industry during the second decade of the twentieth century had an important effect on teacher training. After reaching a peak of employment in 1910, child labor decreased sharply. By 1920, only 8.5% of children between the ages of ten and fifteen years of age were employed. During this same ten year period, 1910-1920, the average daily attendance in high schools increased 151%. While some of this increase is attributable to population growth, it also demonstrated that pupils who normally would not have attended high school during earlier days were now attending. (13: 1964).

Since the children were legislated into the schools, new adaptations were felt necessary to meet the new situation. In addition to the apparent need for newly trained teachers with greater emphasis placed on pedagogy, another newly emerging American phenomenon was developing the professionally trained school administrator. Increasingly, Departments of Education were taking responsibility for the preparation of both teachers and school administrators.

The role of professional education in teacher training gained rapidly following 1920. Necessary sanction for this development came from the Legislature, with leadership coming from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the new lay State Board of Education. In 1920, the Special Legislative Committee on Education discussed in its report the failure of normal schools to meet the demand for trained elementary teachers. (14: 1936) It recommended the gradual extension of the normal schools into four-year teachers' colleges with power to grant professional degrees. By 1921, this was accomplished. Control was taken from the separate boards of trustees and centralized in the State Board of Education and in the State Superintendents in 1923; normal school training was increased from two to two and a half years, then three years by 1927, and finally to a four-year baccalaureate program by 1930.

Unsurprisingly perhaps, as the state began to exercise greater and greater influence and control over the preparation of teachers, it also

added credential specializations in new and applied fields, such as business and agriculture. The advance in professional teacher preparation requirements at the behest of the state is a development which soon worked both to improve and lower standards, depending on societal circumstances. State control implied that the state would be compelled to respond, sometimes in contradictory--but always pragmatic--ways, to social, economic, and political developments that impacted on the supply and demand of teachers. Thus, the Great Depression of the 1930s, with its accompanying oversupply of secondary social science, physical education, and home economics teachers, helped enhance the quality of new teachers in those fields.

In 1930, a special Commission for the Study of Educational Problems was established to study the way the State Department of Education should be organized. The timing of the commission and the circumstances that informed its recommendations occurred when there was a surplus of credentialed teachers. In this atmosphere of teacher surplus, the Commission was persuaded that low teacher quality and too easy access into teaching were critical problems in the field. One solution proposed by the Commission was the abolition of county certificates. The proposal supported the concept of college and university based teacher training over the long standing--though now little used--system of certifying teachers on the basis of county examinations.

A year later, in response to state competition for campuses of the University of California, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching organized a special commission to formulate a general plan for higher education in the state. Not all of the recommendations were implemented, but they did serve to point out the teaching level differences between the teachers colleges and the University of California. Organizationally, the Commission recommended that all higher education come under the stewardship of the University of California Regents. It also recommended that county authority for teacher certificates be abolished finally for all levels of teaching service. Seven types of state certificates were proposed by level of responsibility, including separate credentials for kindergarten-primary, elementary, secondary, junior college, supervision, administration, and special fields. The Commission believed that credentials should have overlapping features to provide an easy transition into the new type of school

organization, one which in recent decades had begun to include junior high schools and junior colleges.

To conserve state resources, the Commission proposed that the several levels of public higher education become responsible for particular aspects of teacher preparation. High school teachers should take their final three years of work at the University of California, thereby giving the University a definitive--and exclusive--role in teacher preparation, but one that also would require it to abandon its role in preparing elementary teachers. Those teachers would be prepared by the state colleges. The Commission's report was rejected by much of the profession, particularly the State Department of Education and the California Teachers Association. Among its recommendations was one that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction be appointed by the State Board of Education, rather than be elected.

There were other committees and commissions on the state level that proposed various reforms applicable to state government in general and state teacher credentialing in particular. In 1941, the Committee on State Organization, chaired by San Francisco attorney Francis V. Kessling, included in its report a recommendation that the state cease issuing life certificates and replace them with ten-year certificates based on teacher merit and standards set by the State Board.

After World War II, the need for teachers increased dramatically. Indeed, between 1950 and 1960, there occurred the most rapid school population growth in the state's history. Between 1950 and 1960, public school enrollments doubled as a percent, and increased absolutely by over 1.6 million students--from 1,661,051 to 3,304,485. (15: 1988) With this growth came increased pressure from school districts for relaxed standards in teacher credentialing. Consistent with a century of experience, the need for teachers produced a relaxation of standards. According to Ralph Brott, a historian of teacher credentialing in California, an estimated 600,000 teachers had come into and left teaching between 1939 and 1945. (16: 1989) Accompanying that pressure in 1946 was a countervailing press for heightened standards in professional education requirements. Unsurprisingly, this advocacy came from the National Education Association's National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. Unfortunately for the professional development movement in teacher education and credentialing, the

reform that eventually prevailed a decade and a half later focused on excesses in professional preparation (education courses), something this author has referred to as an "academic revolution." (17: 1967) The chapters that follow address the particular direction of various reforms after 1960, as well as the ramifications of those reforms for the future of professional standards in the education profession.

Expansion of the state teachers' colleges into a broader liberal arts function during the 1930s detracted little from their original teacher training function. Meanwhile, at the University of California, the Department of Education continued to grow in responsibility for secondary teacher training, even as its overall stature on campus remained low. One educational authority writing in 1936, affirmed that the mandate for teacher training had been derived from the Legislature, not from the University, and noted "the indifference, if not the antagonism, of certain academic faculties who have maintained the traditional prejudices against teacher training." Furthermore, this same commentator went on to reprimand academic departments for being unaware of the complicated problems facing the public schools, and for being willing to "forfeit the leadership of the university," all the while viewing with suspicion the development of the state normal colleges. (18: 1936)

Notwithstanding the difficulty which the pursuit of teacher education experienced within the University of California, the University continued to be a major force in preparing teachers and school administrators until its mission changed in favor of a greater emphasis on research and graduate education after 1960. Data from the State Department of Education revealed that in 1957-58, 3,358 people with bachelor's degrees from Berkeley held some form of credential for school service in California, ranking that campus first among all institutions of higher education in the state Berkeley's younger sister campus, UCLA, ranked second with 3,231. By contrast, the largest producer of credential holders among the state colleges was San Jose State, with 2,871, followed by San Francisco State with 2,306. Among people awarded certificates in 1957-58, 2,991 had completed graduate units applicable to a credential at Berkeley, ranking it first among public institutions in the state. Only the University of Southern California, a private institution, had produced more. (19: 1967)

The sometime scorning of courses in pedagogy by faculty members from the traditional academic departments became a consistent theme throughout the century. Although education departments were to increase their influence over teacher education during the first half of the twentieth century, there is good reason to believe that at mid-century they were really very little closer to becoming a vital part of the university academic community than they had been in 1936-or in 1892.

State credentialing requirements gave teachers two critically necessary elements in their quest for professional status: (1) acknowledgment that they possessed specialized knowledge and skills, and (2) recognition in the law. Standards were not high, but they existed. Teachers and those who prepared them still had to convince the public--and themselves--that teaching required specialized knowledge and skills attainable only through higher education and training. Professional level salaries and respect could not come in advance of that attainment. Although the public schools of California likely enjoyed as high a level of public support and respect during the early post World War II period as they ever would achieve in the twentieth century, the need to staff classrooms to accommodate the unprecedented number of children entering public schools, and do so at a cost acceptable to the public, assured that the serious search for specialized professional skills would have to wait.

Well before the late 1950s, some leaders in professional education showed dissatisfaction with the nature of pedagogical training. As early as 1924, some teacher educators participating in a state sponsored teacher training conference questioned the wisdom of having the state prescribe large amounts of work in education. (20: 1924) Four years later, a new credentialing plan was enacted which permitted universities and colleges greater freedom in arranging their training programs. (21: 1934) On the whole, however, while teacher educators have long appreciated some measure of flexibility in defining their training programs, instances where they urged diminishing state professional education requirements in the name of greater institutional flexibility have been rare indeed. Even as the University of California, and to some extent, other higher education institutions, often favored limited state mandates in the interest of maximizing program flexibility, college and university faculty in education generally seemed to appreciate the

protective tariff which was afforded by state mandated requirements in professional education.

One is led to conclude that the rise of university education departments, teachers' colleges, and state required professional training was done under the leadership of professional educators and without strong societal objection. During 1931, the California Commission for the Study of Educational Problems (22: 1931) even criticized the state teachers' colleges for not adhering more closely than they were to their strictly professional training objectives, yet as the population grew in response to the California dream and industrialization, the complexity of California life eventually led to a greater diversity in higher education. As the mission of higher education expanded during the first half of the twentieth century, the normal schools at Los Angeles and Santa Barbara were brought into the University of California system for demographic and political reasons. The remainder became teachers colleges by 1921, then multipurpose state colleges by 1935, and ultimately campuses of the California State University by 1962. (23: 1964)

As the state colleges and universities became more diverse, the State Department of Education slowly assumed greater responsibility for defining teacher preparation requirements. An increasingly complex web of credential specializations was defined in the decade after World War II. The press for hiring new teachers was so intense that local and state school officials were able to influence state credential requirements in a way that met the personnel needs of school districts, although not without the generous use of "emergency" or temporary credentials. By mid-century the University of California, the state colleges, and a host of private colleges were all offering teacher preparation programs that were substantially defined by the state, albeit each with a measure of institutional uniqueness. This did not imply conflict, however. Indeed, the same deans, and professors who were leaders within their departments and schools of education were also leaders in influencing the nature of state requirements.

Through the 1950s, state credential requirements were influenced primarily by the professional training views of teacher educators from schools of education and by the practical necessity to supply an unprecedented number of teachers for the public schools. Although dramatic change would occur during the 1960s, as forces which

produced both the Master Plan for Higher Education (1960) and the Licensing of Certificated Personnel Law of 1961 (Fisher Act) became dominant, the 1950s ended with the University of California still the most influential higher education force in teacher education, and the State Department of Education firmly in control of teacher credentialing.

Chapter 3
A Political Firestorm Surrounds the Fisher Credential Reform (1950-1961)

Sidney A. Inglis

A comprehensive review of the events and forces working leading toward significant teacher education reform in 1961, reads like a complex, multi-plotted novel. No single chain of events throughout the 1950s led logically and neatly from one step to a successive one. Rather, profound international and national happenings merged alternately with purely California considerations to result in a climatic session of the 1961 Legislature. This complex political mix includes:

- An aggressive drive by the Soviet Union toward some kind of world supremacy.
- An anxiety in the public mind regarding national chances for survival in a once-again more dangerous world.
- A sincere belief, on the part of many California educators, that teacher credentialing was too complex.
- A strong desire, by some university professors and citizens, to return to a distinctly more academic emphasis in the public schools.
- A calculated political strategy, on the part of a major political party, to display a demonstrable public policy achievement.

Within all of these forces were innumerable personal ambitions of individuals and special interest groups, whose perceptions and motives were a large part of the underlying fire-storm that ensued.

The Beginning Rumblings

Rising voices for reform appeared simultaneously in the public, in the academic community, and in the profession. National restlessness and uncertainty about teacher competency and the quality of instruction began to appear five or six years before the advent of Sputnik. Writings from the early 1950s expressed deep disdain for “progressive education” in the public schools; as a logical extension of the concern, this antipathy also included teacher education. Published in magazines, books and other

sources, these criticisms were cutting and persuasive, declaring strong dislike and distrust of professional "educationalists". This storm of public criticism reached its peak in 1958, incited by the Soviet launch of Sputnik in fall of 1957. Their number increased sharply during late 1957 and all of 1958, with more appearing during the first six months of 1958, than in all of 1957; a decided preponderance focused on the perceived over-emphasis upon professional methodology in the preparation of teachers.(1. Hendrick 1967, p.141) A few of the better-known books of the time illustrate this outlook: *Educational Wastelands by Arthur Bestor; Quackery in the Public Schools,* by Albert Lynd; and *The Diminished Mind*, by Mortimer Smith.

In addition to this outpouring of written criticism about the perceived sad state of the public schools, a concerted political effort organized like-minded people. The Council for Basic Education (CBE)--formed in 1956, with the avowed goal "to strengthen the basic subjects of English, mathematics, science, history, and foreign languages in American schools"--carried an incessant theme of attack. In California the CBE rapidly became a special interest group, seeking to influence schools and, especially, the legislature to reform public school curricula and teacher education programs. Its vigorous pronouncements reached many receptive ears among the general public and the higher education academic community in 1956 and 1957; its influence accelerated greatly following Sputnik.

Meanwhile, the background of unrest and dissatisfaction built by these factors contributed to a unique political development in the academic community. An *ad hoc* committee, composed exclusively of academic college and university faculty in southern California, organized a group to influence the political process surrounding credential reform. The Committee for Improving Teacher Education (CITE) was formed, listing among its members the presidents of two liberal arts colleges (Occidental and Claremont Men's) and other prominent individuals and pointedly lacking traditional professional educators--among others Edward Teller, physicist and Nobel Prize winner; Harold Arey, chemist and Nobel Prize winner; and Harry Ashmore, Editor-in Chief, *Encyclopedia Britannia*. This group became a surprisingly potent behind-the-scenes force during the evolution of the Fisher Act, the major reform of teacher education and credentialing in 1961, although its

existence and goals were virtually unknown to the general public. CITE called for steps to return the public schools to the academicians, saying that "while professional education departments might be tolerated, they should serve a minor role in teacher preparation. Leadership roles in the public schools should be limited to those trained in one of the traditional liberal arts." (2. Cannon 1964, p.7) Ultimately, CITE members appeared before legislative committees, lobbied members of those committees in person and by mail and telephone, and testified at State Board of Education meetings when teacher education reform was the prominent issue. Some prime movers within this organization --Harry Girvetz, for one--had direct contact with key members of the Governor's staff and with Senator Hugo Fisher himself during the genesis of the drive to pass the Fisher Act.

The interests of CBE, CITE and other conservative groups--including, interestingly, the California Federation of Teachers (CFT)--converged in one belief: the public schools of California had lost sight of their major purpose, to inculcate skills in the basic subjects in the state's school children. The schools, thereby, had added many "frills" and non-essentials to the curriculum; they had employed teachers who had been thoroughly "brainwashed" by the college departments of education of the State--so went the repeated messages of these groups. These activists sought, too, to find effective ways to force the elimination of superfluous school subjects, to reduce drastically the "professional" preparation of teachers, and to enact upgraded requirements to become a public school administrator.

This ground swell of public demand was preceded, ironically, by the profession's comprehensive, sustained and sincere effort to improve the confusing, variegated requirements and standards established by the early 1950s. Importantly--yet lost in the intense political storm that was to follow--on December 7, 1954, the President of the California Council on Teacher Education (CCET) and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction jointly appointed the Committee for Revision of the Credential System in California, a fourteen-member representative statewide committee, to study state credentialing policy and recommend changes. (3. Simpson, 1958, p.525) For 5½ years this committee and its participants conducted an intensive drive to reach statewide professional

consensus on a new credential structure and on rigorous standards for preparation. Four milestones mark the work of this committee:

March 1954 to May 1957: The committee met often, and ultimately devised and presented to the State Superintendent a set of recommendations reducing the number of basic credentials to four from forty (along with several other items).

May 1957 to Spring 1958: Publicity about the work and recommendations of the committee solicited suggestions and comment from the field. Seven regional meetings provided the opportunity to all professionals concerned to react to the committee's recommendations.

December 1958 to March 1959: Eight regional meetings, all convened by the State Superintendent, were held statewide on Saturdays so that professional and lay persons could attend and react.

January 1960: The State Board of Education conducted a hearing to present and thoroughly discuss the recommendations. It included views, biases and objective thinking of such diverse organizations as the California Congress of Parents and Teachers, the California School Boards Association (CSBA), the Citizens Advisory Committee, and numerous professional organizations.

In February 1960, the State Board officially approved new standards, which were designed to serve as the basis for developing legislation to create a new and improved credential structure for the state. Two essential features shaped the Board's action: (a) adoption of fourteen "basic principles" dealing with the overall credential structure; and (b) recommendations for the establishment of five "standard" credentials. This recommendation significantly departed from the Committee's original intent to develop four credentials covering the entire field of public school service and instead listed five credentials, a development later to influence the Fisher Act; with its strong objective to sharply reform credentials, the Fisher Act contained essentially the same five credentials, at least by title.

The Committee for Revision's goal had been to overhaul and streamline the unwieldy and outdated credential structure which had gradually evolved over decades. That work reached fruition in early 1960. Yet, by early 1961, less than a year later this same Board actively supported proposed legislation that opposed those same relatively non-controversial ideas. In a short period of time, this professional group's

work was overturned, yet its ideas and recommendations were to appear in other venues as the saga unfolded--with seldom, if ever, any attribution given.

The Gathering Storm of Reform

Despite the strengthening signs of discontent with the quality of public education, prior to 1958, the California Legislature showed little interest in the issue. However, as the storm warnings became more evident in early 1958, intensified by the near-universal distress about Soviet advances in science it acknowledged the growing political magnetism of the issue. An editorial in the *Sacramento Bee* suddenly crystallized these vague fears, which had been nascent for half a decade. Seeking to influence directly its backdoor neighbor, the California Legislature, the *Bee* proposed "the creation--by the Legislature--of a joint legislative-citizen commission on education instructed to analyze all facets of education--finances, goals, curricula, the teacher problem, equipment, etc.--and to conduct public hearings on education in various geographical areas." (Sacramento Bee, March 24, 1958) Because the Legislature at that time did not convene in general session in even numbered years, it could not conduct a full-scale investigation itself in 1958. Instead, realizing the need for information as a prelude to some kind of action and spurred by the *Bee's* editorializing, it established the Joint Interim Committee on Education, whose members represented both houses. This Committee then became the legislature's official study group. It became obvious to legislative leaders that an investigation was in order.

The Joint Interim Committee moved rapidly to appoint a Citizen's Advisory Commission on Education, a fact-gathering body composed of representatives of the public. Gordon Winton, a prominent Assembly member at the time and a member of the Joint Interim Committee itself, described the appointment process. Several weeks after the Legislature adjourned in June, members of the Joint Interim Committee reconvened to establish this Commission. Members brought names for consideration by the entire Committee, including many suggested by the candidates themselves. Several legislators suggested three or four names, many of whom were essentially "people with axes to grind" and/or who held conservative views of public education. (4. Winton interview, 1966)

According to Carl Larson, a State Department staff member at the time, initially a requirement for being appointed was "who had the biggest beef' with education." The Joint Committee, realizing that this created too obvious an imbalance, subsequently established broader representation. In the process, 500 names were cut to 27, who became the official Commission. (5. Larson interview, 1966) William Lawlor, a Glendale dentist, became the first permanent chair of the Citizens Commission.

The Commission's charge from the Legislature was to gather public input in a broad and responsible way, to develop a summary of its findings, and to report back. It held public hearings up and down the state, listening to the complaints and occasional compliments and defenses of the schools by citizens and professionals alike. In all, 287 persons with highly divergent backgrounds were listed as witnesses during this long process of information-gathering. In due time--almost two years--and under pressure from the chair of the Joint Interim Committee, the Commission hurried its report to print. Lawlor, fearing that the Legislature would not issue a timely or objective report of the findings and recommendations, had the Commission's final report printed privately. (6. Lawlor, 1960, foreword) The recommendations embodied the findings of its subcommittees, which delved into every major aspect of public education: (1) teacher personnel, teaching and credentialing; (2) curriculum and school organization; (3) textbooks; (4) statewide testing; (5) state and local government; and (6) school finance. (7. Lawlor, 1960, p.41)

A strong but mixed reaction met this long-awaited report. On the one hand, the great bulk of the education profession felt that the recommendations generally were too conservative in educational philosophy and intent--a step back into the past. Consequently, this broad based community generated a great deal of disdain and resentment toward the Commission's work.

On the other hand, elated cries were heard from various lay circles, especially from those who originally had urged the creation of the Commission or were on record as being critical of the schools. The vigilant *Sacramento Bee* claimed credit for its establishment and closely monitored its progress reports: "there is evidence," as the CBE [Council for Basic Education] says in its official bulletin, "that the California

Citizens Commission on the Schools . . . created by the 1958 legislature at the suggestion of the McClatchy newspapers--may fire a shot which will be heard around the educational world." Long before the Commission had completed its work, the *Sacramento Bee* heralded its joy about this work, concluding that:

> "*to the Commission's great credit, it has remained faithful to its legislative mandate to leave no stone unturned in its probe, to seek out truth for truth's sake . . . If the Commission gives its recommendations the same disciplined study, after analyzing the reams of testimony it took on the schools, its findings may be the most important single influence upon California education in the last half century.* (Sacramento Bee, August 23, 1959)

More than a year later, upon the appearance of the Lawlor-sponsored report, the *Sacramento Bee* provided a complimentary summary of the Commission's labors. At the same time, it cast an uneasy eye to the future, seeking to affect legislative follow-up of this important report while simultaneously recognizing the inevitable negative reactions that would follow from special interest groups:

> *This is no casual study. The findings gleaned in 50 public hearings held in every geographical corner of the state are mirrored in the conclusions. So is the testimony of more than 250 witnesses who appeared before the group. . . This considered the legislature should give the report their [sic] most painstaking attention. The urgings for emphasis on hard core curricula, for creating greater opportunity for the gifted, for returning prestige to the high school diploma, for introducing uniform and standard testing statewide - - all deserve sympathetic consideration. . . .*
>
> *The legislature must be prepared for the most vigorous opposition to some of the proposals . . . This will follow as surely as day and night, for this study attacks slavish disciples of ultra progressive education - those concerned with imagined trauma brought on by having to learn the three Rs - - and they will fight hard core education to the hilt.* (Sacramento Bee, November 6, 1960)

The most pertinent of the Commission's recommendations dealt with teaching credentials, and some of them bear a striking resemblance to portions of the soon-to-evolve Fisher Bill in the Legislature.

- Professors of teaching methods in schools of education should have experience in elementary and secondary schools.
- The organization and content of courses in education should be the responsibility of the entire educating institutions.
- All teacher education institutions should keep courses on methods to a minimum and encourage early observation and practice teaching.
- Fifth year teacher education programs based on a paid internship for those who have received a bachelor's degree with little or no work in professional education should be expanded.
- Four credentials should be established: the Standard Elementary, the Standard Secondary, the Standard Junior College, and the Standard Administrative.

Considering the frequent departures by the Commission into other areas of investigation, the recommendation for specific credentials is strikingly similar to that developed by the Committee for Revisions of the Credential System, the statewide professional group described earlier. This was far from a coincidence, for Eli Obradovich, a State Department staff member at the time, remembered the Chair of the Commission's Subcommittee on Credentials telephoning him to ask for recommendations regarding the credential structure. The Commission member told Obradovich that he was under the gun for time and had to present his report soon. Obradovich sent the caller a draft of the Committee's proposal, a project that's been worked on extensively for over five years. (8. Obradovich interview, 1965)

The essence of the Commission's recommendations departed from traditional credential patterns in three ways: (a) a significant decrease in the number of educational methods courses; (b) a year of postgraduate study for all credential candidates; and (c) a required subject-matter major other than education. It was these three salient proposals which most separated the contending forces of credential reform as the time neared for the Legislature to act.

One illustrative division occurred within professional organizations for teachers. The CFT was small in terms of statewide membership and its small size had enabled it to become close-knit and able to speak forcefully and quickly on matters of concern to it. Its much larger rival, the California Teachers Association (CTA) often had to take a more guarded and even equivocal position on critical issues because of diverse and sometimes opposing interests within its numerous affiliated local organizations. Essentially, the CFT was conservative in its outlook toward academic standards; its perspective resembled more that of the CBE and/or of the academic university professors than that of other organizations within the profession. It was generally pleased with the recommendations of the Citizen's Advisory Commission. Where the CTA and most of the teachers, administrators and other professionals regarded the Commission with dislike and even hostility, the CFT could be considered an ally. Indeed, the *Sacramento Bee* in its January 4, 1961, editorial identified the CFT as a cohort of the Commission.

The Legislature Investigates

The years 1959-1960, then, were banner years for full-scale investigations of public schools. In addition to the Citizens Advisory Commission and lengthy efforts of the Committee for Credential Revision, still another segment of the Legislature entered the picture. In April 1960, the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Education, another interim committee, opened its hearings. This Committee was composed of at least three legislators who were to feature prominently in credential revision: Senator Hugo Fisher was a member; Senator Albert Rodda was its vice chair, later to become active in refining the fisher Act and in the Ryan Act; Committee Chair was Donald Grunsky, who later carried CTA's unsuccessful bill to thoroughly overhaul of the credential structure.

As usual, the Committee held a series of open hearings regarding credentials and engendered, as at the Citizens Advisory Commission hearings, a parade of individuals representing a kaleidoscope of particularized interests and testifying to specialized points of view was long. More than twenty organizations formed an incredible array of wisdom during the two days of hearings on April 26-27, 1960. Principal among these multitudinous voices, of course, were those of the CTA, the

State Department, the Citizens Advisory Commission, and university and college academic professors. The CTA presented its proposal for revising the credential structure, which included the following recommendations:

- Reduce drastically the number of credentials to three. Require five years of college preparation.
- Remove the numerous details of licensure from the overburdened Education Code and from the hands of the Legislature.
- Assign implementation of the rules for licensure to the State Board of Education.
- Establish a Teacher Licensure Commission, which would formulate the details necessary to establish a comprehensive and logical system of credentials.

CTA conceded that final authority for credentialing resides in the Legislature but sought to place the development of credential requirements within the profession itself--its long-term dream. This was a radical proposal from all but CTA's point of view; its reasoning was presented by Bob McKay, the CTA's veteran legislative advocate: "we are convinced that the teaching profession in its field, like other responsible professions, is uniquely qualified to determine qualifications for service in the classroom." (9. Senate Fact-Finding transcript, 1960, p.44)

Larson, the State Department's credential specialist, had led this parade of witnesses--and his testimony highlighted many of the issues which were to emerge prominently during the intense legislative contest soon to follow. Committee members questioned Larson closely regarding the Department's recommendation that teaching credentials require five years of college/university preparation.

Sen. Dilworth: *"From the experience of teacher supply in recent years [there had been a shortage] is it practicable to suddenly demand five years of training in institutions of higher education?"*

Larson: *"This is one of the questions which the State Board has very real concern for, and I think that we need to think of one thing particularly. If you have standards which are rigid, if you have standards which are really standards and which require some reaching to reach, then the status of an elementary teacher becomes greater. We would feel that when you raise standards you tend to make it more attractive to get*

into this level of teaching and you get better teachers. . . and you also get more teachers." (10. Senate Fact Finding Transcript, 1960, pp.8-9)

Larson's answer clearly indicated that the Department and the State Board desired to raise standards for certification significantly beyond the norm across the nation. Larson's extended appearance before the Fact-Finding Committee also set the stage, unrealized by any at the time, for a new concept that would have profound significance and impact for policymakers the next five years. Early in Larson's testimony appeared the term "academic major," the core of heated controversy for the entire credential reform battle embodied by the Fisher Act -indeed, its defining issue. It was at this time that the State Board's new thrust became discernible. Under terse questioning by Rodda--who, as early as this hearing in April 1960, showed concern about proposed restrictive requirements for elementary teachers--Larson revealed the nebulous quality and difficulty of definition that was both to drive and to beset all those attempting to clarify the term "academic major."

Larson: *"I can only give you my opinion as to what an academic major on the elementary school level is. This has not been decided by the State Board at this time. We have a structure at this time which is merely a framework, and the second phase of this would be to give specific requirements, specific credential requirements, and at that time an academic major would have to be defined. It isn't defined at this time, but it is the intent of the State Board that there shall be a major and it shall be in a subject matter field."*

Rodda: *"I personally would like to know what a major consists of . . ."*

Larson: *"I'll be happy to talk a bit about some of the thinking in general about what an elementary teacher's subject matter major should consist of. Now we recognize that the job of an elementary teacher is rather broad. [An elementary teacher] teaches in a classroom, and teaches many different subjects. We recognize that we should have a very well prepared teacher for our elementary schools -- as well as possible. Now when you ask an elementary teacher to begin specializing in the field . . . you limit that teacher's knowledge rather broadly in other fields. I would describe very briefly an academic major . . . as many people in California think of it as a rather broad major, let us say in the field of social sciences itself, including history and including some sociology and*

government. This type of thing, a rather broad major. . .This would be differentiated from a high school major which would ask and require more depth because the teacher . . . has less breadth to cope with when teaching a subject or several subjects . . . Try to fit that academic major to the job the teacher must do . . .”

Rodda: *“The point I'm trying to make is that your credential is requiring that everyone have a major.”*

Larson: *“That's right, sir. . . I should say that the State Board wants every teacher who teaches in California schools, and [who is] going to be licensed, to have a good liberal arts education. . . consist[ing] of a certain amount of depth in a certain area.”* (11. Senate Fact-Finding transcript, 1960, pp.13-14)

Larson also presented a summary of the Board’s proposed reform of the credential structure: five years of college; postponement of requirements for the fifth year; a subject matter/academic major and elimination of the “education” major; reduction of credentials to four. (12. Senate Fact-Finding transcript, 1960, pp.21. 29) Larson’s testimony clearly showed the State Board’s active interest in credential reform and initiative in seeking to attain these goals--an uncharacteristic behavior by a state education agency at that time. Larson might be considered to have been the star witness at the hearing. He was required to spend more time before the Committee than any other witness and nearly every Committee member asked him specific questions.

Fisher, who arrived at the hearing after its commencement and during Larson’s testimony, immediately leaped into the fray, questioning Larson closely on numerous major and minor facets of the Department’s proposal. In so doing Fisher revealed his own acute knowledge of details and implications involved in the complex matter at hand. As early as these hearings Fisher made clear his intense concern about the following:

- The amount of professional education courses required of teacher candidates.
- The number of school administrators with an exclusively physical education background.
- The absence of subject matter emphasis in the training of teachers.
- The exclusive responsibility of college/university education departments to train teachers [rather than being joint function of

liberal arts departments and education departments].

During the latter half of the two-day hearings Fisher up-staged everyone else on the Committee by pursuing such intense and knowledgeable questioning of witnesses that a picture began to emerge as to the most favorable--to him--credential proposals. This was particularly evident in his interaction with two witnesses--Edith Merritt of the California Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; and William Lawlor, Chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Education--who were virtually at opposite ends of the philosophical spectrum.

Fisher in effect badgered Merritt about her views on an appropriate subject matter background for an elementary teacher, opening his questioning with the statement, "I gather that you disagree primarily at the elementary school level with the requirements as to major and depth," and never let her off the hook on the matter. When Lawlor's time came to testify, Fisher asked sharply, "Is it your feeling that the educational faculties alone are not adequately prepared to evaluate an applicant's educational background for teaching?" Lawlor replied, "Yes, our position is that such agencies are not adequately prepared for this, plus the fact that a careful analysis by the subject matter departments and liberal arts departments would give a better evaluation of the candidate's actual background and ability in his field." Fisher asked additional questions--in what could be seen as leading the witness, showed Lawlor's priorities and Fisher's to be on a parallel path. Fisher's final question revealed his own position: "Would you say that the standard teaching credential which has been proposed [by Lawlor's Commission], that insofar that it [would] require an appropriate academic subject major and an appropriate subject matter minor or preparation in a specialized area that this is an improvement over the present system?" Lawlor replied, "Yes." (13. Senate Fact-Finding transcript, 1960, pp.156-158; 180; 182)

As the Senate Fact Finding Committee hearings ended, the formerly unstructured, nebulous mass of detailed information had divided into the two rather sharply defined camps--the professional education "establishment" *versus* the newly-emerged, conservative lay reformers--

with a sizable number of less committed contestants situated precariously somewhere between the two major adversaries.

As part of its report to the general session of the 1961 Legislature, the Fact Finding Committee issued a 194-page pamphlet covering twelve phases of California public (K-12) education. Chapter III of that report, dealing with teacher licensure, contained clear-cut recommendations for change in credentials. Written in readable, lucid informal style, this portion of the total report chalks out the issues at hand:

1. There is general dissatisfaction with the present system of teacher licensure. This dissatisfaction has been voiced by associations and individuals representing all segments of the teaching profession and school administration as well as the State Department of Education.
2. The State's system of teacher licensure should be restructured to gain greater simplicity, clarity, and to assure optimum preparation on the part of those who would enter the teaching profession.
3. The application of the principles of teacher licensure to a specific teacher licensure structure is a complex matter, involving many widely different points of view. . . In view of this, it will be necessary for this committee to develop a composite teacher licensure structure which will not only be workable, but also acceptable to a majority of the factions concerned.

The existing system of teacher licensure has become awkward to administer and confusing to those who are affected by it. The present structure consists of some 57 separate teaching and administrative credentials, many of which could be combined or eliminated. Generally, the present teacher licensure system is not in keeping with current needs of public education and it is not based upon sound qualification requirements that make optimum contributions to the improvement of teaching standards in our public schools.

Recommendations from the 1961 Legislative Fact-Finding Committee

1. The Legislature should enact a new teacher licensure stature containing the minimum structure that would assure adherence to the basic principles involved. The specific details regarding

qualification standards, as well as the credential holder's authorized level and areas of service, should be left to the State Board of Education. By doing this, the Legislature would be making a proper delegation of authority to the appropriate state agency.

2. The statute, upon which a new system of teacher licensure is based, should identify each type of license and its duration . . .
3. Implementation of the statutory licensure structure should be the responsibility of the State Board of Education . . .
4. The cost of the statutorily-created advisory committee on teacher licensure should be borne by the teaching professions through increased license fees (Senate Fact-Finding report, 1960, 38-39)

Following these recommendations, the report contained a careful analysis of the major points of view which had been conveyed to the Committee, along with an exposition of the major credential structure proposals of the State Department, the CTA, and the CFT.

Finally, and significantly, the report contains the full text of SB 623, the credential reform bill carried by Committee Chair Donald Grunsky, ostensibly emerging as a result of the deliberations of the Committee. SB 623 was co-authored by Senators Byrne, Donnelly, Fisher, Stiern, Farr, Rodda, Dolwig, and Murdy. A companion bill, SB 624, authorized the establishment of a teacher licensure commission composed of members of the profession--a move long sought by the CTA. SB 623 became informally regarded as a "CTA bill" and, significantly, "disappeared" during the same 1961 legislative session in which the Fisher bill emerged. SB 624, however, survived the legislative campaign, only to be vetoed by Governor Brown at the same time he signed the Fisher Act. According to the close-at-hand insights of Frank Mesple, Brown's former legislative secretary, "the boys said, '[expletive],' why should we give Grunsky [a Republican] the chance for a major bill, especially the way Grunsky beats us around the ears? Our own boys can and should do the job!" (15. Mesple interview, 1966)

The Fight Begins In Earnest

In 1961, as a major issue of the time, credential reform had "arrived." Yet as sweeping as the issue was in the nation as a whole and

especially in California, here the reformers broke into two factions: in one camp were those organizations and individuals strongly seeking to upgrade the quality of teachers and administrators by means of setting and enforcing increased subject matter preparation requirements; in the other camp was most visibly represented by the CTA, but included all professional educators. In essence, at least within the California legislative arena, the credential reform drive became a "beat CTA and the establishment" issue. At the most intense point of contention, antagonists representing the two camps met head-on. McKay, the respected and effective CTA lobbyist, met head-on with Fisher, the Senator from San Diego County.

In early 1961, McKay wrote a mocking column for the CTA newsletter about the Senator's credential reform efforts:

> *A SINCERE desire to be helpful has gotten San Diego's able young Senator, Hugh [sic] Fisher, into a bit of academic hot water he hadn't anticipated and from which he's now ruefully trying to extricate himself.*
>
> *As A RESULT, the mailman is daily lugging bulging bags of letters to members of both houses which take violent exception to "The Fisher Bill" dealing with teachers' credentials . . .*
>
> *THE QUESTION being asked around the Capitol, however, is whether anything he does to the bill now will remove the stigma perhaps unfortunately attached to the original version and whether, even if drastically overhauled, it won't still be the "The Fisher Bill" to thousands of concerned members of the profession all over the State.* (16. McKay 1961, pp.1: 4).

McKay's satire was not lost on Fisher; it quickly became common knowledge in the Capitol that he was incensed by this patronization from the CTA's "old pro." Four days later, the *San Francisco Chronicle* reported that:

> *Senator Hugh [sic] Fisher (Dem., San Diego) has blocked issuance of credentials to Robert E. McKay, veteran lobbyist for the California Teachers Association. . . .*
>
> *The Senator said a McKay aide told him the teachers' lobby here is the "most efficient and most powerful." It supposedly*

> *can pass bills or defeat bills and get approval or a veto from the Governor.* (17. San Francisco Chronicle 1961, p.12)

Credential revision became not only a contested political issue but also a personal contest between two forceful men--one long a lobbyist and accustomed to the halls of the Capitol, the other fresh to the Legislature but ambitious and able. Nonetheless, the personal drama ended somewhat abruptly when McKay's health broke:

> *Complete and absolute rest was prescribed for Bob McKay when his physician ordered him into Sutter Hospital in Sacramento last week. . . It has often been said that the pace in Sacramento during regular sessions of the legislature can be rough. The Washington DC tempo can be equally as intense. The CTA Governmental Affairs Executive has been playing both fields in recent months.* (18. CTA Legislative Letter 1961, p.1)

Fisher's strong interest in and knowledge about the credential issue were not feigned. Indeed, it had become a deep and compelling mission for him. Several versions describe its origins. One, from William Barton, McKay's CTA successor, bitterly recalled that his organization "had been pounding for about seven years for reductions in credentials and had made some proposals. Then Fisher came along and grabbed the credit. He hates [educational] methods courses. If he'd had his way, teachers wouldn't have any." (19. Barton interview, 1965) In another, from Alvar Yelvington, a legislative staff researcher who became deeply involved in writing the initial form of the Fisher bill saw a close link between Governor Brown and Fisher: "Reform in teacher education was one of the Governor's major goals in 1959. Whatever educational reform bill came out of it would have number SB 57. The Governor took an active interest in the 'bright young man,' Hugo Fisher, and tapped him to carry this and other bills for him." (20. Yelvington interview, 1966) A more biting and subjective view came from Roy Simpson, the retired State Superintendent of Public Instruction who had been close to the action at the time: "It was an issue for Mr. Fisher to gain notoriety. . . It was a vehicle to get known. And the timing was right. The public was ignorant and they believed all that was fed them." (21. Simpson interview, 1965)

Fisher himself was not reluctant, if not totally forthcoming, to tell of the source of his interest:

> *While in law school, my wife, who was going to college at the time, complained about the education courses she had to take to get a teaching credential. I paid little attention at the time. But later when I was elected to the Senate, I figured that teacher training would be one of the major problem areas. I delved into it thoroughly and got to know a great deal about the subject.* (22. Fisher interview, 1966)

In addition, Fisher made no bones about his antipathy for those "jock strap" physical education majors who had become school administrators, and this disdain was to remain throughout the battle to have his bill passed.

While Fisher was the prime mover, there is ample evidence that Governor Brown had much more than a passing interest in the success of the freshman Senator's efforts. On January 3, 1961, the *San Francisco Chronicle* reported that one of the Governor's major education recommendations to the Legislature was "simplify teaching credentials, emphasize "solid subjects" and add special programs for gifted children." (23. San Francisco Chronicle, 1961) Philosophically, as well as politically, the Governor was likely influenced by at one least pivotal figure, Girvetz, the Governor's advisor on education and a Professor of Philosophy at the University of California, Santa Barbara. As early as November 12, 1959, Girvetz called the Governor's attention to the nation's great debate with Senator Albert Rodda and its school system: "It has at last become interested in the *content* of public education and the quality of education, and not just in school taxes, school buildings, and extra-curricular activities." (24. Hendrick, 1964, pp.125-126) His report to the Governor included charges against teacher education and certification that by late 1959 had become familiar to many. Licensing requirements for teachers tended to place too much emphasis on "so-called professional courses, and correspondingly less on subject matter; that large numbers of potential candidates, who excel in mastery of subject matter as well as in teaching ability are discouraged from entering the profession by the certification requirements." (25. Formhals interviews, 1965; 1966) Another influential figure was Alan J. Moscov,

one of the Governor's most trusted staff ties to CITE, who throughout the legislative struggle stayed close to the issue. Moscov answered letters dealing with the subject, helped the sponsors with press releases, sought out people to testify for the "Governor's bill." In these and other ways the Governor and his staff lent their active support, much of it secluded from public view. Although several credential revision bills were introduced during the 1961 session, the only one to receive real consideration was that introduced by Fisher, supported by the State Board and endorsed by the Governor.

Legislative Battles Over SB 57

After the Fisher bill's introduction on January 9, 1961, the storm did not take long to form. Groups of various persuasions -- but falling into the two major camps previously described -sought to influence its content. These special interests made their desires known by letter, telephone call, and personal contact.

On March 8, 1961, the Senate Committee on Education held its initial hearing on the bill. Included among the supporters were: Louis Heilbron, President of the State Board; Thomas Braden, Vice President, State Board; Stanley Sheinbaum, CITE Executive Director; William Lawlor, Chair of the Citizens Advisory Commission; William Irvine, Stanford University English Professor; and Jack Crowther, Deputy Superintendent, Los Angeles city schools. During his opening testimony Heilbron affirmed that the bill was a child of the State Board and had resulted from the State Department's hearings, although it is now clear that there were other key "parents" of the bill's textual content.

The amendment process began even before the bill had its first hearing, when numerous minor revisions were made in the original form of the bill--the number varies with the teller. It continued during March, but most of these changes were relatively minor, tending to somewhat soften the effect of the original bill and to enlarge the spread of the "academic" tent, incorporating professional specialties that it at first threatened to exclude from being valid for credential purposes. However, in late March, Harold Spears, Superintendent of San Francisco schools, proposed a more drastic revision, to delete the fifth year for elementary teachers. Robert Formhals, a long-time CSBA lobbyist, recalled the behind-the-scenes dynamics on this point:

> *I talked with Hugo Fisher, and an agreement was reached that we would give our support if the fifth year would not be required. Fisher said "O.K. but that if he could get enough support without having to give this concession he would double-cross us and go for the fifth year." He was quite open about it.* (25. Formhals interview, 1965; 1965)

Despite these activities, the bill had only minor difficulty getting out of the Senate with approval.

Nevertheless, it began to run into rough weather in the Assembly. On April 5, 1961, a CTA sponsored bill, authored by Assembly Member Carlos Bee, was heard before the Assembly Education Committee. For the next two weeks, CTA's strength on the credential question was at its greatest legislative height but, even at that, the Bee bill, AB 1772, never really had a good chance for passage. Instead, the CTA strength was reflected in its ability to harass the legislative path of SB 57, which was destined for a fairly rough struggle at the hands of the Assembly Education Committee. It faced its biggest political struggle on April 19, 1961. Arthur Corey, CTA's Executive Director, asserted that SB 57 did not raise standards, but instead was an "attack on the professional training of teachers."

For two weeks between two Assembly Education Committee hearings (April 19 and May 2, 1961)--a remarkably short time for a political issue of this magnitude--the fate of the Fisher Bill was far from clear. The doubt was apparently so serious as to cause Governor Edmund G. Brown to step forward to speak on the issue at his press conference on April 28, 1961. Since his original statements four months previously, Brown had kept himself well in the background on this hot issue but now felt compelled to speak out in an effort to save a key part of his administration's 1961 program priorities.

Brown: *"I want to emphasize this morning Senate Bill 57. I want to declare my unequivocal support, and I intend to do everything that's proper to urge the members of the Assembly Education Committee to approve it in its present form . . . I regard Senate Bill 57 as one of the most important bills of the entire Session. . . ."*

Question: *"Governor, before you get away from that subject, isn't the bill completely changed, though, largely changed from what you first endorsed?"*

Brown: *"I think there have been some very substantial amendments to it, but the purpose of the bill-to see that teachers major in solids in contrast to working on how to teach courses--is basic in the bill and it's still there. . ."*

Question: *"Has the CTA expressed their opposition to you to that bill?"*

Brown: *"Yes, they have. They made a personal call upon this office and told me that by action of their legislative committee they were opposed to it. . . they didn't want the bill signed . . ."*

Question: *"Did you know of, or have you heard of, any legislators who were threatened with political reprisal by the CTA if they didn't go along with their credentials hill?"*

Brown: *"Well, some of the legislators have advised me that they were heavily lobbied, let me put it that way."*

Question: *"Do you see any compromise between Fisher's bill and the CTA's bill?"*

Brown: *"No, I do not."* (26. McCarthy transcript of press conference, 1961)

Actually, the Governor used more than mere verbal muscle to put his point across. Hugh MacColl, a veteran CFT lobbyist, who was very close to some of the key participants in the crisis at the time, recalled that:

> *". . . behind the scenes is where people don't have to take a stand in public and where the real work is done . . . When the Fisher Bill was being considered it was bottled up in the Assembly Education Committee. The Governor twisted arms, cajoled and threatened certain legislators, saying that they'd better forget their own bills unless the Fisher thing came out. . . He told [a key liaison man working for the Governor], "Get it out, I don't care how."* (27. MacColl interview, 1966)

Barton, the veteran CTA lobbyist, told a very similar story: "the arm-twisting began; the reapportionment bill was being drafted at this time and these two Republicans [the bill lacked but two Republican votes to

clear the Committee] got the word that they would be apportioned right out of their districts as incumbents unless they voted the Fisher Bill out. Then new hearings were held [even though the bill was technically dead] and it was voted out." (28. Barton interview, 1966) The Governor had used every political stratagem at his command to move legislators and was effective in this regard.

Meanwhile, Fisher and his aides were working the political process hard; Fisher indicated that he had the most active support from CITE, which had recruited university faculty members to push for the bill, which they did very actively. The CSBA was also helpful; its only quarrel was with the five-year requirement. Fisher agreed with CSBA in this case and amended it out in the Senate --but it is not clear at what point Fisher did this, if indeed he did, for the five-year requirement was a part of the final version of the law. Fisher and his staff also obtained the militant support of various "far-right" groups who figuratively pounded their legislators, urging a vote for the bill. (29. Fisher interview, 1966)

The State Board itself acted behind the scenes to move the bill out of the deadlock caused by CTA, its affiliated organizations, and other special interest groups. The *Sacramento Bee* added its weight to the drive on the very day of the crucial "last chance" Assembly Education Subcommittee meeting. The *Bee* exhorted that "a vote for SB 57 is clearly a vote for better teachers and school administrators and, thereby, a vote for a better educational system." (Sacramento Bee, May 2, 1961) Opposing and intensely committed sides applied immense pressure upon legislators. By May 2, 1961, they approved SB 57, a bill that earlier had technically been put on ice--in effect, killed. The result was quietly reported: "An Assembly Education subcommittee recommended approval of the controversial Fisher Bill dealing with teaching credentials and teacher training. The measure, opposed by the powerful California Teachers Association, moved closer to enactment." (San Francisco Chronicle, May 3, 1961) Almost anti-climatically, on May 24, 1961, the bill received final Assembly Education Committee approval and on June 12, 1961, passed the full Assembly by a vote of 66 to 9.

A casual observer would hardly have been aware that this major bill narrowly missed being detoured into obscurity and had caused some of the intense political heat to individual legislators that many had ever experienced. So intense was the fight that a knowledgeable former

committee staff member, Michael Manley, remarked about Fisher, "Nobody but George Miller [a tough State Senator], Jesse Unruh or Hugo Fisher could have got that bill through; nobody else could have taken the pressure." (30. Manley interview, 1966)

Already passed in the Senate, it was only necessary for the bill to go to a joint conference committee of the two houses to iron out any discrepancies, which was done speedily. The Governor happily signed the bill into law in June, 1961 and as he did so, pointed with pride at this newly-minted legislation, claiming it as a major political achievement for his administration. This new law "sets standards to prevent professional education from encroaching upon the subject matter training of teachers." (31. Brown, 1963) After an epic and pioneer struggle in a major area of educational policy, the hard-fought battle had resulted in radically new structure for teacher preparation and credentialing.

Summary

The Licensing and Certificated Personnel Law of 1961, the Fisher Act, brought to life five major changes in credentialing for educators.

1. It reduced the number credentials to 5 from 57: Standard Elementary (K-6); Standard Secondary (7-12); Standard Administrative; Standard Junior College (13-14); and Standard Designated Subjects. This credential structure also created, for the first time, a separate license for community college teaching.
2. It required all candidates, both elementary and secondary, to complete a year of post-baccalaureate study, a "fifth year," for full certification. This change made parallel the requirements for elementary and secondary credentials.
3. It required all candidates, both elementary and secondary, to complete as "academic" undergraduate major and minor in their teaching fields for standard certification. It required elementary candidates to complete a "diversified major" consisting of a subject matter major and minor appropriate for elementary teaching. This change significantly increased the responsibility of academic departments in the education of teachers while at the same time significantly reducing the amount of course work in education and pedagogy.
4. It aligned the courses a secondary teacher could be assigned to

teach with to a candidate's major and minor subject matter preparation. This change meant that schools and districts could no longer assign teachers to teach any subject, as had possible with earlier credentials.

5. It required candidates for administrative credentials to have an undergraduate major in an academic field. This change was designed to reduce the predominance of physical education majors among administrators.

Yet these changes were far from clarified on a pragmatic basis. Although state law, the Fisher Act lacked the regulations needed for it to have major impact on long-term practice in the state. The State Board was the instrument for that policy development and enforcement. In this arena, the contending warriors soon began to assemble. The battle lines, drawn in the early 1950s and clearly delineated in the intense action, appeared again in the clashes and pressures exerted upon individual Board members as they sought to carry out the Legislature's will and their own notions of the new law's intent and effects.

REFERENCES

1. Irving G. Hendrick, "Academic Revolution in California," Part I, p. 141. Reprinted from: Southern California Quarterly, Vol. XLIX: Number 2: June 1967.
2. Wendell E. Cannon, "On the State of Disunion," California Journal of Instructional Improvement, Vol. 7, October, 1964, p. 7.
3. Roy E. Simpson, "Reactions to the Report of the Committee on Revisions of the Credential Structure in California," California Schools, No. 29, November, 1958, p. 525.
4. Author's interview with Assemblymember Gordon Winton, July 6, 1966.
5. Author's interview with Dr. Carl Larson, State Department of Education, April 22, 1966.
6. Dr. William V. Lawlor, The Final Report of the Citizens Advisory Commission (Foreword), November 1, 1960.
7. Ibid., summarized from "Recommendations," p. 41.
8. Author's interview with Eli Obradovich, State Department of Education, November 9, 1965.
9. Testimony of Robert E. McKay, California Teachers Association, before the Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Education (hearing transcript, p. 44), April, 1960.
10. Senate Fact Finding Committee on Education, hearing transcript pp. 8-9, April, 1960. Page 29
11. Ibid., pp. 13-14.
12. Ibid., pp. 21, 29.
13. Ibid., pp. 156-158, 180, 182.
14. Senate Fact Finding Committee, Report to the Legislature, 1961 General Session, pp.38-39.
15. Author's interview with Frank Mesple, former Legislative Secretary to Governor Edmund G. Brown, December 20, 1966.
16. Robert E. McKay, "Scene at Sacramento," CTA Legislative Letter, February 20, 1961, pp.1, 4.
17 San Francisco Chronicle, February 24, 1961, p. 12.
18. CTA Legislative Letter, March 20, 1961, p. 1.
19. Author's interview with William Barton, CTA Legislative Advocate, February 19, 1965.

20. Author's interview with Alvar Yelvington, former Consultant, Senate Fact Finding Committee on Education, July 14, 1966.
21. Author's interview with Dr. Roy Simpson, former State Superintendent of Public Instruction, July 15, 1965.
22. Author's interview with former State Senator Hugo Fisher, August 31, 1966.
23. San Francisco Chronicle, January 3, 1961.
24. Irving G. Hendrick, The California Licensing of Certificated Personnel Law of 1961: A History (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1964), pp. 125-126.
25. Author's interview with Robert Formhals, Executive Secretary, California School Boards Association, March 8, 1965 and July 14, 1966.
26. Notes from the Governor's press conference of April 28, 1961, transcribed by Audrey L. McCarthy, and obtained by the author from Governor Edmund G. Brown's Education Secretary.
27. Author's interview with Hugh MacColl, former Legislative Advocate, California Federation of Teachers, July 5, 1966.
28. Author's interview with William Barton, Legislative Advocate, California Teachers Association, July 13, 1966 and July 15, 1966.
29. Author's interview with former State Senator Hugo Fisher, August 31, 1966.
30. Author's interview with Michael Manley, Consultant, Assembly Education Committee, July 12, 1966.
31. Address by Governor Edmund G. Brown to the First National Meeting and Conference of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, Washington, D.C, April 8, 1963.

Chapter 4
California's Fisher Act Unravels (1961-1965)
Sidney A. Inglis

The Licensing and Certificated Personnel Act of 1961, the Fisher Act, established a new credential system for California; but its major elements were not sufficiently detailed for any meaningful implementation. The spotlight, therefore, shifted from the legislative meeting rooms to the State Board of Education. For it was the State Board's charge to develop and officially adopt detailed and specific rules that would be the basis for understanding and implementing this new credential structure.

The Board had been formally deliberating the matter of credential revision since early 1960, even before the law was signed by Governor "Pat" Brown, and, apparently, informally long before that. Margaret Bates, a key Board participant at the time, described the situation:

> *Some of [us] had been trying to do something to force change. We had some ideas for change in the recommendations of the California Council [for the Education of Teachers, CCET] presented in February, 1960. I had become interested personally when I first came to California in 1950, and noticed the difference between California's credential structure and those of my home state. With an academic major and an MA, I could have taught in my state, but not in California. Good people were turned away while poor people with credentials were teaching.* (1. Bates interview, 1967)

During the legislative struggle over the Fisher Act, the Board was informed of the bill's progress; indeed, Tom Braden, President of the Board, appeared once during a legislative hearing and testified in favor of it. In short, the Board and Hugo Fisher kept in close touch during this period, and there appears no evidence they held major disagreements over its content.

Initial Regulations to Implement the Fisher Act

Paradoxically, despite Fisher's patent distrust of professional educators, the Board, upon passage of the new credential law, first turned to the profession to develop a plan for regulations with which to implement the law. In April, 1961, prior to the passage of the Fisher Act, Father Darrel J. Finnegan, President of the California Council on Teacher Education (CCTE), and State Superintendent Roy Simpson appointed a ten-member Central Coordinating Committee on Credential Revision. Its purpose, as well as that of its Resource Subcommittees, was to design a procedure for developing credential requirements and to propose new requirements. Upon completion, these recommendations would be sent to the State Board for review and adoption. The Board appointed one of its members to serve on the ten-member steering committee. Carl Larson, of the Department's Bureau of Credentials, reported periodically on the Committee's work.

At its January, 1962 meeting, the Board noticed that the Coordinating Committee and its Resource Subcommittees were composed predominantly of persons with "education" degrees. William Norris, an exceedingly alert Board member and a Los Angeles attorney who had kept a close and searching eye on the entire legislative process, moved the appointment of ten additional members to the Resource Subcommittees. In speaking for his motion, Norris argued: "The President [of the Board] should bear in mind that of the seventy members [of the committees] only six of the present members are professors and subject matter specialists in various colleges and universities, and merely three are classroom teachers in the public schools" (2. State Board of Education minutes, January 11, 1961. P.3927). Ten new members were appointed but had little time to influence the direction of the original Subcommittees' efforts. Nonetheless, Norris emerged as one of the strongest of the core group of activists in the Board's drive to reduce "methods" courses and to beef up the academic preparation of educators.

As the Coordinating Committee worked on draft regulations, various other quarters noted the apparent drift away from the strong academic intent of the Fisher Act. On January 6, 1962, gubernatorial aide, Alan Muscov, composed a letter to Braden stating the Governor's objection to the Committee's proposal that the junior college credential require ten-hours of professional education. Muscov expressed his deep concern that

a close adherence to subject matter preparation for teachers be observed in the forthcoming credential regulations. At the Board's March 7, 1962 meeting, Norris reported receiving substantial mail from the Long Beach area, alarmed that defining the distinction between "academic" and "nonacademic" subject areas would have the effect of reducing the quality of teaching in nonacademic subject areas.

On March 29, 1962, Clyde Enroth, past President of the English Council of the California State Colleges, alerted Senator Fisher "to the danger that the intent of the Fisher Act for teaching credentials may be disregarded by the committees drafting the requirements for the new credentials." (3. Hendrick, 1964, p.207) Soon afterward, the American Federation of Teachers, Local 1362, recommended turning aside the education-dominated Central Coordinating Committee and replacing it with a committee more widely representative of the academic departments of the colleges, as the only way to fulfill the intent of the Fisher Act.

Although the Department and the Coordinating Committee were essentially parts of the educational establishment and, as such, had never been considered by some to be at the forefront of the drive to achieve significant, that is academic reform, the Board continued to await their recommendations for the content of the new and complex rules. Finally, on June 14, 1962, Superintendent Simpson presented the Coordinating Committee's report to the Board. It was a massive report, containing a history of events associated with credential revisions since December, 1954; a brief analysis of the Citizens Advisory Commission's recommendations compared with the State Department's; and its own extensive and specific recommendations. But the Board had still not come to grips with the difficult issue of the completely new credential structure or shifted gears into the decision-making processes for formal implementation of the Fisher Act.

Shortly before the Board's September, 1962 meeting, Leo Rennert's extensive analysis of the proposed regulations appeared in the *Sacramento Bee*.

> *The State Board of Education will hold public hearings September 13 and 14, in Los Angeles on the most revolutionary package of educational reforms since Sputnik--*

> *an entirely new set of state requirements for teaching and administration credentials . . .*
> *Because the proposed rules use a limited definition of what is academic, officials expect a swarm of protests at the hearings from excluded curriculum groups . . .*
> *"But their beef is really not with us," remarked Larson. "It's with the Legislature. We're taking a limited view of what is academic because that's what the legislature intended."* (4. Sacramento Bee, September 5, 1962)

Again, at the September, 1962 Board meeting, as the assembled Board listened, Simpson reviewed the long-term efforts that had been made by the professional educators to revise the credential structure. He gave the Board a brief chronology of events, starting in 1954. He reminded the Board that it had approved, in February, 1960, the credential patterns that evolved from the statewide study sponsored by CCET. This pattern, Simpson pointed out, framed the credential structure adopted in Fisher's legislation. His lengthy presentation continued with descriptions of the makeup, structure, and operation of the Central Coordinating Committee and its Resource Subcommittees. He then launched into the heart of the matter at hand--the specific recommendations for each of the proposed credentials, including academic definitions and criteria, which he asked to be "general, so as to pose no threat to college or university initiative."

> *The real issue which faces the Board is to establish a balance between the various requirements in terms of preparation which will produce the most capable teachers.*
> *We felt it essential to develop proposals that (1) represented the best thinking of the teaching profession in California, and (2) implemented the law both in its intent and as it is written.*
> (5. State Board of Education minutes, September 13, 1962)

Upon completion of Simpson's extensive introduction, Braden set the Board criteria for the succeeding portions of the meeting--hearing from members of the public and the profession regarding the proposed regulations:

> *The regulations under discussion have been adopted after a great deal of work and consideration. There isn't much point in addressing remarks on something that has already been accomplished.*
>
> *The law as it is written spells out the duties of the Board, as follows:*
>
> 1. *The Board is charged with considering and finding a subject matter major to be academic.*
> 2. *The Board is charged with the job of defining the terms "major" and "minor."*
> 3. *The Board is asked to establish and approve a diversified major consisting of a subject matter major and a subject matter minor.*
> 4. *The Board is charged with the job of prescribing additional requirements to the law for the standard teaching credential and other credentials.*
> 5. *The law finally says such additional requirements are to be promulgated by July 1, 1963.*
>
> *The Board cannot change the law.* (6. Ibid.)

In all, some twenty-two (22) statements were either heard or filed during that first day of the September meeting. The core question on which the intense disagreement centered was a familiar one to those who had followed the struggle: what should be the proper preparation of teachers with regard to subject matter versus professional methodology?

Two perspectives illustrate the diversity of opinion on this issue. On the one hand, Maurice Englander, President of the California Federation of Teachers (CFT), used caustic language to summarize the entire argument against the "education professionals" and the splintered "professional groups" attending the meeting:

> *It is no secret among teachers that Schools of Education are widely regarded as a joke, a grim joke, I might add, but a joke nonetheless, because of their pretensions, their pious worship of the ephemeral method, particularly one known as the "group dynamic," and the formula phrase that justifies it all—"Meeting the Needs of the Learner."*

> *The fact is that Schools of Education have not attained intellectual respectability and have earned the amused contempt of the academic departments of colleges and universities, as well as the disdain of students who move over from subject matter fields to become teachers.* (7. Ibid.)

On the other side of the thorny philosophical fence, a letter from the California State Dental Hygienists' Association pleaded with the Board that they not be forgotten, giving an example of the provincial quality of many of the pleas made to the Board at this time:

> *"We are in favor of whatever upgrades our profession of dental hygiene, but in this matter we feel that the existing graduation and licensing requirements of the State already qualify us for dental health education positions in the public schools of California, and that by increasing the requirements for a teaching credential we will perhaps be decreasing the number of dental hygienists in this field, thus depriving the public of a member of the important dental health team . . . Therefore, we wish to record our opposition to this law."* (8. Ibid.)

Influences Upon the Board's Own Regulations

On the morning of the second day of that September meeting, Fisher himself appeared before the Board to describe the full intent of his legislation. He made clear why he was there: he wanted the Board to discern quickly and unequivocally the central intent and main force of his bill, and he wanted the Board to resist any attempts to blunt its cutting edge. He stated that he could not over-emphasize the fact that the major premise of the author of the bill, as well as the Legislature, was the increased and improved preparation of teachers in the subjects that are taught in California public schools and the assignment of teachers to teach the subjects they are best prepared to teach. He pointed out that the Legislature had rejected every proposal that had the effect of interfering with the academic world in attempting to determine what the content of preparation in a major field --such as history--should be. He said that the main thrust of his bill was to eliminate education courses from the Baccalaureate Degree that persons would be educated in subject matter

first and consequently be prepared to teach that subject matter. Then, in a highly significant moment, he stated that he thought the advice that the Board needed should come from those who were philosophically in agreement with the spirit of the legislation which had been introduced at the Board's own behest. He suggested that the Board appoint an advisory committee to it, not to the State Department, to review the proposed regulations because the Board was given the right to continue in detail the work that the Legislature had begun in general.

There was no mistaking Fisher's dislike of the regulations proposed by the Coordinating Committee through the State Superintendent; he urged the Board to seek its own counsel and not trust that of its own staff or other representatives of the "establishment." Quite obviously, he felt that the central thrust of his hard-won bill was being cut out of the proposed regulations. Later, Fisher had his own private version of this incident:

> *The first regulations were drawn up by the notorious Manfred Schrupp [Dean of the School of Education at San Diego State College], who had disgraced himself by yelling and screaming at some of the hearings. They had proposed regulations drawn up and kept under cover until the day before the Board meeting, figuring that I wouldn't be around to hear them because of the hot campaign [for election in November, 1962] I was in. Instead, by the back door, I got a copy of them the night before, flew to Sacramento, and opposed them. It's the first time I've ever seen Roy Simpson lose his temper.* (9. Fisher interview, 1966)

Following Fisher's appearance, testimonies occupied the reminder of the day, September 14, 1962. The Board heard 24 others and received 23 communications, representing as wide a diversity of organizations and specific interests as had testified prior to the Senator's appearance.

But the Board heard Fisher's recommendation. Upon reconvening the next morning, it voted to set up its own committee to "revise, and correct, in terms of the thoughts and expressions made by the public and members of the Board, the proposed regulations--to be resubmitted for consideration by the Board." (10. State Board of Education minutes, September 13, 1962) In that fast action the Board had made a highly

significant decision: it had wrested the policy initiative from the professional educators. It had "thrown out"--technically, the action was termed "taking under advisement"-the profession's proposed extensive rules for the new credential structure and set up its own committee to write regulations which would be in line with Fisher's suggestions. The committee, appointed by Braden, consisted of himself, Commons, Daba, Norris, and Bates. Five members of the State Department staff were asked to join the discussions but were not given a vote on decisions.

Why had the Board summarily rejected the hard work and presumably sincere efforts of a high level professional group? Individuals who were not on the Board at the time or privy to its most confidential thinking offered varying opinions. The newly-elected State Superintendent, Max Rafferty, who replaced Simpson in November, 1962, viewed it this way: "It was because they did not in any way trust professional educators. I don't know why they let the State Department work for six months and then throw their work out." (11. Rafferty interview, 1965) Hugh MacColl, a former CFT lobbyist, who's been in the thick of the legislative fight over the Fisher bill, offered another perspective: "The State Department's original proposals were too "all-inclusive" and did not emphasize the "academic" enough . . . Our organization opposed strongly the original regulations of the State Department but came to moderately support the final form." (12. MacColl interview, 1966) A former legislative staff member, Michael Manley, who purportedly aided Fisher in drafting his bill, offered this conjecture: "The regulations proposed to the Board, and written by Carl Larson, were rejected by the Board when Fisher appeared to oppose them. Possibly the Board would have approved them if Fisher had supported them even though it would not have been their predilection . . . The Fisher Act was what the Board wanted." (13. Manley interview, 1966)

In contrast to "outsider" views, all five Board members who made up this historic and significant committee provided enlightening if not totally congruent explanations. Dorman Commons, one of the less active members of the committee of five, described its rejection of the professionals' recommendations: "because there was a failure to emphasize subject matter. There were still too many education courses." (14. Commons interview, 1967) Margaret Bates, one of the prime

movers on the Board committee, held this view: "We didn't think they went far enough. When Carl Larson and the State Department brought in another version, somewhat different from the State Council's, it gave us the chance to postpone, and 'to take under advisement' both proposals. It gave us a chance to come up with what was needed." (15. Bates interview, 1967) A third member, Daba, was not explicit about the rejection of the Coordinating Committee's proposals, but he agreed that the establishment of the Board's committee was done at the "spur of the moment." Braden, the highly articulate Board President, held pointed and straightforward perceptions: Actually, the changes recommended by the professionals, whom Simpson had announced at one Board meeting with a flourish, didn't amount to much. All they did was to add a fifth year and simplify the credentials. They weren't what Hugo had originally in his mind. Hugo started out with a tough bill, and it got changed many times so as to weaken it greatly. So Fisher made it so that the Board could put in the kind of regulations that were needed, where he couldn't get it done in the Legislature. We sat down and followed the original idea of the bill before it was weakened. (16. Braden interview, 1966)

But probably the most revealing and colorful version is that of the last of the five committee members, William Norris:

> *It happened at the two-day right here in Los Angeles. Simpson brought in the profession's ninety-three page proposal. I've thought it out. I think they had it figured that they would bring this massive document to us and we--as lay people--would have no alternative but to accept it as presented. It was so complex and detailed, and we were under the gun for time, so we would have to adopt them. Alan Muscov got hold of me on the first day of the meeting during a break and said "You've got to get to them. I don't know how you're going to do it, but you've got to try . . ." I didn't know either what I was going to do. That night, right here in Los Angeles, I was desperate. I tried getting in contact with some of the members. I got hold of Nat Colley [a Board member from Sacramento] and he was agreeable--and Peggy Bates. I don't remember who else--maybe Tom Braden. The next day we took under advisement Simpson's regulations and set up our own committee. This was the turning point and I believe that this was the greatest*

> *contribution that I made during my term. If I hadn't taken time to delve into Simpson's regulations and compare them with the original Fisher bill, before the amendments, I wouldn't have known what they were trying to do. The way I see it, Simpson got a jump on the Board by setting up his own committee which was stacked with the very same people who had originally opposed the Fisher Bill--they were going to achieve by regulations what they couldn't do by legislation.* (17. Norris interview, 1967)

Whatever the factors were that influenced the crucial decision; Braden was a great deal in the limelight because of his pronouncements and interpretations of the Board's activities. He made colorful headlines when he strongly attacked the quality of public education, stating that he was transferring one of his children to a private school because "his son wasn't working in public schools." He concluded that "the 'easiness' of our public school system is a fact that we in California who are trying to build the best system in the world can no longer afford to ignore." (18. San Francisco Chronicle, September 26, 1962) During the Board committee's labor in developing its own regulations, he made clear his own reaction to the profession's work: "Simpson's proposals again emphasized teaching methods. They amounted to tossing out the [Fisher] bill. The Board was astonished." Later, Braden described the Board's growing independence from the Department: "During the past four years I've seen this board change, with the cooperation of the present superintendent, from the role of a captive spectator of the Department of Education to the role of leadership and policy maker for the department. This is a tough board, tough in its insistence on high standards." (19. Sacramento Bee, March 15, 1962)

Notions of Proper Teacher Preparation

Accordingly, the Board's Credential Committee sat down to write its own regulations to implement the Fisher Act. Assuredly, the Board had appointed several representatives of the State Department to aid it, but it was clear that Board members, particularly Braden and Norris, meant to maintain control over the content of the regulations to be devised. Bates, quite naturally a member of the Board committee and a long-term

vigorous figure in the credential issue, described the educational principles underlying the Board's proposed regulations for teacher preparation:

> *As a member of the State Board of Education, my support of the changes in teacher credential requirements has rested on several premises. These are:*
>
> *1.That teaching and learning are compound arts which can and must be cultivated if we are to have first-rate schools.*
>
> *2.That the primary goals of education are to transmit the cultural heritage, foster intelligent behavior, and provide sufficient competence in the basic skills to give individuals the freedom to continue learning throughout our lives.*
>
> *3.That the cultural heritage can be transmitted only by people who have been exposed to it in depth and breadth, who understand the major academic disciplines well enough to apply them as tools for refining their own experiences into usable knowledge. The major, formerly the standard for elementary school teachers, which consisted of superficial sequences of introductory courses, is not sufficient for this purpose.*
>
> *4.That the capacity for intelligent behavior is not confined to a chosen few, but it is a possibility for every human being. So many people find their life work outside the professional sphere that it is important to accord recognition of the basic knowledge underlying all vocational preparation.*
>
> *5.That, as Lionel Elvin holds, the school is the only public agency for the systematic development of the minds of the young and of their operational intelligence; that is, and must remain, its distinct function.*
>
> 6.*That, therefore, it is incumbent upon the State Board, as its president, Thomas Braden, has said, to emphasize the giving to all men some measure of the spirit, and contact with the great minds and treasurers of civilization.* (20. Bates, 1965, pp.11-12)

Norris, throughout the period an extremely vigorous and articulate member of the Board committee and also a long-term protagonist in the

drive to reform credentials, captured the philosophy which guided him, Braden, and Bates. In a CCET address, he stated: "We need teachers and administrators with well-trained minds; and minds are best trained by in-depth study in a narrow, traditional discipline. A properly trained mind could then set itself to any task and perform it successfully." (21. Cannon, 1964, p.9)

But with all, Braden remained the most vociferous Board member, as far as the public ear was concerned. In a forcible address to an audience composed primarily of teachers and administrators, he continued his interpretation of the Fisher Act: "In general, the new law was designed to assure two things: First, that teachers know more about what they are teaching as well as how to teach it; second, that they are assigned teach subjects in which they are prepared." (22. Sacramento Bee, February 17, 1963)

Against this enthusiasm for higher standards, some members of the profession raised a dire and highly relevant prediction: if the requirements for teaching credentials were further stiffened and if the amount of required college work increased by the Board, a distinct shortage of teachers would eventually occur. Throughout the Fisher legislation, Senator Albert Rodda had argued this very point. He felt that elementary teachers would become especially scarce. In fact, actual statistics from teacher preparation institutions showed a striking decline in teacher candidates during the period, but these data were argued away by Board members and like-minded legislators and others, intent on upholding the central thrust of the Fisher Act.

Braden and Norris unequivocally denied the possibility that this misfortune would occur, despite evidence to the contrary. They held the optimistic prediction that, instead, teacher supply would increase from their efforts. Rather than reducing the number of persons wanting to enter teaching, the new regulations, because they gave "unprecedented" stress to subject matter proficiency, would give California a wider choice of high caliber teacher applicants. Norris reasoned that graduates of Harvard, the California Institute of Technology, and "other distinguished institutions" would be more attracted to teaching because the number of professional education courses would be reduced. For the same reason, he predicted, better educated women with degrees in academic subjects would turn to teaching after their children were grown. In March, 1963,

both Braden and Norris issued statements showing their belief regarding the matter. Norris said: "Our committee concerned itself at great length with the supply problem, including candidates from out of state. We're satisfied there will be no great problem." Braden supported this view wholeheartedly. He predicted, further, that out-of-state colleges would pay considerable attention to California's new standards because, for a long time, it had been a national leader in how to teach. "Now it is about time to assume leadership in the subject matter competence of teachers." He amplified this theme in these words: "This marks the beginning of the end for high emphasis on how to teach, and the beginning of emphasis on subject matter . . . I think we have some regulations of which we can be extremely proud. We hope to approve them unless someone can point out some great oversight." (23. Sacramento Bee, March 15, 1963).

Within six months, the Board Committee's work was complete. At the April, 1963 Board meeting, the business quickly moved to its all-important proposed regulations. As Chair of the Board's committee, Braden presented its work. His preface cut sharply to the heart of the matter, leaving little doubt of the thinking of the committee:

> *The point of view of the committee, we believe, is clearly expressed in the report. We have endeavored to implement the 1961 Certification Law in the spirit in which it was enacted. The regulations proposed place emphasis upon subject matter in the dimensions of both breadth and depth. We believe that this emphasis, coupled with the statutory regulations permitting assignments only in subject matter areas in which teachers have been specifically prepared, is at the heart of moving California's public schools toward increased excellence.* (24. Proposed State Board of Education Regulations, 1963)

The committee had undoubtedly worked hard; it had held eleven meetings during the period of October, 1962 through April, 1963; and had developed a 57-page statement of highly specific regulations. Part of the intent and deliberate control displayed by the committee is evident in the explicit nature of the definitions of certain key terms which under girded the content of the regulations: for example, "Social Sciences means anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science,

psychology, sociology, and such additional areas of study as the Board may hereafter include, other than education . . ." and "subject matter area means a subject or subjects normally taught in the public schools, other than education." The effect, or at least the intent, was a body blow aimed directly at the "educationists"--presumably school administrators, college education departments, and the CCET.

Then Braden, in a dramatic and strategic move, read aloud a telegram that he had just received from Fisher--by then the Administrator of California's Resources Agency, having been defeated for reelection in November, 1962--which commended the work of the Board's committee and strongly urged the adoption *en toto* of the proposed new rules: "I have carefully reviewed the proposed regulations and find them entirely consonant with both the letter and spirit of the law." Further, Fisher acknowledged that the Board's work had been accomplished under pressure to "water down the law on the one hand and to make the law more restrictive on the other." (25. State Board of Education minutes, April, 1963)

Despite this impressive opening gambit by Braden, the "pressures" to which Fisher had presumably referred rolled up their artillery to bombard the Board with words. The first shot of this barrage was that of CCET, the overseer to the profession's more or less united efforts to revise credentials. Dr. Glenn Kendall, speaking for the CCET, after a few obligatory words of commendation for the Board's work, moved quickly to the faults of the proposals. His were the same arguments as were heard against the Fisher Bill when it was being considered by the Legislature. Principally, they boiled down to grave concerns with four issues: (1) the requirement of 45 units of general education, considering the number to be so high as to be restrictive on the student and the college; (2) the need for a "diversified major" for elementary teaching renders the Fisher Act's academic major impractical; (3) the specificity of the regulations seriously limit the creativity and flexibility of the colleges to provide realistic programs; and (4) the lack of content regarding professional preparation.

Immediately following the CCET and certainly contradictory to the most salient parts of Kendall's testimony and too much of the debate during the Fisher legislation, Dr. Arthur Corey, the CTA leader, surprised many when he stated:

> *The California Teachers Association and the State Board of Education have this common objective: in all California schools we would have teachers with broad, general education--a truly liberal education--including depth in one or more areas of subject matter, and specific preparation for teaching . . . In studying these proposed regulations . . . we find this objective clearly recognizable. The procedures set forth to attain these standards, with some exceptions to be noted later, are in large part acceptable to the profession.* (26. Ibid.)

It is, of course, that last sentence which is startling, for Corey's words; for the partisan political drive by Brown and Fisher in 1961, had been to "beat the CTA" while achieving significant teacher preparation reform, those results seemed, at least at this moment, to be supported by the CTA.

Two other prominent groups--representing widely divergent points of view--appeared before the Board to present their positions. The Committee for Improving Teacher Education (CITE) issued a brief statement from its base at the University of California, Santa Barbara, reflecting its philosophy, and suggesting several small but detailed changes.

But it was the teachers of speech throughout the State who had felt most wounded by having been overlooked as an "academic" subject--or so it would seem by the size of the delegation and the vigor and quantity of their presentation. Shrewdly realizing that it would be more advantageous to link their position with the clear intent of the Board rather than attempting to oppose the thrust of the Board's thinking, the representatives of this group, one after another, developed the argument that speech is an academic subject and, furthermore, is an extremely necessary part of an educated person's background. Citing instances from the history of American schools in which rhetoric, debate, oral interpretation of literature, and other facets of speech instruction were an integral part of an educated seventeenth and eighteenth century person's overall background, these speakers argued eloquently that speech should be recognized as a distinct academic subject and, therefore, should qualify fully for inclusion within the teaching credential structure. Five

other witnesses made statements citing the traditional place of rhetoric and like subjects as being genuinely academic. However, probably the most telling statement in favor of the speech was made when Board member Bishop Kennedy declared that "I cannot see how one can say that speech and speech areas are non-academic until they are proved to be. The burden of proof is on the other foot . . . The presentations made in behalf of speech are completely convincing." Kennedy was not known for making statements in the area of teaching competency and teaching credentials, but when he ended his comments by noting, "Of course, I am easily convinced, because I majored in speech." (27. Ibid), it quickly became evident that speech would qualify as an academic subject for a teaching credential.

Following these long and carefully-prepared arguments, a host of special interests moved to the podium, requesting specific changes relating exclusively to the welfare of members of the specific organization being heard or, in several isolated instances, supporting the Board's work *en toto.* They presented a bewildering clamor of quite narrow points of view. All groups had followed with intense interest the Board's crafting of the new regulations and seized the opportunity to dissect, with microscopic vision and missionary zeal, that portion of the proposals which in any way affected their own status. Each spokesperson commended the Board for the job that had been done and then quickly launched into objections to specific items--making suggestions for minor and technical alterations which would favor them. All sought to avoid the status of "second class" teachers by arguing vigorously to be included with the regular credential structure, or to revise the proposals so that they would be included under the broad canopy of first-class citizenship. Each sought to clarify their role--an indispensable one--in the education of the children of California.

When the Board reconvened in May, 1963, Braden reported the Board's Credential Committee had held two public hearings and three meetings since the previous month's meeting, resulting in 24 changes in the proposed regulations, mostly of a technical nature. Notably, the only substantive change was to prescribe "speech" as an academic subject major. After brief consideration of a minority report submitted by Bates, the profound matter was settled anti-climatically when the regulations

were adopted, by unanimous vote, to become effective in six months, on January 1, 1964.

Happily for the crusaders seeking major reform of the rules and structure of teacher preparation and credentialing, the Board kept faith with the intent of the Fisher Act. The new rules provided for a reduction in required course work in education for teachers at all levels, requirements of academic majors for all regular classroom teachers, and graduate work in academic subjects for administrators--all reflected an adherence to the spirit of the legislation.

The *Los Angeles Times* immediately indicated its happiness with these regulations by reporting it in a page one lengthy article: "Credential reform, adopted under 1961 legislation, was described by Thomas Braden, board president and chairman of the subcommittee which framed the new formula, as the greatest single advance California has ever made toward quality education." (28. Los Angeles Times, May 25, 1963) The *Sacramento Bee* also made no bones about its joy, trumpeting in unusually large headlines, "Teacher Credential Setup Is Changed," followed by, in part, with this analysis:

> *California's biggest educational reform program since Sputnik -- a sweeping change in teacher training requirements--was approved today by the state board of education . . . Shrugging off strenuous objections from many professional quarters, the board adopted a 57 page set of new credential rules designed to give future teachers more subject matter proficiency and fewer methods courses.* (29. Sacramento Bee, May 24, 1963)

Then an uneasy calm settled over the scene, with merely an occasional crack of verbal thunder reverberating in the distance as if from a receding storm. These occasional loud noises came from those segments of the profession who envisioned an alarming shortage of teachers that would result—Braden's optimistic prediction to the contrary--from the more rigorous rules. And, significantly, it became this very strategy that shortly began to dominate the attack upon Fisher's and the Board's provisions.

The Unraveling Period

The ink on the new credential structure was hardly dry when the Board's attention was directed to some deceptively minor decisions regarding slight modifications of the regulations in certain categories. One of these adjustments related to provisions for districts who wished to hire individuals who could not fully meet the new requirements by July 1, 1964. Anticipating the need for a transitional plan, Larson prepared a memorandum, dated October 3, 1963, for the Board's Committee on Credentials and Accreditation. Briefly outlining a recent history of provisional credentials--1955 to 1963--he set forth recommendations for specific and technical procedures for granting provisional credentials "on condition of partial fulfillment of requirements." He also informed the Board committee that he had requested district and county superintendents to submit their projections of need or lack of need for provisional certification. The results of this survey were appended to the memo. This type of survey and the information it derived was, significantly, the first of a rush of many larger studies designed to assess the teacher supply situation soon to follow--conducted by the Legislature (1965-1966), the CTA (1965), the State Board itself (1967), and others.

Larson's document was a cool, objective and brief slice of information for the Board and suggested its purpose in these opening words: "These recommendations would appear to offer the transitional means necessary for at least the remainder of the 1963-64 year and are based upon the stated needs for provisional credentials of school districts and county school districts." (30. Larson memorandum, October 3, 1963, p.3) With these words, Larson introduced the first flicker of a flame that was soon to grow and to require increased attention. The specter of teacher shortages was an unnoticed harbinger for the erosion process that had begun.

A number of distinct forces had begun to assault the resolute will of the State Board. These new regulations quite naturally raised the ire of college teacher education departments who found it difficult to adjust in a short period and to continual changed. In the September, 1964 issue of the *CTA Journal*, Robert Smith, Dean of the School of Education at San Francisco State College, addressed these difficulties in a lengthy, no punches-pulled article. Smith described the intense confusion which had arisen over implementation of the Fisher Act and the impact of this

turmoil on defining course patterns for undergraduate students and, simultaneously, retaining sufficient college faculty members to carry out programs of instruction. One problem posed by the 1963 regulations was the short transition period:

> *During the past three years the transition from the old California credentials requirements to the new regulations effective last January 1 has been poorly managed. Implementation of the new law has ignored the massive problems posed for the colleges. . . .*
>
> *A token 60-day--November 1, 1963 to January 1, 1964--gave the colleges only one semester during which to prepare for students entering the new programs last February.*
>
> *College-wide teacher education committees or curriculum committees of most colleges had been at work on the problems of implementation since the bill was passed in 1961. However, failure of the State Board . . . to issue its regulations until last May made such coordinated action a kind of "blind man's bluff."* (31. Smith, 1964, pp.6-7)

Smith was also bitter because the college Departments of Education were not consulted when the Trustees of the California Colleges issued a statement in February, 1964, interpreting the Board's new regulations in terms of exceedingly limited education course requirements:

> *The [February 26 policy] statement was assertedly designed to "insure uniformity of application" and to "adhere to the requirements and enforce the spirit of the legislation." In effect it translated the minima included in the May, 1963, State Board regulations into maxima in general education, including student teaching. This sentence provided the key: "Units required in programs of teacher education should be at or reasonably near the minima established by the State Board of Education."* (32. Ibid.)

His anger was directed at a coalition of the Chancellor, the State College Trustees, and "selected members" of the State Board directly--and at odds with the Fisher Act--who sliced off a sizable hunk of

professional education courses. Smith analyzed the probable results of such actions:

> *Professional sequences will be so severely curtailed that little hope exists for providing either the necessary pre-student teaching exploratory field experience or an adequate range and depth of student teaching. New teachers will also be spared the pain of realizing that break-through in the methodology of teaching math, language arts, social studies, and other subjects have occurred since they were in elementary and secondary schools.*

Then he set forth his view of the ultimate outcome:

> *One dean of education says," . . . they have crippled the fine work (in other fields) done in cooperation with the division of education, thus, in my estimation, they have reduced the quality of teacher education in California." The rhetoric which has flooded the state about the upgrading of teacher preparation under the new licensing law thus is revealed for what it has been from the beginning, a mask for massive attack on the professionalization of teaching – smugly clothed in words like "standards" and "rigor" and subject matter "depth."* (33. Ibid.)

Smith perceived the political dynamics on the issue as forces in armed contest:

> *We are in a race between those armed with political power that would capture education with well-honed cliché's and those who would have built careers assessing its complexities and its promise for an open society. The architects of the new certification law are key members of the State Board of Education and the State College Trustees, a formidable double play combination.*

Finally, his bold prediction was uncannily prophetic:

> *I predict that during the next two years, the state must face a certification shambles. Despite the best of efforts of the colleges . . . to accept the new regulations and to make*

> *whatever gains seem possible within the framework of the law, the political pressures impinging upon the present certification system will distort all useful purposes.* (34. Ibid. pp.40-42)

If the education departments of the teacher training institutions were glowering because of the new regulations, others were not. In direct contrast to Smith's strong views, the *Sacramento Bee* also analyzed the arena into which the action had moved:

> *The State Board of Education this year approved new credential regulations emphasizing academic preparation and reducing course units in education.*
>
> *Yet many teacher training institutions, including several state colleges, still have not reconciled themselves to this change.*
>
> *Reports are reaching the board with increasing frequency that attempts are under way to circumvent the spirit of the new credential program with all kinds of ingenious bureaucratic devices.*
>
> *These apparently include the concept that the board's prescribed number of education units is to be considered only as a minimum level, with colleges free to increase this number substantially at their own discretion.* (35. Sacramento Bee, December 2, 1963).

The Bee went on to "expose" an ingenious strategy of the educationists: "There also are indications that courses previously offered in the "education" category may be re-titled as subject matter courses to keep them alive within the bounds of the board's new regulations." Fisher himself, in an interview with the *Bee's* indefatigable education writer, analyzed the forces at work against his legislation:

> *Some "enormously embittered people" in teacher training institutions still have not reconciled themselves to his bill, which places greater emphasis on subject matter and less on methods courses in the preparation of teachers.*
>
> *"After you have a major reform," he observed, "the bureaucracy always tends to pull things back to where they were."* (36. Rennert, January 16, 1965)

Several times in 1963-1965, CTA stood as the Board's ally in its intent not to weaken the hard won gains. On November 15, 1963, Ted Kostyshak, the CTA representative, stated:

> *The California Teachers Association recommends adoption by the State Board of the resolution terminating further issuance of the provisional credential . . . We are not moved by the arguments of those who fear the consequences of change and [who] predict an alarming shortage of teachers. Tougher standards are almost always accompanied by short periods of difficulty and adjustment.* (37. Kostyshak testimony)

In January, 1965, Corey bolstered the Board's barricades, urging it to hold the line, saying, in part, "the California Teachers Association is at this moment ending its appearance of assent through silence. We shall stand before you to fight for higher rather than lower standards." (38. Sacramento Bee, January 13, 1965) Interestingly, the Board chair, indicating the rigors of decision-making, and simultaneously a softer position than several years previously, told Corey that the problem is "not as easy as it seems." What should the Board do, Braden asked, when the State Department again insists that some exceptions must be permitted if the Board does not want to be saddled with the responsibility of finding classrooms without teachers at the start of the school year? Corey's answer was forthright: "If necessary, let it happen for a few weeks. At least you'll be acting then to meet a real crisis instead of just on the bases of what may happen." (39. Rennert, January 13, 1965)

Corey's views were well received by the Board. Commons remarked that the Board had been "in a lonely position" defending high standards until the CTA decided to join the battle. "The Board has felt like an island until now. It seemed nobody else cared whether credential standards should remain high. Most of the pressure has been to reduce them." Braden, seldom silent about his views, agreed with Corey that the Fisher Act had been undermined with a host of exceptions. "It saddens me to see how a great idea can be chipped away in four or five years by lots of "beavers," gnawing at the foundation." (40. Ibid.)

Conceivably one of the "beavers" was Paul Lawrence, Associate State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Reporting to the Board at this same January, 1965 meeting, Lawrence admitted that earlier Department

forecasts of an upcoming teacher shortage were "conservative." He stated that the expected supply gap would now be widened by a new state law-authored by Assembly Speaker Jesse Unruh, which established state funding for school district reading programs and a certificate for teachers in such programs-and by new federal programs poverty areas-President Lyndon Johnson's "War on Poverty"-which would create a heavy demand for new teachers. Despite Lawrence's pessimistic words, the Board decided to "hang tough." It rejected Lawrence's suggestions to ease credential requirements and instead called for fewer loopholes in credential standards, starting the next year. (41. Sacramento Bee, January 13, 1965)

This education upheaval and "conservative revolution" in California created intense interest throughout the nation, particularly among, but not limited to, education professionals. Articles appeared in national magazines, both of professional and mass circulation. A lead editorial in the Phi Delta Kappan, the house organ of the national professional education fraternity, analyzed in satiric terms that many changes made in California educating during the period 1960 to 1964-only one of which was the Fisher Act; the editorial writer minced few words in highlighting the role of the professionals in the decision-making process:

> *School administrators farther east often turn an envious eye on opulent California, which year after year entices some of their best teachers to go west. Eastern school men say they like to catch up.*
>
> *But catching up right now might be like a dog catching a car. California's schools are in trouble . . .*
>
> *Some say the state is in the pains of an educational rebirth. Others suggest it is in doubt about one thing. Non-educators with decision-making authority have made decisions for California schools without understanding the consequences of their acts*. (42. Editorial in Phi Delta Kappan, pp.209-210)

Despite the hue and cry, the Board did make a significant number of changes in implementing the 1963 regulations during the period May, 1963 to June, 1965. It granted requests to issue provisional credentials with requirements postponed for specific individuals under specific conditions. It began making time modifications. It created significant

new categories of teaching credentials to respond to National changes and anticipated pressures.

The Board had made provisions for meeting the increased need for teachers of industrial arts and vocational, trade and technical subject by establishing a designated subjects teaching credential with a specialization in these subjects. The need for more teachers of the vocational subjects in grades nine through twelve was created as a result of the increased emphasis in vocational programs reimbursed with federal funds.

The actual number of changes is subject to dispute and is actually irrelevant; in the long view, each may have been a minor change when considered in isolation. Board members were genuinely confused by the awesome specificity of the regulations and the constant and conflicting requests for special dispensations made at each meeting, including specific applications for "provisional credentials." Based on their views, two significant categories of requests "unraveled" the regulations during the period 1963-1965:

1. Requests in the form of postponement of requirements for given individuals in given localities (at no time was made a statewide postponement of effective dates made).
2. Requests in the form of general authorizations to include certain special areas of teaching, which had been originally omitted--home economics, industrial arts, school nursing, and the like-into the standard credential patterns. (This change resulted in professionals prepared in these areas now escaping from "second class" status but, ironically, was the very kind of situation that the academic reformers had sought to eliminate.)

The Board felt constrained to make these changes for two major reasons:

1. Because of the extreme difficulty of defining what was academic, in terms of what a credential applicant offered as a major, and what was not "academic."
2. Because of strong arguments from administrators, and sometimes local board members, that they simply could not find a sufficient number of teachers to fill their needs--both for classroom teachers and sometimes in special areas.

The complex issue of academic/non-academic distinction plagued the Board since 1960, because no one could set forth criteria for each subject pattern. If "academic" could not be discretely defined, then how could the credential patterns of some colleges be approved by the Board and others not, when it could be shown, and often was, that the specific courses taken toward a certain "non-academic" major were more "academic" than certain other "academic" majors? Physical education made a minor breakthrough in this regard when the Board, during the 1963-1965 period, approved the physical education major at the University of California Los Angeles because the program included many clearly academic courses in the biological sciences.

The other issue, which continually assaulted the Board's desire to "hold the line" on stiffened credential requirements, was the uncertainty of whether the Fisher Act and the Board's regulations had not, in fact, resulted in a serious reduction of new teachers available to the State's continually growing schools. The Board was impressed and depressed at the evidence brought before it of the growing need for teachers, and at the widely publicized pronouncements by seemingly knowledgeable persons regarding the growing shortage of teachers. While statistical evidence supported the contention that teachers were suddenly becoming in short supply, the Board found suspect the sources and purveyors of this evidence; they were almost exclusively from the "establishment."

> *The State Board of Education today was warned it may have to lower its teacher training standards to overcome a predicted shortage of elementary instructors in the next few years . . .*
>
> *Board members, however, took a wait-and-see position. They asked for more extensive teacher-supply studies before proceeding to any sweeping change in credential requirements . . .*
>
> *"The reason we're so sensitive about standards," replied [Board Member] Norris, "is because we fought so long and hard to get something we're very proud of." (*43. Rennert, December 9, 1965)

The Board had, essentially, held onto the basic thrust of the Fisher Act, despite what can be seen now as the incremental and steady erosion, described above, of the ostensibly firm set of rules and standards that had so laboriously been written and approved in 1963. In the years between

the passage of the Fisher Act and the end of 1965, the Board had devoted countless hours to listening to testimony, reading reports, reading letters from innumerable persons--in short, being deluged with information and pressures regarding the implementation of the regulations which had been so controversial and yet significant as public policy. That it had held relatively firmly, despite the types and trends of the changes described above, seems to be borne out by the fact that some special interest groups began to seek another avenue to get what they wanted. The teacher credential issue again comes full circle, when the Legislature again turns its attention in 1965 to this hot political area.

Legislature Re-Enters the Arena

The special interest group which considered itself most gored by the Fisher Act and the 1963 regulations was the California Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (CAHPER). An active, lusty organization for California's coaches and physical educators, its members had been one of the prime targets of Fisher's antipathy in 1960 and 1961. He openly derided school administrators who had been appointed from the "jock strap" contingent. CAHPER continued to chafe under the restrictions inherent in the Fisher Act and sought means to gain relief. But mercy from the State Board was not forthcoming; for the Board presented an unyielding face toward physical education--except in the sole instance of approval of the PE major at UCLA. A past CAHPER president, also a veteran lobbyist in the legislative wars, spoke bluntly: "We have given up as a group trying to work with the State Board. They won't even talk with us. Of course, some individual members of CAHPER have some personal contact with certain members of the Board. But as a Board, we can't get anywhere with them." (44. Ibid.) Then he added significantly: "We are concentrating our efforts upon the Legislature to get them *[sic.]* to change the law regarding physical education as a major subject."

In 1965, the Legislature made two drastic efforts to revise the Fisher Act: a first term Assembly Member introduced a bill to eliminate the "academic" and "non-academic" language of the Fisher Act; and a veteran Senator introduced a bill to significantly change the subject matter requirements for elementary teaching. These two actions became the ignition points for the thoroughly political fracas which followed.

In February, 1965, Assembly Member George Milias, a Republican from Gilroy, introduced AB 1275. Milias's position here is quite intriguing: his party affiliation was opposite to that of Fisher and the party in power; he was barely dry behind the ears as legislators go--first elected in November, 1962 --and he numbered among his constituents members of the faculty at (then) San Jose State College, long a teacher preparation institution and physical education stronghold. As with most bills of any consequence, the period between its actual introduction and final outcome is many weeks, more commonly three or four months. During this process Milias issued a newsletter to his constituents, telling them of his plans.

> *I have recently introduced AB 1275, intended to remove the controversial academic/nonacademic labels for credentialed positions. This measure is the first of a series of bills designed to correct many of the hastily conceived and since proven faulty Education Code changes sponsored by Senator Hugo Fisher in his SB 57, passed during the 1961 Session*. (45. Milias interview. 1966)

He viewed his efforts less as politically partisan than as a rebuff to Fisher, revealing an interesting sidelight on the larger political scene:

> *While it's mostly Republicans--and a few Democrats--who have been voting for changes or the abolition of the Fisher Act, it's not a partisan issue, exactly. Rather, it's a slap at Hugo Fisher. He's in hot water with the Legislature and there are a few strong votes against him any time a bill comes up to change his Act. He has picked up many of these because of the huge pyramid for which he is responsible*. (46. Ibid.)

As might be expected, while on the legislative assembly line, the Milias bill picked up both strong support and heated opposition. At the drop of a hat, Rafferty, since his election in 1962, an outspoken opponent of the State Board, voiced immediate support for AB 1275. His action soon brought him under fire from a variety of high-placed sources, when he appeared as a witness before the committee:

> *Rafferty . . . said he would abolish the academic requirement in favor of a new regulation permitting potential teachers to major in any subject taught in the public schools.*
> *Rafferty said that his position now was considerably different from the one he took in his first book, Suffer Little Children. There, he wrote that "America's survival depends upon the students of chemistry and calculus and languages, rather than upon the worthy patrons of upholstering and badminton and second-year table setting . . . in the hierarchy of subject matter there are giants and there are dwarfs . . ."*
> *He said that world conditions since [the time of writing that book] . . ."Under pressures of the cold war, we had to set [subject matter] priorities. But we are not in the position today of having to make that choice," he said.* (47. Sacramento Union, February 24, 1965)

To one's surprise, Braden leaped into the fray:

> *Thomas W. Braden . . . said today the Legislature would "betray" hard won reforms enacted after Sputnik by accepting Dr. Max Rafferty's suggestion to ease academic requirements in teacher training program . . . "Any emasculation of the basic education requirement would be a betrayal of the victory for excellence in education which the people of California won four years ago."* (48. Sacramento Bee, February 24, 1965)

A small town editor (the *Redding Record-Searchlight*) observing the scene was bemused by this facet of the issue and observed perceptively:

> *Few things are so certain these days as that Dr. Max Rafferty and Tom Braden will find another area of debate . . .Rafferty . . . supports a proposed amendment to the Fisher Act which would make persons majoring in these "non-academic" subjects eligible for both teacher and administrator credential . . . [because] their exclusion creates a "second class" citizenry in the teaching ranks . . .Rafferty, it seems to us, is looking at the question from the wrong end of the barrel . . . The Fisher Act was passed to raise the intellectual level of*

> *public education.* (49. Redding Record-Searchlight, February 24, 1965)

Even Governor Brown entered the debate, again making his position quite clear:

> *Brown quoted from Rafferty's book: Suffer Little Children, in which he said, "When we promulgated the idea that basket weaving and physics were equal in importance to the average pupil, we were being worse than irresponsible."*
> *The governor said, "I think this is a good statement and I agree with it." Now Dr. Rafferty seems to want to return to the good old days, and I would oppose that.* (50. Sacramento Bee, February 25, 1965)

Rafferty responded quickly and sharply to the Governor's attack. The *Sacramento Union* reported the sharp clash at some length, saying in part:

> *Dr. Max Rafferty leaped into the legislative thicket Monday to defend his education budget and deliver an angry attack upon Governor Edmund G. Brown . . .*
> *Rafferty said that no one can define "academic" and "nonacademic" and, that, furthermore, pressures of the cold war have relaxed enough to end the need for such distinctions . . .*
> *Rafferty accused Brown of having taken "snips and pieces" from this writings and of having ignored Rafferty's second book: What They Are Doing to Your Children?* (Sacramento Union, March 2, 1965)

The *Sacramento Bee* reported the same clash:

> *"Since the governor saw fit to act as a book reviewer last week, Rafferty added, "I thought it only fair to do the same for him, but I couldn't find a single book he has written."* (52. Sacramento Bee, March 2, 1965)

As a well-worn theme, the political battle lines again were drawn sharply, although the players were not totally consistent with the recent past. For example, the CTC, which had played a rather circumspect role

in not overtly opposing the Fisher Act, despite many appearances to the contrary, and had, as a matter of fact, supported it after certain amendments made in 1961, supported AB 1275. The industrial arts and home economics people quite naturally supported it, as did CAHPER, the statewide administrator organizations and others of like positions. On the other side, merely three individuals appeared at the May 13, 1961, hearing to oppose the bill: Donald Kitch of the State Department; Bill Plosser, CFT lobbyist; and Glen Harrington, CSBA. None of these individuals' positions was genuinely surprising, even that of Kitch, who was, after all, a subordinate of Rafferty who openly supported AB 1275. However, Kitch was in a peculiar position, for he was required to speak for the State Board in vigorously opposing the bill, not for his boss Rafferty. Plosser represented a consistent CFT view, while Harrington echoed the stand of the sometimes conservative CSBA.

Upon close of the testimony, the committee voted 11 to 4 for a "do pass" recommendation, sending the measure to the Assembly floor. The most formidable hurdle had been overcome, and the Assembly in short order approved AB 1275, making it appear as if a surprising and major victory had been scored by the indefatigable foes of the Fisher Act's main thrust.

This sudden development alarmed at least two of the major and several minor newspapers of the State, prompting several to speak forcibly to the public and the Legislature. The Sacramento Bee on May 30, 1965, ran a feature article on its editorial page written by the paper's political analyst--rather than by its education writer--explaining the political importance of the issue at hand. Then, the next day the Bee hit hard again on the same theme:

> *The California Assembly's action in approving, 47 to 22, legislation to free certificated administrators and supervisors in the schools from having to have majors in academic subjects as a condition for administrative offices, is a shocking disregard of both the interest of public education and 1961 assembly reforms.* (53. Sacramento Bee, May 30, 1965)

The *Bee* was able breathe more easily nine days later, however, when the Senate Education Committee killed AB 1275, an action reported also in by the Los Angeles Times, which had been aware of the situation. The

Times expressed its concern and relief about the Senate's actions in words which set the issue into a larger political and historical context:

> *Credential reforms voted by the 1961 Legislature, and implemented by regulations promulgated in 1963 by the State Board of Education, have been hailed as the greatest single step California has ever taken toward assuring quality education . . .*
>
> *It is disconcerting, therefore, to note the almost reckless abandon with which the Assembly has moved this year to knock out major items in that meritorious program.*
>
> *The Senate Education Committee acted wisely in killing the measure relaxing requirements for school administrators. It should promptly administer the same fate to this latest attack on the reform program, thus serving notice on the Assembly that playing fast and loose with important and controversial measures will not be tolerated.* (54. Los Angeles Times, June 13, 1965)

Milias and his "revisionist" supporters, then, were defeated. But in a newsletter to his constituents shortly after, his enthusiasm was not dampened:

> *"I carried a number of bills, not all of which were successful, which would have taken steps towards the solution of our current teacher shortage. These were known as amendments to the notorious Fisher Act . . . The existing Fisher Act sets up peculiar and ridiculous requirements for the obtaining of teaching credentials that thousands of individuals are discouraged from entering the teaching profession. The Act is incompatible with the great need for additional teachers in California, and I plan to reintroduce this legislation in the next session."* (55. Milias interview, July 1965)

However, Milias's optimism was not in line with an analysis by Michael Manley, an extremely able and usually knowledgeable committee consultant.

> *"It was a fluke that AB 1275 got out of the Assembly. In the last minute press of business, a few persons, including my boss*

> *[a powerful and outspoken Assembly member] were not there, and someone voted for him. It got out by only a few votes--by chance. It was promptly killed by the Senate."* (56. Manley interview, 1966)

A Major Change Enacted

Then an intriguing political paradox occurred. Where an Assembly measure, designed to alter or weaken the Fisher Act and the State Board's resolute stand, was defeated, a bill introduced in the Senate, designed to accomplish a similar general effect--fundamentally to alter the Fisher Act-went on to pass quite handily.

SB 908, authored by Rodda, himself a college teacher in former times, suffered no such controversy and active opposition as had AB 1275. Rodda's bill was introduced in the Senate concurrently to AB 1275's consideration in the Assembly; the two bills passed in the night during May, 1965, when the Milias bill was sent to the Senate, where it met its Waterloo. Meanwhile, SB 908, successful in the Senate, went over to the Assembly, where it met little opposition in the Assembly Education Committee. The bill was voted out of the committee easily, and in slightly more than a week--on June 18, 1965--it was passed by the Assembly and was signed into law on July 17, 1965.

In reality, SB 908 was not a broad-based attack on the Fisher Act; its aim was to relieve the rigorous and, it was argued, untenable situation wherein an elementary school teacher was required by the Fisher Act to have an academic major and minor yet, also by law, was required to teach a distinct variety of subjects in the public schools. Rodda's bill contained two highly important provisions: one eliminated a requirement of a single academic minor for elementary school teachers, and the other established a "diversified major," allowing elementary school teachers to broaden their education rather than being restricted to a single academic subject. Both provisions were developed almost exclusively to correct what had been felt to be a principal deficiency of the Fisher Act.

Rodda's bill had almost no opposition whatsoever; it had no opposition from several highly salient sources, conspicuous by their absence--the *Sacramento Bee,* the Governor, Fisher, and even the State Board. Several factors were important in this process. One was that Rodda as a Democrat was a member of the party in power, which held

the edge in both houses of the Legislature and held the Governor's chair. But more importantly, he had become a veteran legislator--elected in 1958--and was respected by many of his colleagues for his sincerity, honesty and, quite significantly, because he was an educator. Rodda could not, of course, be considered a member of the "educational establishment" but from past performance and predilection, he indicated no desire to have California return to "soft pedagogy." Since the early 1960s, he had been intensely concerned about the alarming shortage of elementary school teachers that was being demonstrated to him statistically and in other ways. A fellow Senator, in analyzing the fate of legislation dealing with education, described Rodda's influence: "There are few--only two--men in the Senate who are educators. [Another Senator] is a real rightist and, therefore, is not listened too much when it comes to education. Senator Rodda has been a main source--he has been the big man to turn to." The *Sacramento Bee*, notably, had always been a strong supporter of Senator Rodda and of then-Governor Brown.

Rodda had much positive support for his bill: most of the major professional organizations, the CSBA, the State Superintendent and the Los Angeles Unified School District, to name a few. CAHPER did not support or oppose his bill.

The State Board, on the other hand, was in an ironic position: it had not been a passive observer with any legislation attempting to threaten the Board's academic standards for teachers and administrators.

Indeed, it had vigorously opposed Milias bills, as had Rodda. Moreover, by 1965, the Board had become quite concerned about the supply of elementary teachers. It was, then, receptive to legislation which would alleviate the situation to some degree but in a carefully defined way. Several members claimed the Board initiated action that would lead Rodda to introduce this bill. Rodda viewed it otherwise:

> *"During the writing of the regulations by the Board, I expressed concern about the preparation required for elementary teachers and I was in touch with Bill Norris. However, the regulations were written. Later, I resumed the dialogue; I went to Norris and initiated the concern. The ensuing dialogue was amicable disagreement."* (57. Rodda interview, 1966)

It seems quite clear that both the Board and the Senator were of one mind regarding the requirement for an academic minor for elementary school teachers--it was too restrictive. Then, too, the time was ripe; the Senator and specific Board members who had made the credential issue their key concern formed an alliance. The Board favored the bill which would eliminate the "minor" requirement; the Senator would carry it. The honeymoon was of short duration, however, for the SB 908 also established provisions for a diversified major for elementary school teachers--something not anticipated and not to the liking of the key Board members. They were disappointed about the turn of events and criticized Rodda for adding the diversified major to the issue. Norris described the Board activists' thinking, at the same time showing a keen knowledge of the realities of the academic process:

> *We wanted two things: (1) to give the colleges a chance to develop experimental teacher training programs; and (2) to get rid of the minor requirement in the Fisher Act. Senator Rodda, at the same time, was interested in getting the diversified major implemented. He took our part and carried it, but also insisted on getting the diversified major enacted--despite our objections. The trouble with the diversified major is that it's a hodge-podge; it doesn't give any background, or theme, for a person to tie to and go on to a master's degree or advanced work.* (58. Norris interview, 1967)

Despite early and extensive communications between the Board and the Senator prior to introduction of his bill, and with an apparent agreement developing, an unmistakable rift, even if amicable, occurred. The Board almost, in fact, opposed SB 908; in the end it did not, and the "Rodda Bill" stood as the most important piece of legislation affecting teacher preparation and credentialing during the period 1961 to 1966.

The State Board had been bitterly criticized for allowing so many changes to be made in the implementation regulations--even if they had been minor in terms of effect--over the period 1963 to 1965. Ironically and perhaps unreasonably, some of the strongest criticism had emanated from what would seem to be an unlikely source--the state colleges, which had sought time and again to "soften up" the Board's stand on the

regulations. The Board members, indeed, considered themselves in a "damned if we do, damned if we don't" position.

Yet, too, the colleges were placed in an extremely difficult position, as were school administrators looking to hire additional teachers. James Stone, one of the most knowledgeable persons in California teacher education at the time, analyzed the problem in not overly sympathetic words shortly after the passage of SB 908:

> *Regardless of the cause--and doubtless there are many indigenous to the college faculties' resentment over the Fisher Act dictating college curricula--the panic button had been pushed.*
>
> *Imagine the problem of the school district personnel officer recruiting out-of-state teachers. Imagine the predicament of a college counselor trying to help a student who wishes to teach, when the requirements change each semester. On the one hand is a carefully cultivated image of the highest academic standards which often dampens the enthusiasm of possible California migrants prepared in four-year programs. On the other hand there is a series of escape hatches too numerous to be conversant with, while new ones are continually being added.* (59. Stone, 1966, 20)

Many colleges felt it necessary to include caveats when setting forth the teaching credential requirements in printed catalogs, warning students that changes were being made at the state level and that mimeographed information would be available when the latest policy had been firmed up.

The vigorous hostility toward the State Board from some college people--and a sense of the sharp contradictions perceived by the key parties in the issue--can be seen by these words of William G. Sweeney, who had appeared, many times before the Board or legislative committees to urge revisions in the law or the regulations:

> *The objective of the [Fisher Act] to strengthen the academic background of teachers was, I am sure, applauded by all segments of the profession. But the prostitution of this ideal in the attempted implementation of the law during the ensuing five years has been nothing less than a travesty. The State*

> *Board of Education seems passionately devoted to a crusade designed to determine if the colleges are circumventing the law or the intent of the law. The colleges are just as passionately devoted to implementing the bill without circumvention . . . Meanwhile . . . the State Colleges report decreases in enrollment of persons entering elementary teaching of from 35 to 50 percent.* (60. Sweeney, 1965, pp.39; 52)

By 1965, then, the Fisher Act was in disarray--disarray caused by two conflicting yet noble efforts: the desire to raise standards, particularly academic standards, for teachers and administrators; and the desire to be responsive to schools as well as colleges. But the Board's decision to wrest control from the profession and craft its own regulations for implementing the new credential structure delayed the distribution of regulations; teacher educators were angered at the extremely limited transition period in which to convert undergraduate education course work into graduate professional studies and to advise students appropriately. Without incorporating the State Department's licensing expertise, the Board's regulations contained major technical difficulties and lay it open to continuing requests for exception. These monthly changes in regulations, as the Board attempted to clarify academic and non-academic majors and to respond to a growing teacher shortage, angered--but for different reasons--the very profession it sought to transform and the public who viewed all changes as undermining Fisher's intentions. Despite this confusion and except for Rodda's SB 907, the legislature remained quiet on the credentialing front. It awaited the ambition of an activist legislator.

REFERENCES

1. Author's interview with Margaret "Peggy" Bates, Member, State Board of Education, February 10, 1967.
2. Minutes of the State Board of Education, January 11, 1961, p. 3927.
3. Irving G. Hendrick, The California Licensing of Certificated Personnel Law of 1961: A History (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1964), p.207.
4 Sacramento Bee, September 5 1962
5. Minutes of the State Board of Education, September 13, 1962.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Ibid.
9. Author's interview with former State Senator Hugo Fisher, August 31, 1966.
10. Minutes of the State Board of Education, September 13, 1962, p.5035.
11. Author's interview with Dr. Max Rafferty, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, February 2, 1965.
12. Author's interview with Hugh MacColl, former Legislative Advocate, California Federation of Teachers, July 5, 1966.
13. Author's interview with Michael Manley, Consultant, Assembly Education Committee, July 12, 1966.
14. Author's interview with Dorman Commons, Member State Board of Education, March 21, 1967.
15. Author's interview with Margaret "Peggy" Bates, Member, State Board of Education, February 10, 1967.
16. Author's interview with Thomas Braden, Member, State Board of Education, March 20, 1967.
17. Author's interview with William Norris, Member, State Board of Education, March 20, 1967.
18. San Francisco Chronicle, September 26, 1962.
19. Sacramento Bee, November 9, 1962.
20. Margaret P. Bates, "The Revolution in Teacher Education," California Elementary Administrator, December, 1965, pp.11-12.
21. Wendell E. Cannon, "On the State of Disunion" California Journal of Instructional Improvement, Vol. 7, October, 1964, p.9.

22 Sacramento Bee, February 17, 1963.
23. Sacramento Bee, March 15, 1963.
24. Thomas W. Braden, Foreword to Proposed State Board of Education Regulations to Implement the Licensing of Certificated Personnel Law of 1961.
25. Minutes of the State Board of Education, April, 1963.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid.
28. Los Angeles Times, May 25, 1963.
29. Sacramento Bee, May 24, 1963.
30. Carl A. Larson, "Memorandum to the State Board of Education's Committee on Credentials and Accreditation," October 3, 1963, p.3.
31. Robert R. Smith, "Teacher Preparation-Curbed and Confused," CTA Journal, May, 1964, pp.6-7.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid.
34. Ibid., pp.40, 42.
35. Sacramento Bee, December 2, 1963.
36. Leo Rennert, "Solons Say 'Radical' School Reforms are Over," Sacramento Bee, January 16, 1965, p.A10.
37. Written testimony of Ted Kostyshak, CTA, obtained from the California Teachers Association by the author.
38. Sacramento Bee, January 13, 1965.
39. Leo Rennert, "CTA Gives Full Support to Demands for Raising State Teacher Standards," Sacramento Bee, January 13, 1965.
40. Ibid.
41. Sacramento Bee, January 13, 1965.
42. "California's Legislature Bypasses the Schoolmen," Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1965, pp.209-210.
43. Leo Rennert, Sacramento Bee, December 9, 1965.
44. Ibid.
45. Author's interview with George Milias, Assembly Member, July 6, 1966.
46. Ibid.
47. Sacramento Union, February 24, 1965.
48. Sacramento Bee, February 24, 1965.
49. Redding Record-Searchlight, February 24, 1965.

50 Sacramento Bee, February 25, 1965.
51. Sacramento Union, March 2, 1965.
52. Sacramento Bee, March 2, 1965.
53. Sacramento Bee, May 30, 1965.
54. Los Angeles Times, June 13, 1965.
55. Author's interview with George Milias, Assembly Member, July 6, 1966.
56. Author's interview with Michael Manley, Consultant, Assembly Education Committee, July 12, 1966.
57. Author's interview with Senator Albert Rodda, July 6, 1966 and July 11, 1966.
58. Author's interview with William Norris, former Member, State Board of Education, March 20, 1967.
59. James C. Stone, "Teacher Education by Legislation," Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1966, p.290.
60. William G. Sweeney, "The Helpless Hierarchy—California's Confused Teacher Education Structure," California Journal of Instructional Improvement, Vol. 8, October, 1965, pp.39, 52.

Chapter 5
Development of the Ryan Credential Reforms (1966-1970)

Sidney A. Inglis

In retrospect, it is clear that the Legislature did react to the growing complaints about the Fisher Act's implementation, although its initial actions were not foreseen as important.

Prior to Ryan's election to the state Legislature, he was a city council member and mayor of South San Francisco and had been an educator in Nebraska before moving to California--and that fact had much to do with the eventual establishment of the Ryan Act. In Nebraska, Ryan taught English and social science and later he served as superintendent of a small Nebraska high school district. Shortly after World War II, he moved to California and was hired to teach civics in a school district near San Francisco. His teaching career was stopped, however, when his application for a California credential was denied because he lacked a minor professional education requirement. Irked as he was, he made up the credential requirement, sustaining a loss of income until it was completed. Later, Ryan told this tale often as a kind of exemplar of bureaucracy and red tape. (1. Inglis, 1974, pp.6-7) As an apparent consequence, the story has long been told, he developed a continuing hatred of educational bureaucracies. His intensive actions between 1965 and 1970 seem to lend credence to this tale.

While Ryan showed antipathy for the state's educational bureaucracy, he consistently showed support of teachers and the profession of teaching and built a reputation for independence from special interests and a strong desire to reform teacher education and credentialing, especially in light of teachers' problems in obtaining Fisher Act Credentials.

> *"There has been much comment recently," said Ryan, "about the alleged teacher shortage. Many educators have complained that because California has raised its standards so high, that migration of teachers into California from other states will be discouraged. If this is true, the Legislature must make some adjustments in the Fisher Act."* (2. Ryan Press Release, October 1974)

Indeed, Ryan's early legislative proposals in education were often aimed at increasing the autonomy and compensation of competent teachers. One example is his successful stewardship of AB 451 in 1968, described in this undated press release from Ryan's office:

> *Teachers will no longer be tried by a "kangaroo court." They will be insured a fair and formal hearing.*
>
> *AB 451, authored by Assemblyman Leo J. Ryan, of South San Francisco, guarantees teachers due process on all complaints brought against them before the State Department of Education's Committee on Credentials. The bill was signed into law by Governor Ronald Reagan on Saturday, September 2 . . .*
>
> *A recognized expert on education, Assemblyman Ryan said, "Three years of work by subcommittee on education went into this bill . . . "In the past, an accused teacher was not notified of a hearing,. . . often not admitted to the hearing, or even informed of the charges against him," Ryan said. "While we are spending billions for school buildings, we were neglecting the individual who taught our children . . . and who was working in a climate of fear similar to that caused by Communist purges."* (3. Ibid.)

Under Ryan's leadership, the newly-established Subcommittee conducted public hearings during 1965 and 1966, inviting a great deal of testimony from educators in the field. Its report, *The Restoration of Teaching*, issued in January, 1967, was critical of the State Department of Education and, by implication, of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Max Rafferty. The Subcommittee found all major education organizations supported the basic provisions of the Fisher Act but were confused by the inept implementation of that law.

> *On the basis of the testimony, we have found that if there is a problem of educating future teachers, the fault lies not with the law, but with those who are responsible for this task on a day-to-day basis. We found, for example, that it is difficult for an individual teacher to get reliable information from the credentials office of the State Department of Education. The department officials explained that there was a staff shortage*

> *and that the Department of Finance had urged minimum efforts, but we are inclined to think that it is unnecessary administrative complexity that causes much of the problem . . . Seldom in the history of California has a public mandate [the Fisher Act] of such proportion, heavily supported by both parties, been subjected to so much bureaucratic frustration? We think it incumbent on the State Department of Education and the persons responsible for teacher education to accept public demand and do their duty.* (4. Assembly Interim Committee Report, 1967, pp.12-13)

The subcommittee also criticized the practice at some colleges and universities of forcing elementary credential candidates to wait until their fifth year before allowing them to take student teaching, in direct conflict with the Fisher Act's purpose:

> *It was clearly the intent of the Legislature that elementary teachers should be allowed to begin teaching after four years of college training. Yet several Schools of Education have renumbered the course in practice teaching so that it falls in the graduate year administratively, and thus the teacher is forced to remain in college for the fifth straight year, legislative intent notwithstanding.* (5. Ibid.)

The report contained two surprising recommendations, considering the direction of Ryan's future actions. First: "Out basic recommendation, therefore, is that the 1967 Legislature makes no substantial changes in the [Fisher Act.] (6. Ibid. p.14) The second recommendation arose from an analysis of testimony by individuals relating "horror stories" about multitudinous college requirements for "academic" majors:

> *The State Board of Education could be directed to recognize various departments within colleges and universities as suitable for the designation of "academic." We think such simplification has much to recommend it, and, if simplicity is achieved, we think it well to authorize each recognized college or university in California to issue state teaching and administrative credentials in the name of the State Department*

> *of Education, subject to random post audits by the Department.* (7. Ibid, p.15)

The Subcommittee's rationale for this last, rather startling, recommendation was that it might reduce the Department's work load and long delays in credential issuances, so that "the Department then would be giving most of its attention to out-of-state applicants"--and also to affect budget reductions.

The Subcommittee's report made it clear, however, that there should be no reduction in the academic standards of preparation that the Fisher Act had established. To bolster its position-ironic in light of later disagreements--the report cites passages from Rafferty's book, *Suffer Little Children,* bitingly critical of the lack of academic preparation for teachers and administrators prior to the Fisher Act.

> *We think Dr. Rafferty, as well as others we might have quoted, has admirably expressed the fundamental concept inherent in California's 1961 credential law. For all practical purposes, these beliefs expressed in Suffer Little Children in 1962, were enacted by the 1961 Legislature because of general public demand and the specific recommendations of the Citizens Advisory Committee.* (7. Ibid. p.16)

The Restoration of Teaching did not confine its scope to preparation and credentialing matters alone, but also studied teacher supply and demand, the operations of the Committee of Credentials--the body that suspended and revoked educational credentials--making recommendations about all of these. It boldly included a section titled "A Study of Methods of Upgrading and Improving the Teaching Profession," a range of findings and recommendations concerning the working conditions of teachers, salaries, and reasons for many talented individuals leaving the profession. The report, then, was a comprehensive and meant-to-be important status summary of a vital political area in California. It served to expand the political base and body of expertise that Ryan was building as he sought to gain greater prominence and influence within the Legislature.

The Search for a Cohesive Platform of Reform

An immediate legislative outcome of the Subcommittee's report was Assembly Concurrent Resolution 123, in which Ryan urged the State Board to declare a one-year moratorium on changes in credential regulations and requirements, a politically logical response to the hue and cry that he and his colleagues had heard so frequently. However, such legislative resolutions often are more smoke than fire, for they have no effect in law; they generally serve as a trumpet call directed to the public for publicity purposes. In this case, there is little evidence that the State Board paid any heed to ACR 123, even if it had been administratively possible to do so.

A second outcome of the Assembly Subcommittee's work, and a far more substantial event, was the establishment in 1967 of a legislative committee that spanned both houses, the Joint Committee on Teacher Credentialing Practices. This Joint Committee consisted of three members of each house who were seasoned legislators--Assembly Members James Dent and Victor Veysey, as well as Ryan, and Senators Mervyn Dymally, John Harmer, and Albert Rodda. Ryan was named chair.

At the same time, an important new structure became a part of the Legislature's operation, one that immensely increased the power and expertise of legislative committee chairs and the Legislature as a total policy-making body: the introduction of full-time staff members to serve as "consultants" to major committees. This innovation was a part of Assembly Speaker Jesse "Big Daddy" Unruh's grand vision for an effective state legislature. For a time after Unruh established such major structural enhancements to the operative capacities of the California Legislature, it became a highly touted model for the nation. The establishment of legislative committee consultants provided legislative leaders and committee members far more outreach than they previously held. Committee staff were not as tied to constituent concerns and demands; they could use multiple resources to acquire information about major issues under study--condensing and compiling it for quick study by legislators, who genuinely had little time themselves to conduct major policy research projects, even on a temporary basis. Such was the case with Ryan's new Joint Committee on Teacher Credentialing Practices.

The Committee chose Denis Doyle as its consultant, a non-educator who would come to have an enormous influence on California's teachers because of his personal drive, Ryan's affinity for his views, the broad net of information search he cast, and the extensive and intensive negotiations with legislators, special interests and the general public that he carried out from 1967 through 1970. He has often, if informally, been credited with being the major force and thinker behind the refocus embodied in AB 740 (1969) and AB 122 (1970), the two "Ryan" Acts, while Ryan was the out-front and legitimate driver of the political action necessary for such achievement.

The Joint Committee began work in earnest in early 1968, with two major public hearings. At the first of these hearings, April 8-9, 1968, at San Francisco State College, Ryan outlined the Committee's purpose:

> *The issue before this committee is quite simply the quality of California education. Teacher certification is the state's checkpoint or quality control device to insure that adequately prepared teachers are in the classroom. The state's role in this process is necessarily limited and to a certain extent ambivalent, for no qualitative process can assure beyond a doubt quality instruction. As we all know, in the final analysis teaching is an art. It is a changing, fluid, often provisional and tentative relationship between teacher and student. It demands of the mind sensitivity and intuition which cannot be mandated by the state.*
>
> *We of this committee recognize this. However, this does not relieve us of our obligation to establish standards, and there are minimum standards which are appropriate. The development of basic instructional skills, particularly in reading and arithmetic, and the insistence that teachers be knowledgeable in the subject matter area are only the most obvious.*
>
> *I would also mention that while the basic purpose of this committee is policy review and formulation, financial and procedural problems have not reached the point where they must be reviewed. The fact is proliferation of rules and regulations have, and will continue to have, significant financial and procedural implications for this state . . .*

> *Does, for instance, unit by unit review of transcripts produce better qualified teachers? And what is the appropriate role of the recommending process? The backlog of teacher credential applications is now reaching a crisis proportion as will be indicated in our testimony . . .*
> *Finally, I should like to say that the committee's only preconception is that the system is not working as well as it should, and we hope to improve, strengthen and simplify it in the interest of improved education in California. And I might add that we don't intend to relax and the attempt which the Fisher Bill made impose some kind of quality on the instruction and training of teachers before they get into the classroom. We are trying to improve and not reduce quality.* (9. Joint Committee transcript, April 1968, pp.1-3)

At the same time the Joint Committee was organizing its work, the Legislature had asked the Legislative Analyst's Office to study the rapidly increasing credential application fees—in 1967, the State Board increase the fee from $15 to $20—and report back. The Analyst's Office final report, titled simply *Teacher Credentialing*, issued in February, 1968, was clearly critical of the State Department's credential issuing process. It documents inefficiencies in Department's licensing processes, noting that from 1963 to 1967 the increase in expenditures by the credentialing office was significantly greater than the increase in the number of credential applications received. At the same time, processing time for an application had grown to over three months. Because the licensing office relied on manual filing, these antiquated procedures that served to clog the system and rendered it unable to provide the Legislature (or anyone else) with summary data on hundreds of thousands of individuals holding California credentials of all kinds. The report presented a set of recommendations dealing with administrative and fiscal matters designed to streamline the credential process. One recommendation, however, introduced an examination system, a concept that was far more than a procedural matter: "By November, 1968, the State Board of Education should submit to the Legislature a report on credential regulations . . . including the substitution of a statewide examination for teacher applicants for all or part of the present

requirements." (10. Legislative Analyst Report, 1968, p.33) This report came at a propitious time for Ryan and the Joint Committee.

The report's principal author was James Murdock, who became the first witness before the Joint Committee at its initial public hearing on April 8, 1968. Basing most of his testimony on Teacher Credentialing, Murdock focused particularly upon the significantly higher costs of individual credentials compared to the relatively low increase in the volume of credential applications, testifying that since 1963, the cost had increased 73%, while the number of credentials issued had increased by only 14%, and that it took up to four months to process a credential application. At the same time, he found that the credentials office had expanded to over 50 credential analysts, with a large support staff. Each credential applicant's record--transcripts and other papers-required a detailed, often subjective, analysis to determine whether the individual's college units in subject matter, professional education, and student teaching met the requirements of the multitudinous and confusing regulations that had evolved since 1963. He stated that it was not the Fisher Bill per se that was to blame but the specific and complex regulations adopted by the State Board in its implementation of the Fisher Act. (11. Joint Committee transcript, April 1968, pp.21-34) He predicted that if the credentialing system continued in its present state, it would collapse within two years. He acknowledged, however, that the Legislative Analyst's Office was working to provide computers and a consultant to the credentialing office in order to improve the process, indicating that this step would have at least three favorable outcomes: (a) the speed of credential issuances would increase; (b) the growth of credentialing staff would slow or stop; and (c) it would make available badly-needed summary data to policy makers about teacher demographics, supply, and demand information and the like. In reply to Doyle's query about whether the system just described could be expanded to include processing data on teacher examinations, Murdock agreed, adding that full support could be expanded almost infinitely. Indeed, he argued for a general examination system for teachers, a policy that, Rafferty had for many years urged the State Board to consider. But the Board had never shown support for examinations as a general requirement. (12. Lane, 1979, 133)

The issue of teacher examinations, introduced by Murdock report and the Doyle query, was to become a major plank in the reform platform that Doyle and Ryan were beginning sketchily to formulate. The exploration of examinations as a sanctioned basis for credentialing teachers and other educational specialties was to gain greater credence and momentum as the year 1968 progressed. Yet, as radical an idea as it may have seemed to some in the middle of twentieth century California, it had an earlier ancestor in the teacher exams of the 1860s.

Following Murdock's testimony, Carl Larson, the Chief of the Bureau of Credentials, found himself in a tight spot, for he was in charge of the office under attack; was a subordinate of Max Rafferty, who was at odds with the Board; and was also representing the State Board at this hearing. Larson stepped into the breach by placing the source of the widespread dissatisfaction with credentialing in the Board's complex regulations and in the disputes between the Board and Superintendent Rafferty. The Board had attempted to accommodate "requests from the field" and, rather than grant individual exceptions, had too often changed the regulations. Its policy making efforts were plagued by problems with the academic/non-academic distinction. (13. Joint Committee transcript, April 1968, pp.21-34)

An extremely important suggestion was made by Joseph Brooks, Executive Director of the California School Boards Association (CSBA), who proposed that a commission be established that would develop teacher education policies, standards, and implementation rules. The ultimate asset of such a body was that it could adapt more readily to the constantly changing needs of society and would not be rigidly locked into laws, while allowing many groups to participate in the policy making process. Viewing it as a "professional commission," he elaborated on its composition, its reporting authority, and suggested that it could be more effective and efficient in carrying out its assigned role than other state agencies now doing the job. At this early stage, the idea of an independent credentialing commission did not catch on with members of the Committee as a whole. Later, a quite similar concept was suggested by James Koerner, a critic of education, with whom Ryan and Doyle began communicating, and both men later came to view the concept far more favorably than when it was first heard before their Committee. Therefore, while Brooks did not originate the idea, the

timing of the suggestion, in conjunction with other important happenings, was ultimately to have a major effect on Ryan's thinking.

The second hearing of the Committee was held in May 1968, in San Diego and was essentially a repeat of the first hearing-with one important exception. Gjertud Smith, Principal of Chatsworth High School, testified about the difficulty of finding high school teachers who were prepared to teach reading to their students-in addition to their regular subject. She told the Committee that she felt many students came to high school that had "never learned to read." (14. Joint Committee transcript, May 1968, pp.23-27) She pointed out that students who had poor reading skills would have a great deal of difficulty reading textbooks and other manuals used in their shop classes. She believed all teachers should have some knowledge of skills in teaching reading. Smith's was a unique recommendation, one that had never been suggested as a requirement for all teachers. Apparently, Ryan-or Doyle-was struck by its common sense, for such a requirement was later to appear in Ryan's credentialing law.

The notion of an independent commission to be responsible for so vital an area of public policy was not entirely new, of course--either in California (CTA had long held such a desire) or elsewhere in the nation--but it never had been seriously considered by lawmakers. Lowery, the Senate Education consultant who was attending the meeting to keep up with what was being said, challenged this suggestion as a device to delegate teacher preparation to the education establishment. He saw it giving unrestricted authority to teacher education institutions through an approved programs approach, where approval would be determined by the very professionals who had shown no desire for real reform.

There is no evidence that at the outset Ryan, other committee members, or staff had a completely clear idea of exactly what they wanted in a thorough revision of existing credentialing practices; they believed that some kind of major change was needed because of the numerous and intense problems that had arisen. The two mid-1968 hearings were exploratory-fishing expeditions-to gather information and ideas upon which to craft some kind of new legislation. Most testimony was in the form of unrelated complaints, suggestions, and outright requests which did little to give the Committee members a concerted sense of direction and substance. However, two suggestions for an

independent commission and a requirement in the teaching of reading-were to survive and to have a profound effect upon the content of the eventual law.

It is also significant that in the mass of special interest testimony, and in contrast to the central theme of the hearings leading to the Fisher Act seven years earlier, no one recommended seriously that stronger academic emphasis be required in the preparation of teachers and administrators. Rather, most witnesses argued that unwarranted academic stress had created teacher shortages and other problems--notably the intractable gridlock caused by the academic/non-academic distinction definitions that had become the Achilles heel of the Fisher Act's implementation. Quite possibly those strong-minded academicians who had fought so hard in the early 1960s for academic rigor in the preparation and practice of teachers did not appear to testify at these hearings for a number of potent reasons, not the least being that during the mid-to-late 1960s the nation was convulsed by college student riots and rebellions that brought into serious question long-held concepts of academic, political, and social authority in American society. At any rate, the bulk of testimony centered on credential policy and process problems and on the lack of equity between the status of "first class" teachers, who had sanctioned academic majors, and "second class" teachers, who had credentials authorizing teaching "applied subjects" like home economics, industrial arts, and physical education. Over the next two years these groups would return time and again to plead their needs while credential reform legislation was slowly being shaped into a new law. Some were more or less successful in getting Ryan to include some or all of their requests; most were not.

The hearings, then, were instructive, even valuable in some ways as a part of the exploratory process for Ryan and Doyle. The two searchers then turned to enlarging the geographic and ideological bases for their thinking.

Turning to the National Arena for Ideas

Doyle began communicating with educational leaders across the country in seeking to identify people with original and important ideas about teacher education reform. Ryan also sought names of experts and instances of exemplary programs. In the course of this outreach, he

talked with State Board member Margaret Bates, who had been one of the State Board's driving forces behind the Fisher Act's thrust, and who recommended contact with James D. Koerner of Massachusetts. This lead was to have immense significance for Ryan and Doyle.

Koerner had been at the forefront of the academic revolution, especially in the Northeast. A former professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, he was a charter member of the Council for Basic Education (CBE) and its executive director for two years. He had written a searing indictment of schools of education, *The Miseducation of Teachers* (1963), basing his criticisms on a study of teacher training conducted in the early 1960s.

> *From the beginning of my survey of teacher education, I made a special effort to visit all classes at all levels and to discuss them with education students. I managed to visit 200 classes, chiefly in education but also in academic subjects that most often are a part of teachers' programs. Let me say at once that I do not see how any observer, having made such visits to a large number of institutions, could fail to conclude that education courses fully deserve their ill repute. Like the textbooks, they suffer from a high degree of dullness and superfluity.* (15. Koerner, 1963, p.82)

Soon after Bates's recommendation, Ryan sent Koerner a copy of *The Restoration of Teaching.* Koerner sent Ryan a copy of a recent study of Massachusetts teacher preparation policies and practices. The communication between Koerner and Ryan and his consultant increased in tempo and substance, with Ryan actively seeking more leads to places he should visit and people to whom he and Doyle should speak. As a part of this activity, a meeting was arranged in the summer of 1968, between the Joint Committee and the Massachusetts Senate Majority Leader, so that the Committee could learn at first hand the Massachusetts legislative proposals.

The Massachusetts legislative proposals came from the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, a body created in February 1968, to help draft a design for comprehensive state reform of teacher education. As a high-profile critic of current practices in teacher education, Koerner was invited to appear before the Council in February

1968, to present his trenchant ideas on improving teacher education. In one of his most important, and perhaps most radical, suggestion, Koerner urged the creation of "some new instrumentality of control" for teacher licensing, perhaps some kind of licensing board. He despaired that real change in teacher education would never occur from within the ranks of professional educators: "It is clear that the teacher training industry welcomes change if it makes no waves, rocks no boats, usurps no power, unseats no sovereigns, undermines no empires, threatens no financial or professional interests. (16. Lane, 1979, pp.166-167)

He described in detail the structure that he envisioned: it was to be a process that would be open to far broader representation from the wide range of groups and interests which were part to the overall preparation and licensing of educators, definitely to include classroom teachers, as well as the general public, faculty members from university departments of academic subjects, and other key interests—all except representative of the "teacher education industry." In order to achieve this broadly representative and open process, and to escape traditional models of state education control, Koerner proposed the establishment of an independent state-sanctioned body, a licensing board, that would be responsible for developing and carrying out good policy in this important are of public policy and concern. In recommending that the licensing board establish and gain advice from numerous specific topic-related advisory panels whenever the need arose for current and relevant input, he envisions an even broader social and political base for identifying and compiling sound knowledge and promising practices in teacher education. (17. Ibid., p.168)

Koerner rejected the "approved programs" approach suggested by some thinkers—James Conant for one, and the State Board, for another, reiterating his distrust of professional educators and the elementary bureaucracy. (18. Brott, 1989, p.196)

While his attack upon the traditional model of state control of teacher education and credentialing and the envisioning of a new, independent, and broadly-based state agency may have been his most profound and important recommendation, Koerner had additional thoughts about how teacher education should be improved. For one, he saw no reason for a fifth year of study to be required to teach, believing that a qualified person should begin teaching after receiving a Baccalaureate Degree. He

also feared that by requiring an additional year beyond the traditional four-year program, institutions of higher education would add on requirements in education, further burdening candidates with financial costs and unnecessary, if not stultifying, pedagogy. Part of this thinking was that "education" should be eliminated as an undergraduate major and that admission standards for teacher preparation programs be raised. He felt that all teachers should be required to pass an essay qualifying examination. Indeed, in The *Miseducation of Teachers*, he argued clearly and strongly that examinations should be an integral part of the process for determining a teacher candidates' qualification to teach. While conceding that a mere set of pencil and paper tests alone, including the National Teacher Examinations, would be quite inadequate for such purposes, he nevertheless stated that he believed that a rational and sound system could be developed:

> *Despite the negative attitude of the education field, it is safe to say that the overwhelming majority of academicians and their professional associations would see far more virtue than vice in a carefully developed system of qualifying examinations for teachers, and would feel that the exams should be prepared by recognized men in the fields being tested, in collaboration with high school teachers and perhaps other parties. They would also feel, in all probability, that essay-demonstration exams, although expensive to administer, are still the only way to test a person's grasp of most academic disciplines, his ability to reason logically in the field, to organize, relate, synthesize, and give orderly expression to his thoughts.* (19. Koerner, 1963, p.256)

Koerner did not recommend total abolition of professional education as part of the preparation of teachers, but he felt that such requirements should be limited to 18 semester-units for secondary teachers and 24 units for elementary teachers. While he was not about to offer a guarantee that his plan would definitely lead to improved teacher education policies and practices, Koerner felt that it was more likely to bring about significant reform than any other way, certainly more likely than waiting for it to happen with existing structures.

In his study, Ken Lane provides an incisive analysis of the similarities between the licensing body envisioned by Koerner and that long-envisioned by the CTA:

> *There is an obvious resemblance between Coroner's Education Licensing board and the CTA's long-sought recommendations for a professional licensure board [in California]. The conceptual origins and the goals of the two proposals, however, were quite different. CTA leaders and other professional educators would have the licensing board dominated by professionals; such control of occupational entry was, after all, itself a hallmark of a profession--especially of the medical profession. Koerner, on the other hand, in seeking to reform teacher education in Massachusetts, would tilt the membership in favor of university scholars, distinguished laymen, and outstanding classroom teachers. Teacher educators and other educationists, in Koerner's view, should be excluded at all cost because they, more than any other group, were responsible for deficiencies in American public education.* (20. Lane 1960, pp.168-169)

Even as the Massachusetts proposal to establish such an independent body was headed for defeat, due to intense power and ideological clashes (21. Ibid.), Ryan obtained that state's Advisory Council's report, and he and Doyle studied it for ideas and direction. In the Council's final report to the Massachusetts Legislature, they found most of Koerner's plan for an independent licensing body, although the Council recommended a somewhat different composition for the agency from Koerner's recommendation. Specifically, the report recommended a licensing board that would be made of six classroom teachers, two non-teaching personnel, five college/university professors, and only two lay persons. *Ex officio* members would represent major professional organizations, the State Board of Education, and the Massachusetts Legislature. The report also recommended other significant changes in teacher education. Lane concludes that "the Massachusetts effort was therefore almost a replay of similar reform efforts in California in the early 1960s when the Fisher Act was born. But, on the east coast the reform effort was in vain: the proposals died in the Massachusetts Legislature." (22. Ibid.)

Quite significantly, many of Koerner's major, and perhaps "radical," recommendations--while failing in the heated political dynamics in Massachusetts--were ultimately to gain a life of their own in the California political environment as an aftermath of the Fisher battle and subsequent problems with implementation of that law.

Strikingly, a more eminent national educator, James B. Conant, had also undertaken a comprehensive study of national teacher education policies and practices and his sweeping conclusions, The Education of Teachers, also appeared in 1963. As President Emeritus of Harvard and a considerable luminary and scholar, he was not in any sense a professional educator of the type viewed so negatively by Koerner. Yet Conant's overall views stand in marked contrast with Koerner's. Indeed, Conant did not develop a conspiracy theory but viewed teacher education with a more moderate and accommodating lens:

> *In our travels to sixteen capitals, my colleagues and I tried to test an often-stated and rather widely-accepted charge: that there is in this country a national conspiracy on the part of certain professors and their friends to use the processes of teacher certification as a device for protecting courses in education and for maintaining a "closed shop" among teachers of the public schools who, as a result of the courses, will dependably follow the National Education Association (NEA) "party line." This conspiracy, it is argued, has been so successful that highly talented people are kept from the classrooms, and responsible laymen and distinguished scholars in the academic fields have been denied a voice in the formulation of programs of teacher education.*
>
> *I confess to having had some initial skepticism about this charge: first because I have generally found "devil" theories inadequate; and second, that any statement about a national situation in education fails to account for highly significant state-by-state variation. My present study has reinforced this skepticism, although I have seen more considerable evidence than one could use, with some distortion and considerable oversimplification, to support the charge.* (23. Conant, 1963, p.15)

Conant did have one view similar to Koerner's: he felt that a four-year higher education program for teachers was sufficient, provided "first, that an adequate high school preparation be assured, and second, that the subjects studied are adequately distributed among general education, an area of concentration, and professional education." (24. Ibid. 203-204) While he did not view education courses in quite the same light as Koerner, he found education courses relating to teaching methods and psychology of learning were almost meaningless until after teachers had struggled with problems of the classroom, that such work should be at a minimum prior to student teaching.

In *Shaping Educational Policy*, his 1964 analysis of educational policy making, Conant contrasted the credentialing systems of California and New York and traced the history of the Fisher Act and its implementation. In his view, the California Legislature had become too prescriptive in credential requirements and had gone too far in limiting professional influence in educational development. Having studied the educational policy making patterns of many states, he was struck by the different structure and tradition in America's two largest states.

> *The Legislature is the source of authority in every state constitution. But tradition and custom play an enormous role in determining how this authority is employed . . . New York and California are at almost the extreme opposite ends of a wide spectrum of possibilities. The citizens of New York come to expect that educational policies will not become footballs in the legislature resolve all major educational issues.* (25. Conant, 1964, p.82)

By mid-1968, it was decided that all members of Ryan's Joint Committee would benefit from first-hand contact with national educational reform leaders. Therefore, the Committee embarked on a series of nationwide travels to talk with key individuals. In June 1968, they met with Wisconsin legislators, educators and public officials. In October, they visited Olympia and Seattle, to meet with Washington legislators and educators. In November, they took their principal to an out-of-state trip to the east coast where they met with Kevin Harrington, the Majority Leader of the Massachusetts Senate, who had spearheaded the major educational reform package-inspired by Koerner—through the

Massachusetts Legislature. They also met with representatives of the Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education, with leaders of several teacher unions, and with officials of the Arthur D. Little Company, the management consulting firm that, in the mid-1960s, had studied the California State Department and had recommended its extensive reorganization. While in Boston, Committee members also met with Koerner, the first of such meetings, which furthered the contact already initiated with Koerner by Doyle and Ryan. The Joint Committee journeyed to New York, where it scheduled meetings with a representative of the Ford Foundation, several highly active leaders of the neighborhood school movements, several principals of urban schools and with teacher union leader Albert Shanker-whose influence upon educational thought was developing significantly.

When members of the Joint Committee returned to California, Doyle stayed on to explore one further area of inquiry: he met with officials at the Educational Testing Service (EST) in Princeton to talk about how ETS expertise and services might fit into the Committee's future plans for legislation, particularly relating to the notion of testing procedures for teachers. Soon after, Doyle met in Washington with Mortimer Smith, a CBE founder and a prominent critic of public education in the 1950s and 1960s.

Armed with ideas gathered during this extensive travel, augmented with communication with leaders on scholars, books and other background information-and prodded by the considerable drive from Ryan and Doyle, the Joint Committee was now in an excellent position to consider the development of draft legislation that would incorporate many of the major reform ideas to which they had been exposed, as well as to address the critical problems in the Fisher Act. The Joint Committee, including Ryan, now had a great deal more information and ideas than it had upon conclusion of the two public hearing earlier in the year. It had a thorough exposure to broadly-based information about educational reform which could serve as rich preparation for a subsequent major proposal to their legislative colleagues-as soon as such mix could be coherently organized for systematic consideration.

The "First" Ryan Act Takes Shape

To consider what should be done in preparation for the new legislative session, the Joint Committee then met in a two-day retreat in mid-December. Doyle developed a comprehensive discussion document for the retreat, in which he raised a significant number of rhetorical questions, based primarily upon the ideas and issues that had been presented to the Committee in 1968, particularly during their travel sessions, and intended to clarify purposes and directions for the Committee. The Committee's decision, arising from its deliberations at this retreat, was to introduce an omnibus bill dealing with teacher preparation and credentialing. The Koerner proposals and the Massachusetts reform efforts would shape the framework of the intended legislation.

Early in January 1969, Doyle developed a rough draft of the bill to accomplish this perceived intent. The draft included the radical, if not surprising, proposal for a teacher examination system, which would emphasize a minimum standard in subject matter background to be eligible for a teaching credential in a given area. Doyle sent the draft to a list of selected individuals for reaction--Koerner, selected academic professors who had met with members of the Committee, and few other "trustworthy" individuals. In the cover letter, Doyle indicated the draft's confidential nature, for the educational establishment was not notified of its existence. He knew that as soon as the draft bill was well known to the educational establishment, an uproar would occur, raising the possibility that his efforts might be hampered or derailed.

Doyle's draft also contained other important elements of a thoroughly changed system of teacher preparation and credentialing in California, many of which were to appear in the official version of the proposed bill when it was introduced in the 1969 session. In addition to the major component of an examination requirement, they included:

- a fifteen-member independent commission, outside the State Department of Education;
- a Baccalaureate Degree;
- elimination of the academic/non-academic distinction contained in the Fisher Act and its implementation rules;
- a limitation in education course work for the teaching credential of nine semester-units; and

- retention of the fifth year of study, with an allowance of seven years to complete the requirement.

During the next several months, Doyle actively communicated with many sources of knowledge and influence--sending and receiving numerous letters, conducting many conversations with people from whom he wanted pertinent input, and in other ways assembling a body of content revolving around the draft legislation. For those in the know, Doyle evidenced during this time an unwavering belief in the validity of and the need for examinations for teachers. One example is a letter to ETS in which he stated that "examinations provide a more rational and equitable measure of subject matter mastery than [do] course and unit counting." (26. Lane, 1979, p.176) Murdock, who had now become the staff consultant to the Assembly Education Committee, was more than encouraging. He felt that examinations could serve as a "safety valve" exams would not only serve to cut the red tape in administering credential issuances and allow the qualification of out-of-state applicants who held education degrees; but they would also provide an alternative to the monopoly he perceived held by universities and colleges in academic certification. Certainly, avoiding the "monopoly" appealed to Ryan, in particular: it allowed a credential holder to become certified in a new teaching area without necessarily returning to college.

Doyle also had another concern about exams, which he suspected could become a major political impediment to the concept: charges that racial bias may exist in an examination system. So, before he or Ryan could marshal sufficient political support for the proposed bill, they had to overcome strong political opposition they expected from the minority community. Doyle was not concerned about the costs of examinations so much as about the bias issue. Therefore, prior to introducing the proposed bill in the Legislature, he wrote to Kenneth Clark at the Metropolitan Applied Research Center, about this issue:

> *The core of the bill is the examination. Unfortunately Senator [Mervyn] Dymally [an influential African-American legislator and a member of the Joint Committee] is opposed to examinations as a prerequisite for certification. My intention in requiring exams is to guarantee a minimum level of subject matter mastery regardless of the place or pattern of*

> *preparation. Thus, it would be no longer necessary to approve courses of study or institutions, to require certain majors and minors, or to count units and courses arbitrarily. I felt--and still do--that this procedure would work to the advantage rather than to the disadvantage of minority group teachers.* (27. Ibid. p.177)

After describing the envisioned examination process, Doyle made clear that he felt it important to secure Dymally's approval and that of other minority legislators and educators. He further elaborated on the design, process and policy setting aspects of the envisioned examination process. An important element in this policy setting would be that the proposed licensing commission, in setting passing scores, would hold public hearings and be assisted in the process by expertise derived from subject matter advisory panels composed of classroom teachers and university scholars in those subject areas. In the event that bias could not be eliminated, the proposed commission could establish procedures for "adjusting" the passing score. Clark's reply contained his support of examinations and his belief that it is possible to develop examinations that were "equitable and workable."

As appealing as an independent licensing body might seem to the education community, educators voiced intense opposition to the proposal when they learned of the full dimensions of the draft bill. Doyle had wanted to have the concept paper reviewed and critiqued by credible resource persons before professional educators began their attack, and he had proceeded to carry out that process. However, he took one calculated gamble: in February 1969, he sent a copy of the draft bill to Larson, who had been involved in the thick of various credential reform hearings--most often being placed in a highly defensive position. Naturally, Doyle had sent it with the hope that he would receive substantive, helpful, and unofficial advice from Larson.

Without a doubt, Larson's reaction differed dramatically from Doyle's, possibly naive, expectation. In a short time, Doyle learned that other professional educators and their organizations had knowledge of the content of the draft. Indeed, the so-called "confidential" draft became so widely known prior to its official introduction in the Legislature that several major education-related organizations included it on meeting

agendas for discussion and debate. The CSBA, for example, in March 1969, published a two-page summary of the proposal, which included a technical analysis of its provisions, effects, and inconsistencies. Several other organizations and loosely-knit groups began forming arguments against specific provisions that concerned them; one broadly-based group, the Cooperative Committee on Teacher Credentials-who quickly became the target of Doyle's intense ire analyzes the incident in loose statewide alliance of professional organizations--met in February 1969, to discuss what they knew, with Larson and several of his staff in attendance.

While Larson may not have been the only source who shared the draft bill with others, it was he who quickly became the target of Doyle's intense ire. Lane (28. Ibid. p. 180) analyzed the incident in these words:

> *Larson evidently had been stunned by the radical scope of the draft bill. The new teacher licensing board proposed in the [bill] would . . . spell the end of the existing bureau of credentials with the State Department and probably end his function as chief of teacher licensing operations. Furthermore, Larson was unusually sympathetic toward professional educators, especially those engaged in teacher preparation.*

After angrily advising Larson that he may have placed the bill in jeopardy, Doyle sent the draft bill to several other professional educators, including several highly-placed staff members of the CTA, inviting their reactions.

Meanwhile, Doyle sought additional means to offset the possible charge of bias in examinations. He had already advised Senator Dymally, who he knew could prove to be a major obstacle to the concept, that Clark had looked positively upon the examination proposal, but he found Dymally unconvinced. Both Dymally and Senator Rodda had insisted that there be an alternative to examinations. This insistence eventually resulted in the provision of an approved subject matter program, later to be known as "waiver programs," as an alternative to the exam. Rodda, an educator but not of the "professional" establishment and concerned for some time about extensive preparation requirements for elementary teachers, extracted this price for his support of examinations at all: Ryan was forced to include provision for a "diversified subjects" major for

elementary teachers--something that Rodda had sought for years, although the Fisher Act had incorporated such provisions.

With ample evidence that the cat was out of the bag, Ryan, Doyle and the Joint Committee were ready to introduce the bill.

AB 740 (the First Ryan Bill) Introduced

Shortly before the introduction of the Joint Committee's bill, the CTA, never resting in its desire to have greater control over the licensing of teachers--perhaps anticipating what Ryan was up to-worked with Assemblymember Waddie Deddeh to introduce AB 586 on February 10, 1969. If enacted, this bill would establish an eleven member State Board of Teachers' Standards and Practices, a giant step toward the "professionalization"--that is, self-regulation--of teachers that the CTA had long sought.

The composition of this board would include ten members holding valid California teaching credentials--of these ten, two would teach in an accredited college or university and some representation of school administrators and junior college instructors would be possible; one member would be a member of the public. As proposed in the bill, the new board would assume all teacher credentialing and accreditation functions in California, removing all responsibility for these functions from the State Board and the State Department. Removing authority from the State Board and placing membership of the board almost entirely in the hands of educators was a far more radical and politically difficult idea than Ryan and Doyle had in mind. But the CTA continued to work on its own pragmatic ideas during a time of parallel deliberations about structural reforms in educational governance.

Ryan moved forward. A statement of "legislative intent," contained in the early passages of AB 740, served as a preamble for the extensive provisions of proposed new law--providing a remarkably soaring and perhaps contradictory promise of what this lengthy and, ironically, detailed bill would enact:

> *The Legislature, recognizing the need for excellence in education and the variety and vitality of California's many educational resources, intends to set broad minimum standards and guidelines for teacher preparation and licensing to encourage both standards and diversity. The Legislature*

> *intends that within the framework of state control school districts and teacher preparation institutions will develop programs which realistically meet the needs and resources of pupils, teacher candidates, school districts, and teacher preparation institutions.*
>
> *Moreover, the Legislature finds that highly complex, detailed and prescriptive regulations governing the preparation and licensing of teachers and administrators frustrate imagination, innovation, and responsiveness. In addition, the Legislature finds that diversity of functions served by modern education requires licensing regulations which are flexible, realistic, responsive, and simple.* (29. AB 740, 1969)

AB 740 was, necessarily, complex, lengthy and comprehensive in scope; it contained "mega provisions" dealing with major changes in the state's governance structure for educator preparation and credentialing, and it contained innumerable "mini-provisions" to flesh out the necessary details of what was to be accomplished in the mega-provisions. Seven key concepts framed this work:

1. First and foremost, it was proposed that there be established a new and semi-independent state agency, to be titled the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPL), which would have authority over all rules and regulations pertaining to the subject, yet (ambiguously) subject generally to the policies and objectives of the State Board of Education. However, with the intent of creating a politically viable model, as well as providing an almost ecumenical representation, the new body was to have, in addition to public school and higher education instructors, input from many of the major components of the state's educational structure: *ex officio* non-voting representations from the University of California (UC), the California State Colleges and Universities (CSU), the California Community Colleges, the State Board of Education, and the Coordinating Council on High Education.
2. Four kinds of credentials would be established:
   (a) "Regular" [basic] teaching credential with 'levels' of school service-"self-contained" (principally the elementary school)

and specific subject matter authorizations (principally the high school).

(b) The Designated Subjects Credential for teachers of vocational education (welding, auto shop, and the like) and adult education.

(c) The Designated Services Credential for professional personnel who served as librarians, in counseling, and the like.

(d) The Administrative Services Credential for administrators, coordinators, and the like.

3. The academic/non-academic distinction of the Fisher Act would be eliminated, thus enabling individuals who majored in physical education, home economics, industrial arts, and the like, to obtain a credential equal in stature to other regular teaching credentials.
4. An undergraduate education major would not be valid for a credential (a continuation of the Fisher Act).
5. Teacher Applicants would demonstrate competency in the subject matter of their choice by passing a subject matter examination or, if they completed a higher education subject matter program approved by the CTPL, the examination could be "waived." Teachers would not be assigned to teach in an area for which they had not demonstrated competency.
6. A fifth year of study, which would be completed over a seven-year period from the issuance date of the initial credential.
7. A limit of nine semester-units of education coursework to be required for a teaching credential. This limitation did not apply to requirements for student teaching, which was set as a semester of full-time student teaching, nor did it apply to other "advanced" credentials (administrative, for example).

Most members of the education community reacted with surprise, even shock, when the content of the bill became sufficiently known to them. The three provisions which aroused the greatest rhetorical intensity and active opposition were the creation of a separate agency, the examinations, and the education course unit limits. The State Board and the State Department were adamantly opposed to losing so much of their authority over so important a matter as educator preparation and licensing and made those views known to Ryan and other members of

the Joint Committee. Some school district representatives became upset about the restructuring of the traditional governance structure, finding fault with various aspects of the proposed new, additional, state education agency with which they would have to contend.

The teacher education community, in turn, was intensely outraged by the proposed limitation on the amount of professional education course work that could be required for a teaching credential. The community had long before made peace with the fact that the education major was no longer legitimate in California and had learned to work with the Fisher Act's frown on professional education. But this latest proposal was unbearably benighted. Beside the perhaps obvious self interest evidenced by this concern, there was a rationale for feeling that the limitation was ill advised: how could a potential teacher learn his/her complex craft without having been exposed sufficiently to the fundamental body of knowledge which undergirds effective practice? Most teacher educators felt passionately, as a professional matter, that nine semester-units--a mere three courses--was a pitiful amount in which to equip a beginning teacher with the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful with a culturally diverse group of students and a complicated curriculum.

The third idea of intense concern was the radical, perhaps even punitive, idea of examinations for teachers. One skeptic, Lester Wahrenbrock, a school district personnel administrator and representative of a statewide personnel group, noted that few students fail to do well in school because their teachers are not well prepared in subject matter; from his experience students more often do poorly because their teachers were not competent in such teaching abilities and skills as classroom management, creating motivation to learn, adapting presentation styles to pupil learning modes, and the like. In other words, pedagogical competence was far more important than subject matter competence--and examinations were not able to measure teaching performance in these vital areas. Wahrenbrock's argument was not original or unique, for it was a common refrain in professional education circles since the advent of the subject matter emphasis of the Fisher Act. In addition, if California required examinations for teachers, it would be more difficult to recruit out-of-state individuals to teach in California, a

situation that would exacerbate the problem of staffing schools with fully-qualified teachers in times of teacher shortage.

Other educational organizations wrote similar critiques and objections to various parts of the bill. Included in the groups opposing the bill--or major parts of it--were the California Council on the Education of Teachers (CCET), the Cooperative Committee on Teaching Credentials, all of the major administrator organizations, the deans of schools and departments of education throughout the state and, somewhat, the CTA, for it grew ambivalent about or opposed to some major parts of the bill while being supportive to other provisions. By May, 1969, with support for its own AB 586 fading--and in the face of opposition from several prominent members of the Assembly, the CFT, representatives of some junior college faculty members, and the State Department--CTA was left with only the hope of working with Ryan to secure as independent a licensing body as politically possible. Ryan--convinced that educational policy making could not be left exclusively to professional educators--provided a substantial voice for educators on his proposed commission, but not an exclusive voice, one of the principal differences between the two bills.

In retrospect, the most intense and searing battles that occurred in the drive to enact the Ryan Act occurred during the struggle over the “first” Ryan Act, AB 740 in 1969, not over AB 122, the Ryan Act of 1970. As the “trail breaking” bill, AB 740 had major provisions encountered for the first time by elements of the education community and the state's governance structure, elements that caused intense consternation and resistance.

Soon after the introduction of AB 740, as was his style, Ryan called a press conference to trumpet the bill's features and values. He took pains to explain the amount of time and thought that had been given to the bill’s content before its introduction. One of the main advantages of this bill, Ryan pointed out, was that it would allow dissemination of simple, clear, straightforward credential requirements and information--never achieved under the Fisher Act and certainly meant to be a compelling argument for the bill’s passage. Then, among other things, he predicted that credentialing costs would be reduced by 50%; he touted the conceptual merits of the separate licensing commission; he explained the soundness of the examination system as a way to assure subject matter

proficiency of newly credentialed teachers, with clear advantages over the inferior practice of merely counting courses and units taken, while assuring several forms of safeguards that could be built into the system; he emphasized the bill's preservation of the Fisher Act's basic thrust for subject matter competence in teachers and the elimination of education as a major. All in all, these highly visible pronouncements were intended to give momentum to the bill and to blunt the inevitable arguments raised in opposition to it.

Two days after Ryan's press conference, Eli Obradovich, a credential specialist in the Department, delivered a critical analysis of the bill to Larson, his boss. Briefly, Obradovich raised this point in criticizing Ryan's intentions:

1. It would be unwise to separate the function of overseeing teacher preparing and credentialing from the state agency responsible for school curriculum programs and state approved text books;
2. The proposed body would have a strong representation, if not control, by professional educators, where the State Board not only was principally of public make-up, it also had many advisory committees providing its expertise in addition to its firmly established professional staff in the Department;
3. The potential for conflict between this divided authority would be very possible;
4. The amount of detail contained in the Ryan bill foretold a great deal of the prescriptiveness and inflexibility in credential requirements;
5. The Ryan bill placed undue emphasis upon subject matter competence of pedagogical competence; and
6. There would be too great a reliance upon examination results that might result in discriminatory screening of promising candidates.

At the State Board's March meeting, Larson presented an analysis of the bill, which included the gist of Obradovich's complaints along with additional defects that Larson found. The sole advantage of the Ryan proposals was the elimination of the academic/non-academic distinction. The Board was far from happy about this unpleasant news, for it had not ceased to wrestle with ways to better implement the Fisher Act. Indeed, it had become increasingly aware of the need to somehow simplify the credentialing processes. At this meeting, the Board reviewed and quickly

approved a new policy on approved programs, by which the Board approved teacher education programs, which could then issue credentials. However, as Lane points out, there was a difference between what the Board approved and what become known as "approved programs" in later years under the Ryan Act.

> *These approved programs were not . . . the same as the CTPL approved academic programs that Ryan envisioned as an alternative or "waiver" to his examination system. [Rather] the State Board adopted an approved professional preparation program through which teacher education institutions would gain greater autonomy and flexibility.* (30. Lane, 1979, p.207)

In taking this significant action, the board probably hoped that this decision would lead to more efficient processing of credentials, less need to grapple with the onerous decisions about credentials, and even to slow the momentum of Ryan's radical proposals. Interestingly, this action did serve to cause a temporary delay for Ryan's bill in one of the Assembly's subcommittees, much to his chagrin, but the delay was not a serious one.

Board members had no direct source of information from Ryan's committee or staff, and almost all of their knowledge of the bill and its long term effects were received from Larson and Rafferty, who strongly opposed it. Not surprisingly, the State Board had little hesitation in voting to oppose AB 740 unless it was amended in ways acceptable to the Board. At the same time, the Board was apparently unaware of the Legislature's negative attitudes toward the Board and, especially, toward Superintendent Rafferty and his top aides. Indeed, Ryan's proposal for an agency separate from the State Board and Rafferty's Department had begun to have a strong appeal because problems with the Fisher Act's implementation simply would not fade from the Board's monthly agenda. Nonetheless, the Board remained adamantly opposed to losing the credentialing authority that it held, despite the many difficulties that responsibility had been causing and voted to oppose AB 740. Its reactions and Larson's report only served to increase the Joint Committee's hostility.

With the continuous assaults upon the bill from angry or concerned parties, Ryan and Doyle began to amend the bill and to deflect the opposing arguments, while holding onto the major principles of the bill.

Each time the bill was heard at an Assembly committee, Ryan was there to testify to the bill's value and promise for the improvement of all aspects of teacher preparation and credentialing, and to emphasize the extensive work of the legislature's own Joint Committee, composed of a broad political spectrum represented by its six co-authors. Ryan continued to tout projected values of the bill's examination system, noting that most trades and professions had examinations required as bases for state licensing, while illustrating the additional values and special uniqueness of his approach: "the examinations would permit teaching outside of one's major field upon demonstration of competency. Not only could journalists teach English and legislators teach social studies, engineers could teach math--so long as they pass the examination and hold a BA." (31. Ibid. p.21)

The revision process continued as Ryan and Doyle sought to meet objections and to further clarify their intentions and structures within the bill. Among these amendments were: changing the composition and means of appointment of members of the proposed commission; clarifying the role of the Committee of Credentials--a sub-group of this commission; adding authority to oversee teacher education program standards and approval of such programs; adding authority to develop and implement administrative law (Title 5) that would give specific interpretation to the broader statements of the basic credential law, heretofore the role of the State Board; adding a statement that would establish a closer tie between this commission and the State Board--that is, giving the State Board a bit more control over the agency than in the original version of the bill; and authorizing classroom teachers to be part of the panels of educators who would conduct formal reviews of teacher education programs.

By the end of May 1969, a considerably amended version of AB 740 was sent with a "do pass" recommendation from the Assembly Education Committee to the next step in the process, the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, where it was further amended. These latest amendments addressed primarily the functions and operations of the new agency: setting fees to cover certain costs of operation; expanding the vision for initiatives that the commission could undertake (research and evaluation of programs). This version of the amended bill was in print by June 12, 1969. Within a few days the bill overcame one of the prime

legislative barriers to progress: it was passed by the full Assembly and sent to the Senate, where it would face another daunting gantlet.

AB 740 Moves to the Senate

Ryan had repeatedly not only extolled the inherent values of the examination concept, but also maintained that such process for obtaining teaching credentials would result in considerable cost savings to the state, in particular because of the greater efficiencies in determining the competence of credential applicants and the reduced processing times involved--meaning, also, lower payroll costs. In a concerted effort to bolster this argument, he asked the Legislative Analyst Office for a formal opinion on the costs and, especially, savings that could result from passage of the measure. His request went to A. Alan Post, the Legislative Analyst, and a man who had gained a strong reputation for competence, integrity, and objectivity. Post soon sent Ryan a favorable review of the bill's costs, estimating that establishment of the examination system would, indeed, save a considerable amount of money per year--Post stated $650,000--because it would no longer be necessary to carry out the detailed analysis of transcripts from each credential applicant. However, Post did perceive one area of ambiguity: he noted that the bill's provisions for "waiver" of exams might lead to unknown additional costs, depending on the process to verify the soundness of programs. Ignoring the caution in Post's report, Ryan cited its favorable parts in subsequent press releases.

AB 740 was now to be reviewed by the Senate, where its first stop would be the Senate Education Committee. Lowery, the Committee's staff consultant, was highly knowledgeable about the content and thrust of the Assembly bill, for he had been in ongoing contact with Doyle as the drafting was completed. Lowery had even suggested a set of the categories of subjects that the new credential law might specify and in other ways consulted with Doyle and Ryan. Lowery, unlike Doyle, was a former public school teacher and school administrator and was very well informed about schools. In addition, as consultant to the other major education committee in the legislature, he was well abreast of other educational matters to come before it. Further, Senator Rodda, one of his legislative bosses, was not only a member of Ryan's Joint Committee but also an influential member and Chair of the Senate Education

Committee. Rodda had been an active inquirer and activist on educational matters for quite some time and, even more importantly in this context, was co-author or AB 740. Both Rodda and Dymally, as co-authors of Ryan's Assembly bill and two of the most influential members of the Senate at this time, had participated in many of the discussions and trade-offs that had occurred during the amendment process in the Assembly-Dymally on the racial bias factor in examinations, and Rodda on the diversified major factor as a waiver to subject examination for elementary teachers.

Lowery, himself, for a time had genuine doubts about the practicality and validity of subject examinations, but ultimately was persuaded by Doyle and CTA representatives that such examinations either existed or could be developed. He came to believe that the Baccalaureate Degree would assure that a teacher was reasonably well educated and that the examination would then assure a minimum knowledge in one of the eleven "umbrella" categories that Lowery had identified for the secondary school or the multiple subject area for the elementary school. Although only a staff member, Lowery played a pivotal role in the ultimate outcome of Ryan's efforts. So, while the thought of examinations was an anathema to the education community, the way had been cleared for many legislators to accept the concept.

In June 1969, the Senate Education Committee's first hearing on the bill gave additional opportunity to testify on the demerits of the proposal. By that time the State Board had issued a lengthy analysis of the bill, in which they found four major objections:

- The new state agency would probably be dominated by professional educators--too narrow a focus for a public policy making body.
- The cost of developing the examinations called for in the bill would be enormously expensive, and the process would not be a savings to the State.
- The limitation on professional education would not be a good idea because of its prescriptive and lack of flexibility for all concerned.

Although no longer pursuing its own bill, the CTA was still a strong potential enemy. It sought changes that would raise standards for credentials and give more professional autonomy to the profession

through the proposed new state agency. It wanted even more educators that are teachers, on the proposed CTPL than the bill provided retention of the traditional nomenclature of credentials which the bill proposed to greatly change, and a minimum of a Baccalaureate Degree for issuance of an Emergency Credential. As Doyle communicated with the CTA and offered amendments that might satisfy the organization, he kept in mind that he had to balance those offerings with the realization that each amendment might engender strong opposition from another quarter.

Now in the Senate, the same organizations came again to the fore to object to aspects of the bill and/or seek amendments in their favor or to defeat the bill. The bill's momentum began to slow as Senate Education Committee hearings continued. The CSBA, for example, sought to have an end to Life Credentials for educators; it also sought to have teachers allowed to be assigned to teach outside their major areas of subject preparation. Continuing objections were heard from the State Department and, of course, the State Board, each having specific points of criticism.

By early July 1969, the bill was in serious trouble in the Senate Education Committee, despite the influential support from within the Legislature. Doyle and Ryan, with Lowery's help, sought constantly to draft amendments that would meet objections, but would not lose the main thrust of the bill. Some of these amendments were more cosmetic than substantive in nature; other changes were more administrative process provisions than substantive; others were genuine concessions, such as adding the statement in one version that the new commission would be "under the exclusive control and direction of the State Board." (32. Ibid. p.225) But these concessions did not placate the State Board, for it continued its campaign of opposition.

Even with Ryan's July 11, 1969 concession amendments, AB 740 continued to face opposition because of features that Ryan had not changed. The examination system continued to be the most prominent and most visibly attacked during hearings. Senator Dymally now announced that he would not vote for the bill, even though Ryan and Doyle thought they had removed Dymally's concerns about possible racial bias. The representative of the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) urged the Committee to hold the bill for interim

study, reminding members of the problems resulting from hasty approval of the Fisher Act in 1961.

By mid-July, the CTA reached a pragmatic conclusion, observing that "it is a Sacramento axiom that no bill is perfect and such weaknesses may be subject to later changes" (33. Ibid. p.228) and decided that because its own bills (AB 586 and SB 708) had failed, it was time to work with the author of AB 740. The organization's legislative operatives then began working closely with Ryan and the two committee consultants to shape the bill to their interest as much as possible. CTA still was not satisfied with the provisions that required examinations and a limitation on professional education but was willing to bide it's time for the present.

As the struggle to kill versus maintaining its viability ensued, additional inconsistencies developed in the content of the bill as Ryan grudgingly made concessions. One example illustrates the nature of these contractions: an amended version would require an Administrative Credential candidate who completed an approved administrative preparation program to fulfill the diversified subject major, while another candidate who passed the examination for the Administrative Credential--the latter a permanent feature of the bill--could fulfill any major.

After the long saga of concessions in the amendment-making process, continued hearings, and numerous consultations between opponents and Ryan and his aides, the bill ultimately cleared the Senate Education Committee and was sent to the Senate Finance Committee for review of its financial impact. Assembly Bill 740 passed muster in that important committee and went to the Senate floor, where it was passed on August 4, 1969, by a 27 to 2 vote.

On August 21, 1969, the bill arrived on Governor Ronald Reagan's desk, needing his signature to become law. Ryan did not rest in his campaign to have it enacted; he knew that, as with any highly controversial bill, disappointed opponents would direct their arguments and pressures toward the Governor in a concerted effort to obtain a veto. With that knowledge, Ryan held a press conference to tout his bill, pointing out the overwhelming votes it had received in both houses, its bipartisan authorship, the substantial savings that would occur, and other notable features of the bill.

Uncharacteristically, the *Sacramento Bee,* especially, and the *Los Angeles Times* had paid scant attention during 1969, to so important an educational reform bill as it moved through the tortuous maze of the Legislature. But, upon passage of the bill, both papers editorially urged the Governor to sign it.

In another decisive action, Ryan directed a letter from himself and co-authors--Assembly Members Veysey and Dent; Senators Harmer, Dymally, and Rodda--to the Governor which urged him to sign the bill (Dymally apparently having been finally won over to Ryan's way of thinking on examinations).

As is customary in state law-making practices, the Legislative Counsel--the Legislature's lawyer-prepared an exhaustive analysis of the bill for the Governor as a basis for determining whether to sign or veto it. The Legislative Counsel found numerous inconsistencies, ambiguities, and actual conflicts between provisions in the bill and existing statutes. The analysis and its findings of problems covered thirteen single spaced pages. Lane speculates that "Doyle and Lowery had not been scrupulous in finding the bill's technical inconstancies, probably because they had no effective working relationship with technical specialists in the State Department's credential office." (34. Ibid. p.231)

Despite Ryan's depiction of its overwhelming support in many important quarters--including CTA's cautious approval--the intense opposition of the State Board, in particular, along with the State Superintendent and the State Department, Governor Reagan vetoed AB 740 on September 4, 1969. Conceivably, he may have also been influenced by the substantial negative findings of the Legislative Counsel.

After several years of intensive and extensive preparation and relentless campaigning for a major reform bill, Ryan and his allies had apparently met a crushing defeat, one that otherwise might have ended a major public policy drive and have discouraged for a time significant efforts to have impact upon the quality of California's public schools. Yet Ryan's drive to have a major education reform bill to carry his name was not to end so suddenly, for he was to introduce AB 122 in the 1970 legislative session--AB 122 was a near carbon copy of AB 740, at least at the outset. There's a great deal of evidence that a mere year later that

second bill had far less overall difficulty in negotiating the tortuous legislative course and obtain the same Governor's signature.

Inevitably, the question arises: why did the bill meet so clear a defeat in 1969, yet experience success a mere twelve months later, particularly when the 1970 bill differed so very little from its predecessor? The Governor's 1969 salient veto message gives several compelling clues:

> *Reason for Veto: There is little doubt that a major overhaul is very much needed in the areas of teacher preparation, evaluation, and credentialing. Scarcely a voice has been raised to the contrary. It is also obvious that it would be desirable to develop as is stated in AB 740, licensing regulations which are 'flexible, realistic, responsible, and simple.' It is also clear that the need for improvement is so great that impatience is present in many quarters. In view of the above, it is perhaps not surprising that responsible and informed people of the greatest good will argue with intensity on both sides, for and against, AB 740. Within its many broad, complex, and innovative provisions, there are some things to please most. There are also some things which give concern to many. I veto this bill at this time not because I wish to discourage attempts at change in this area; on the contrary, I encourage change in the area covered by the bill. In my charge to the Commission on Educational Reform [which Reagan created in 1969], teacher preparation and credentialing was stated to be of high priority.*
>
> *Because so many responsible educators report sections of the bill which they "don't understand," because of elements within the bill which are seen by some as contradictory, because there is a major question as to whether testing for measuring the qualifications of teachers is a hope for the future or a proven dinosaur of the past, because there are questions regarding the jurisdiction and responsibility of the State Board of Education in its relationships to the commission suggested by AB 740, and, finally, because where there are so many questions, it would be so much better to develop clear answers before, and not after, a bill becomes law, I veto this measure--but express my hopes that the Legislature, the Commission on*

> *Educational Reform, and others will see the basic elements of AB 740 as provocative and worthy of study and discussion. I hope that AB 740 will serve as a stimulus and that its veto will not serve to discourage consideration of change in an area which needed it badly, and I assume that by the next legislative session we will have a strong consensus around a clearly understood and well developed program of legislation--or changes in policy and procedures within present departments and boards to improve the preparation, evaluation, and certification of teachers. Accordingly, I am returning the bill unsigned.* (35. Reagan quoted in Inglis, 1974, pp.5-6)

The "Second" Ryan Act

One important political event in mid-1969, had significant effect upon the final form of the Ryan Act, yet it was not directly connected to AB 740 as it struggled through the Legislature's roadblock. That event--occurring concurrently to Ryan's shepherding his bill through the Legislature and obliquely referenced in the Governor's veto message--was the appointment on July 28, 1969, of the Governor's Commission on Education Reform. Reagan issued the following "charge" to this body:

> *The goal of this distinguished group of citizens will be to view the entire elementary and secondary credential process and to make recommendations to me to improve its effectiveness and the quality of the teaching of all our children. I should like to see particular attention given to the following areas: reforms in the areas of public school financing, teacher training and certification processes, salaries and the possibility of a merit system, districting, urban and suburban needs, organization and management of school administration, classroom practices and curriculum development, including campus unrest. A preliminary report, including a recommendation regarding the future of the commission, will be expected in December, 1969.* (36. Governor's Commission, 1969, p.1)

The scope of the new commission's charge was considerably broader than Ryan's efforts, which focused on teacher preparation and credentialing exclusively. It was probably obvious to any knowledgeable

person that no credible study and summary of findings for so complex a field could actually be achieved in less than five months. However, a "preliminary" report was put together by December, 1969, while the final report was not transmitted until more than a year later.

In its preliminary report, the Governor's Commission presented a number of interesting, even radical and, in some instances, enduring suggestions. It criticized the state's teacher preparation and credentialing system, recommending establishment of a separate licensing agency similar to those proposed by Koerner, Ryan, and the CTA in their several efforts. The Commission ventured these additional "radical" suggestions: that there be a single credential for all levels of teaching; no credential requirements for non-teaching positions (administrators and the like); creation of a series of instructional "ranks" for teachers; and continuing education requirements for teachers so that their knowledge would regularly be brought up-to-date. Many of these suggestions were so far from traditional practice that they may have seemed almost preposterous, yet several--in addition to the notion of a separate licensing body--came to have a life of their own in the ultimate outcome of the battle to enact the Ryan bill. Not surprisingly, Ryan and the Governor's Commission were not philosophically far apart, but initially Ryan believed that this Commission's suggestions were so radical that they would generate unbeatable political resistance and would be unable to be adopted in the Legislature. Nonetheless, during the deliberations surrounding the legislative progress of Ryan's second bill, AB 122 in 1970, the Commission's Executive Director Stanley Green worked diligently to have those provisions relating to preparation and credentialing incorporated into the Ryan bill or any other legislative medium available.

Reagan's veto of AB 740 did not discourage Ryan from moving ahead in his determination to have a major educational reform law enacted with his name on it. On the contrary, he redoubled his efforts to secure such legislative success. Among other things, he was convinced--especially in light of the Governor's words of encouragement in the veto message--which he needed to marshal additional support for his package of ideas, not necessarily to change them. During the legislative recess between December 1969 and January 1970, Ryan and Doyle visited schools out-of-state which yielded additional insights and ammunition, particularly related to school successes with minority students. As Ryan

conducted these outreach efforts to other states--including Florida, Washington DC, and New York City--he made a special point to consult with independent thinkers who were writing about non-traditional educational practices or doing innovative work in nontraditional settings. In addition to talking with William Johntz and Seymour Gang, educational innovators working with inner city students and using unique processes, he and Doyle met with Joseph Featherstone of the New Republic, a critic of education and on the staff of the CBE. These conversations enhanced Ryan's reputation as an independent and visionary thinker himself, one who knew his way around what was happening on the cutting edge of experimental educational thought and practice and who also knew what was wrong with accepted practice and policies. He and Doyle corresponded regularly with advisors that he trusted, including Koerner, Conrad Briner of The Claremont Graduate School (who was briefly a member of the Governor's Commission, who knew Koerner, and who was later appointed to the CTPL), Charles Brown of the Ford Foundation, and others. Koerner's views had by now become fairly well-known to most legislators and the education community, due in good part to Ryan's publicity of Koerner's recommendations to the Massachusetts Legislature and to Ryan's Joint Committee in 1969.

At the beginning of the 1970 legislative session, Ryan was again passed over as Chair of the Assembly Education Committee (he had failed in that quest in 1969, as well), but did retain his role as Chair of the Joint Committee on Teacher Licensing and Public School Employment--a role which was vital to his ambitions. On January 2, 1970, he introduced AB 122, a 61-page replica of the vetoed AB 740. As further preparation for the oncoming battles, Ryan continued a campaign to gain national publicity for this legislation while his new bill was being considered by the California Legislature.

In early 1970, Ryan sent to Martin L. Gross, a reporter for the *Los Angeles Times*, a publicity packet in support of the bill, including contributions to its content by Koerner, Featherstone, and other prominent supporters. Ryan suggested that Gross might write an article for a national audience about the state of teacher education and California efforts to reform it. Gross responded by writing "Courses in 'Education:' Worthless for Teachers," a repetition of an earlier piece but

now including an update of information about AB 122. He endorsed these reform efforts, which added to Ryan's political momentum.

An additional arrow in the Ryan quiver was an article in the February, 1970 issue of the politically influential periodical, *California Journal*, a publication well-read in legislative and other political circles. In its usual and ostensibly objective style, the Journal analyzed the recently introduced AB 122, gave a summary of the work of the Joint Committee, forecast the nature and sources of opposition to the bill, and predicated that the work of the Governor's Commission would likely be in concert generally with the content of the Ryan bill. If this were to occur, it could result in a politically acceptable package for the Governor, who could then be in a position to sign it. Ryan and Doyle glowed in this favorable review and used it in the publicity campaign during the first half of 1970.

Prior to the bill's first hearing, Ryan had intensified his campaign within the legislature itself, first by sending letters to his colleagues to remind them of the purposes of AB 740, of its support in 1969 and the evolution of AB 122. He reminded them of the pertinent parts of the Governor's veto message than had held open the door for credential reform and sent a packet of other information and promotional materials. In addition, in a confident and calculated move, he invited other legislators to become co-authors of the bill--an effort that resulted by February 25, 1970 in more than ten Assembly members joining as co-authors. With all of these factors going for him, Ryan thought that he well might gain sufficient momentum this time around.

Yet, as the hearings began, it became evident that however much support Ryan may have gained within the Legislature there was not an across-the-board support for all components of the bill among the many special interest groups. The CTA, for one, while it at the end had not actually opposed Ryan's first bill, still had ideas of features that it wanted and testified that it had not taken a position. Various other groups and agencies that had been seen and heard often in opposition to major reform initiatives since 1961 rose to be heard again. Now, however, most of these groups--which included the State Department, the State Board, and the Cooperative Committee--began to modify their views and requested various amendments, rather than taking a stridently opposing stance. All, that is, except Manfred Schrupp, now the President of CCET,

who apparently broke ranks with other members of his organization, for he testified vigorously against the bill. He argued for having minimum standards for credentials developed by a new commission rather than having them fixed in law by the Legislature.

He testified that the limitation of nine units of education, contained in the bill, was "grossly inadequate," and that a competency examination system fixed into law would be impractical. If exams were to be introduced, it was better, he believed, to let the new commission set criteria for all aspects of the process. In short, he made clear his condemnation of the proposed legislation, and there is little question that Ryan knew that intense opposition from schools of education would continue during this legislative session.

As a result of this testimony, little of which was favorable to the bill, the Assembly Subcommittee held over the bill for further hearings and awaited amendments sought by several major groups that had appeared before it. During the week of February 23, 1970, the Subcommittee held its second hearing on AB 122, at which time the bill was significantly amended. The CTA, for its part, still wanted additional professional teachers on the proposed commission, other changes in composition, and elimination of the nine units of professional education; the representatives of the Cooperative Committee warned the subcommittee against creating another period of lengthy chaos like that following the "hasty" passage of the Fisher Act. Green presented the Governor's Commission's position on eliminating both Life Credentials and school administration credentials and on establishing a single teaching credential for grades K-12. Ryan, never eager to concede when he did not have to, responded that he believed that the bill in its present form was acceptable to most legislators and that he would permit only those changes that the Governor himself insisted upon.

A week after this hearing, the full Assembly Education Committee approved the bill after only perfunctory discussion of an amendment to eliminate the driver education credential. As seemingly minor as this action appeared at the time, like the physical education controversy during the Fisher legislation, it aroused intense opposition and marshaled a vigorous campaign to retain the credential. Ryan soon became engaged in a bitter word battle with the group, which continued for some time. (37. Lane, 1979, p.248)

As the bill appeared more and more likely to pass the Assembly, several of the state's major educational organizations sought to further moderate their opposition by suggesting amendments that would favor their views. The CSBA, for example, asked for additional public members to be appointed to the proposed new commission, wanted the new commission to be placed under the authority of the State Board, and supported continuing education for teachers. Ryan granted some of these requests, and in May 1970, CSBA had moved to an "approve" position, even though it still had a number of concerns, and kept working with Ryan and Lowery to gain additional amendments.

The State Board, of course, continued, indeed intensified, its firm and active opposition to nearly all elements of AB 122, even though Ryan maintained that he had amended the bill many times to try to satisfy the Board's, and the Department's, concerns. The Board became so active that it sponsored SB 825, introduced by Senator Clair Burgener on March 31, 1970, would repeal the Fisher Act and create--within the State Department--a new commission, entitled the Commission on Professional Standards and Practices that would have a semblance of separate "professionalism" but remain completely under the control of the State Board.

Meanwhile, the Governor's Commission, while not gaining from Ryan all that it wanted, developed a fairly positive view of the bill, certainly an advantage for Ryan. Other groups-primarily professional special interest associations, like the members of the Cooperative Committee--which had been relatively unified in opposition to the 1969 version of the bill, over the months in the first half of 1970 became less unified on positions to the 1970 version, thereby providing Ryan additional advantage. The CTA, for example, one of the strongest members of the alliance, had begun to signal support of the bill, indicating the crumbling of resistance.

Fairly early in 1970, having passed out of the Assembly Education Committee, AB 122 was heard by the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, potentially a major roadblock to progress. Again Ryan had marshaled significant support for the bill to testify before this committee: the Governor's Commission favored nearly all of the bill; Assembly Member Veysey, a co-author, urged a yes vote; both the Legislative Analyst and the State Department of Finance had no objections to the

bill--which was significant information for this particular committee. The Ways and Means Committee found in the bill's favor, sending it to the full Assembly, where it passed on March 16, 1970, by a vote of 60 to 3.

While AB 122 was still in the Assembly, but anticipating its success, Ryan and his staff, as usual, prepared extensive updated information packets about the bill, sending them to all members of the Senate. The packets contained clippings, articles, identifications of the bill's supporters and opponents, a history of the bill--all in all an impressive bundle of campaign information.

By the time that AB 122 was to be heard by the Senate Education Committee, however, a rash of bills related in general to credentials, teacher qualifications, and state educational agencies had been introduced in the Senate. Senator Burgener's SB 825, sponsored by the State Board was one; Senator Grunsky introduced SB 1245, similar to his (and CTA's) SB 708, which had died in 1969; and Senator Rodda introduced SB 1206, designed to change the credential requirements but not establish a new state agency. Again, the CTA bill—Grunsky's SB 1245--had little chance for passage in competition with the Ryan bill, but Rodda's bill had some ideas in it that Rodda had firmly held for years, particularly the need for a diversified subject major for elementary teachers.

So when the Senate Education Committee began its formal hearing process in April 1970, it had three credentialing bills to consider. The Committee decided to consolidate the hearings on the bills, but the bulk of the testimony focused on AB 122. From the testimony, Ryan and his voiced clear opposition; Green of the Governor's Commission still called for a single credential for all teachers and the total elimination of school administration credentials. The staff knew they had not yet obtained the degree of consensus the Governor's veto message had asked. ACSA, represented by almost-revered Gordon Winton, a former respected legislator, CTA stated that it was still working with Ryan to obtain amendments. It further maintained its opposition to the nine unit limit on professional course work in education, to the elimination of administration credentials, and to the Governor's Commission proposals for a single credential and elimination of the life credential. Indeed, the CTA had voted to oppose AB 122 if these provisions became a part of

the bill. The CTA representatives, of course, declared their preference for SB 1245, the Grunsky bill which they sponsored.

Others who spoke in opposition included the State Board and representatives of several groups who were members of the Cooperative Committee. But the most notable, if not the most colorful, witness was Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, who had captured the imagination of millions of people during one dramatic moment as an activist college president defying the chaotic actions of rebellious students during the turbulent days of the 1960s and had become a hero to many legislators and to Governor Reagan himself. Much to Ryan's disappointment, his mentor Hayakawa testified in opposition to the bill, although Ryan had written to him, urging this support. Because of whom he is; Hayakawa's stance carried significant weight, at least at the time of the testimony.

The intense and continuing pressure from the State Board through its president, Howard Day, forced the Senate Education Committee to hold a series of hearings on the three credential reform bills, continuing into mid-1970, although for all intents and purposes, the only bill that mattered was AB 122. Indeed, Rodda's own bill, SB 1206, was not formally heard--that is in public session--by the Committee, yet several of its key ideas became amended into AB 122 along the way. One of these was the diversified major for elementary teachers; another would allow a teacher's assignment to a subject area in which that teacher had taken 18 semester-units of college work--a means to make more flexible the classroom assignment of teachers and, thereby, to decrease the problems that had plagued the school districts under the Fisher Act.

During these ongoing deliberations, Ryan continued his campaign to gain even broader support. He maintained communications with Alex Sherrifs, the Governor's advisor for education, and other staff members. He also took pains to garner the understanding and support of several key conservative senators that might be persuaded to ask the Governor to sign the bill when it reached his desk. One of those senators was already in his camp: Senator John Harmer had been a member of the Joint Committee and a co-author of both AB 740 and AB 122. He courted another conservative, Senator John Stull, who had been active in introducing other educational legislation over the years, so successfully that Stull wrote a constituent that he favored AB 122 over a fellow senator's bill—Burgener's bill, sponsored by the State Board. Ryan later

gave credit to Stull for being instrumental in having the bill pass the Senate.

Prior to resumption of hearings in early June, Ryan and his staff sent each Senate Education Committee member an updated briefing package, which had been carefully prepared. Its contents included: the purpose of the bill; its special features; a detailed comparison between AB 122 and the other two credential bills; an argument that his bill would significantly save money and increase efficiency in the state credentialing process; a justification for the nine unit limit on professional education course work and the use of examinations for credentialing; and a declaration that AB 122 was the only true reform bill that would make major change. He offered to accept amendments that were among the recommendations of the Governor's Commission, "so long as there is strong support from the Governor's Office and the Senate Education Committee." (38. Ibid. p.267)

As a result of the June hearing, Ryan again made significant amendments: he softened the strict unit limit on education course work to make it clear that it applied only to restricting the requirements prerequisite to student teaching, having the effect of making the stipulation a minimum rather than a maximum; he redesigned the classifications of several credentials, teaching and non-teaching, to be more like a "single" credential that the Governor's Commission had spoken for--by making the authorizations for all subject areas and services applicable to all grade levels, grades one through twelve; and he clarified other sections. Further, he struck back at the State Board that had worked so hard to defeat him: he returned provisions to the bill that would give the proposed new commission greater autonomy, by including language that made only administrative regulations developed by the new commission subject to Board review. This move, in effect, allowed the new commission to operate almost totally free of State Board control--and would further alienate it. He also angered another special interest group, the driver education community, by reducing considerably the requirements for driver education teachers in school districts.

For his extensive efforts in pursuing a means to effect major reform in teacher preparation and credentialing in California, Ryan had gained considerable state as well as national renown as a fearless and effective political thinker and innovator. As evidence of Ryan's imminent success

with this bill, his co-author Dymally--once nearly an opponent of the bill--offered to sponsor an amendment that would name the law after Ryan, the so-called “tomb stoning” practice of legislative courtesy often carried out by legislators for major pieces of legislation. Ryan, a Democrat, resisted this overture, fearing that such designation could be a negative factor with the Republican Governor. Instead, he suggested that the tombstone provision could be included in a follow-up bill that he planned to introduce after passage of AB 122 that would serve to refine and “clean up” provisions of the preceding bill.

After the extensive and important amendments of June 12, 1970 appeared in print, Ryan contacted the Governor's Commission to point out how many of their changes he had incorporated, even though not all of their recommendations had been fully met. He urged the Commission to support the bill. Ryan and his staff continued cautiously making various relatively minor amendments whenever they felt it necessary without losing the major elements. By June 23, 1970, the bill passed the Senate Education Committee and was sent to the next stage of review, the Senate Finance Committee, which had little difficulty with the bill in the form presented to it and passed it out. The bill then moved to the floor of the Senate. On July 21, 1970, the Senate passed the bill; on July 22, 1970, the Assembly concurred with the numerous amendments made in the bill while it was on the Senate side, and the bill moved on to the Governor’s desk on July 27, 1970. As it awaited the Governor's review, Ryan documented the considerable and broadly based support his bill how had, including among others: several key conservative Republicans; the California Taxpayers League, the CSBA, (tacitly) the CTA, and, most importantly, the Governor’s Commission. Obviously, the Governor’s Commission was of unequaled weight in the crucial political balance of that moment. It was the Governor’s own advisory body, one that he was close to and could trust; furthermore, the fact that it supported AB 122 showed that Ryan has gained more than a semblance of the broad support Reagan had called for in his 1969 veto message.

Opposition persisted, however. The State Board, composed of gubernatorial appointees, marshaled every means at hand to convince the Governor to veto the bill, including a thirteen-page legal analysis of the bill, which reported numerous inconsistencies and defects and recounted the number of times the bill had been changed during its course through

the Legislature. Probably its strongest arguments were that enactment would create a situation fraught with possibilities for jurisdictional battles and impasses if the State Board and the new commission were to disagree on the Commission's new policy adoptions. The State Board's document concluded by indicating that the signing of AB 122 would result in chaos, confusion, inefficiency, and other troubles for the state. State Superintendent Rafferty, a constitutional officer and a Republican, tried to bring his weight to bear to convince the Governor to veto the bill, also predicting chaos. He offered to sponsor a simple bill in the next legislative session that would address the reforms needed. By this time, however, elected official or not, Rafferty had become an anathema to most legislators and an embarrassment to the Republican administration. His efforts counted for little, especially in the impressive support that had been marshaled behind the bill.

On July 30, 1970, Governor Reagan signed AB 122 into law, as the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970--later known as the "Ryan Act." The long saga to enact a major reform milestone was ended, a decidedly new era in state policy and governance structure for educator preparation and credentialing in California was about to begin.

The same forces to enact the Fisher Act in 1961 were at play during the Ryan legislation in 1969-1970. The drive for standards for academic rigor and for simplified credentialing--these account for part of the drive. Other strong forces, in counter reaction to the Fisher Act also served to strengthen the momentum. In July 1973, Ryan--by then a Congressman--outlined these forces by saying that the Ryan Act developed because:

a. Under the previous Fisher Act, the number of credentials in California had proliferated to the point where the legislative analysts were able to identify 340 separate credentials.
b. The cost of credentials for a teacher rose from $8 to $20 in less than ten years.
c. The length of time for issuance of a teaching credential went from less than 30 days to more than nine months in that same ten year period.
d. Most important of all, students themselves and classroom teachers had indicated in the Arnold Report of the State Senate that courses in education on college campuses had little value for the practicing teacher, and the schools of education in the State were requiring an

> incredible number of education courses in order to obtain a credential. (39. Ryan letter, 1973)

Lowery explained the forces this way: he had worked hard in the Senate, along with Doyle in the Assembly to assemble as sponsors of AB 122, a broader panoply of political perspectives than had been true for AB 740. "We tried for a well-balanced bill, politically, for a number of reasons. No one could generate strong opposition to it. We tried to make it a classic case of compromise." (40. Lowery interview, 1971)

Summary

Ryan's analysis, along with Lowery's, give first hand, if partial, perspectives on forces at work in 1970. These forces and interests included: a Legislature wanting to escape criticism it was hearing in abundance about the dysfunction of the Fisher Act; an aggressive and pragmatic legislator seeking prominence; and--far from least--an almost universal desire to see some significant improvement in the public schools themselves, which activists still perceived as possible if teacher preparation itself could only be significantly strengthened. Probably the most potent factor of all, however, was mix of political forces itself. Ryan, as an astute and ambitious state legislator, along with energetic and sophisticated staff consultants, was able despite considerable opposition to act as a focal point and prime mover, to bring together the forces and interests needed to achieve this major piece of legislation.

The Teacher Preparation and Licensing Act of 1970 created a new governance structure and language for California credentialing. It introduced five new principles:

1. It created an independent licensing agency, the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing, composed primarily of educators to oversee the professional preparation and certification of all educators. This was the first agency of its kind in the country.
2. It endorsed the strong emphasis on subject matter preparation, begun in the Fisher Act, and provided a new avenue by which a candidate might demonstrate subject matter competence: by passing a state of course work approved subject matter examination or by completing an approved subject matter preparation program, which "waives" the examination requirement. These two avenues also provide, through

the exam, the opportunity to add additional teaching fields without additional college course work and permitted "supplemental authorizations" to teach a subject in which a teacher had studied eighteen-hours of course work.

3. It created a one credential for all teachers, kindergarten through grade twelve, authorizing teaching assignments by the grade level of the content rather than the age of the students. This one credential also makes possible assignment of teachers in a variety of alternative school organizational patterns.
4. While retaining the "fifth year" requirement for a complete license, it provided the option of completing a teacher education program within a four-year college degree. A teacher candidate has seven years to complete the "fifth year."
5. It created a new language for teaching authorizations: "multiple subjects" for teachers who teach many subjects to a single group of students in a self-contained classroom; and "single subject" for teachers to teach a single content to changing groups of students throughout the school day.

REFERENCES

1. Inglis, Sydney A., "Informal Notes of the Meeting of the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing, Held on October 4-6, 1974, Sacramento, California," pp. 6-7 [prepared for members of the California Council on the Education of Teachers].
2. Undated press release, obtained by the author from the office of Assembly Member Leo Ryan, October 1974.
3. Assembly Interim Committee Reports: Subcommittee on School Personnel and Teacher Qualifications, *The Restoration of Teaching*, Sacramento, CA, pp. 12-13, 1967.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 15.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
8. Joint Committee on Teacher Credentialing Practices. *Transcript of Proceedings*, April 7-8, 1968, pp. 1-3.
9. Legislative Analyst, California Legislature, Sacramento, *Teacher Credentialing*, February 1968, p. 33.
10. Joint Committee. *Transcript of Proceedings*, April 7-8, 1968, pp. 3-20.
11. Lane, Kenneth S. Professional Licensure in Teaching: A History of California's Ryan Act of 1970 (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1979).
12. Joint Committee. *Transcript of Proceedings*, April 7-8, 1968, pp. 21-34.
13. Joint Committee. *Transcript of Proceedings, Part 2*, May 25, 1968, pp. 23-27.
14. James D. Koerner, *The Miseducation of Teachers*. Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1963, p. 82.
15. Lane, *Professional Licensure*, p. 166.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 166-167.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 168.
18. Brott, Ralph E., Jr. The Cyclical Nature of Education Reform: A Case Analysis of Educator Certification in California (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1989).

19. Koerner, *The Miseducation*, p. 256.
20. Lane, *Professional Licensure*, p. 168-169.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 170-171.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 169.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 170.
24. Conant, James B., *The Education of American Teachers*, McGraw-Hill, 1963, p. 15.
25. *Ibid*., p. 203-204.
26. Conant, James B., *Shaping Educational Policy*, McGraw-Hill, 1964, p. 82.
27. Lane, *Professional Licensure*, p. 176.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 177.
29. *Ibid*., p. 180
30. Assembly Bill 740, California Legislature, March 1969.
31. Lane, *Professional Licensure*, p. 207.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 21
33. *Ibid.*, p. 225.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 228.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 231.
36. Inglis, Sydney A., "Oh, Why the Ryan Act?" *California Journal of Teacher Education*, October 1974, pp. 5-6.
37. Governor's Commission on Education Reform, July 28, 1968.
38. Lane, *Professional Licensure*, p. 248.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 267.
40. Letter to the author from U. S. Congressman Leo Ryan, July 7, 1973.
41. Author's telephone interview with Dr. Leroy Lowery, former consultant, Senate Education Committee, December 10, 1971.

Chapter 6
California Establishes an Independent Standards Board Responsible for Teacher Licensing (1971-1980)

Richard K. Mastain

Article 2 of the Statutes describes the composition of the Commission: six public school educators, four of whom must be classroom teachers; four college faculty members, one of whom is from teacher education, and the other three from different academic departments; two school board members, and three private citizens. You are aware of the National Education Association's (NEA) persistent efforts to promote independent professional boards, with a majority of practitioners, since the early 1950s. The NEA sees autonomous professional boards as a must in establishing teaching as a recognized profession.

In Article 1 of the Statutes, the preamble to the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 calls for "broad minimum standards for teacher preparation and licensing to encourage both high standards and diversity . . ."

> *The Legislature finds that highly complex detailed and prescriptive regulations governing the preparation and licensing of teachers and administrators frustrate imagination, innovation, and responsiveness. In addition, the Legislature finds the diversity of functions served by modern education require licensing regulations which are flexible, realistic, responsive, and simple.*

As a teacher educator, you are pleased that the preamble calls for high standards, diversity, imagination, and innovation. However, as you next turn to the Commission's powers and duties, you see a potential conflict between the preamble and some of those powers and duties. You are especially concerned with the seeming conflict between the preamble and subsections (g) and (i) of Section 13114.

> 13114. The duties of the Commission shall be to implement this chapter, to establish and promulgate standards and procedures for certifying educational personnel as qualified for license to

> practice in the public schools of California, and to support, facilitate, and delineate functions and programs of preparation for the teaching profession.

The Commission, consistent with the terms and provisions of this article, shall have the following powers and duties: . . . (g) to develop objective, independently verifiable standards of measurement and evaluation of teaching competence as it relates to teacher licensing . . . (i) to develop objective standards for the identification of specialist teachers.

These two subsections seem to predict a move toward a performance or competency model of teacher preparation. You are well aware of the current trend toward behavioral objectives and competency-based education. In fact, you know of a number of states that have become increasingly prescriptive in the content and intended outcomes of teacher education programs.

You are also concerned with subsection (h), "To develop new or employ existing objective examinations as a measure of subject matter knowledge . . ." You wonder about the reaction of faculty in academic departments, given the turmoil many of them faced with the ever-changing regulations to implement the Fisher academic/nonacademic conflict.

The credential structure, described in Article 4, is considerably different from the Fisher Credential structure. The two major types of credentials, teaching and services seem simple enough. The authorizations of the first type of teaching credentials include four basic kinds: Single Subject, Multiple Subject, Specialist Instruction, and Designated Subjects. The Designated Subjects Authorization is the only familiar term, and seemingly offers a match with Fisher Designated Subject Authorizations. The Single Subject and Specialist Instruction Authorizations are very different in name and in terms of requirements and assignment possibilities from Fisher Credentials, and will undoubtedly cause considerable confusion. The authorizations for the second type, Services Credential, include administration, health, librarian, school counselor, and school psychologist. You know your colleagues will be concerned about the examination route included in the new law for the Administration

Authorization, and the fact that the school counselor is not required to hold a teaching credential. These two issues will be interesting to watch.

The statutes include five requirements to obtain the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Authorization:

1. a Baccalaureate Degree, except in professional education;
2. a fifth year of study;
3. completion of an approved program of professional preparation;
4. verification of subject matter knowledge by examination or completion of a Commission approved subject matter program;
5. verification of knowledge of methods of teaching reading, by examination or a Commission approved program of study.

Article 7 further clarifies the requirements of the program of professional preparation for the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Authorization. The statutes stipulate that the program will be no longer than one-fifth of a five year program; that student teaching will constitute one-half of the program; and that colleges are limited to nine semester-units of professional courses as a prerequisite to student teaching. In addition, California public colleges and universities are required to make provisions for candidates to earn the Preliminary Credential within the four-year degree.

You are aware that these limitations were strongly opposed by the California Council on the Education of Teachers (CCET, a coalition of California educators at diverse levels) and other organizations. However, they are in the law, even though many of your colleagues are not aware of these limitations.

You are vaguely aware of the work of the Department of Education's Committee of Credentials. You know that all cases involving moral turpitude are reviewed by the Committee, and that they can take action to revoke or suspend existing credentials, or deny an applicant. You note that Article 3 calls for the Commission's Committee of Credentials to include seven persons, including four teachers, an administrator, a school board member, and a representative of the public. You wonder if you'll have some role to play in the work of the Committee of Credentials.

You note in subsection 13114 (c) that the Commission will have as a major function the issuance of credentials. In another section (13171.1),

you are made aware that "no (Fisher) credential shall be issued after September 15, 1974." Given the implementation of a second credential system on top of, and in addition to, the Fisher system, you wonder about the potential for confusion and lengthy turn-around time for issuing credentials.

You are aware that one of the first tasks of the new Commission will be to appoint an Executive Secretary, "who shall be exempt from the provisions of the state Civil Service Act." This means the Commission can select its Secretary from among candidates throughout the United States and without any civil service ranking, experience, or tenure. You also notice in the statutes that present employees of the Department of Education, engaged in teacher preparation or licensing activities, can remain with the Department, even though the Department will no longer be responsible for those duties, or request transfer to the new Commission.

You have read about the State Board of Education and its staff's severe opposition to the enactment of the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970. You wonder how that opposition will affect future relationships. You note that the statutes require the Commission to "regularly transmit a report of its findings and regulations to the State Board of Education." You wonder just how much autonomy the Commission has, and the relationships the Commission will have with other agencies and organizations.

It seems to you, as you peruse other sections of the statutes, that there will be special challenges with other issues the Commission is responsible for. Issues such as the evaluation of candidates for Designated Subjects Credentials, which have been handled by University of California, Los Angeles and University of California, Berkeley for many years; the Eminence Credential, which some refer to as the concept that would enable Einstein to teach in a California public school; Emergency Credentials, which provide a "back door" into the profession; additional credentials that various groups will want added; legislation that will impact licensing and teacher preparation; "recommended" vs. credentials on direct application to the state; and a host of other possibilities.

It's time to move from imagining to reality. You realize that you and the other Commissioners are embarking on a journey that is bound to be difficult and frustrating, but hopefully satisfying and successful as well.

The Beginning

The first meeting of the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPL) was held in the Department of Education building March 17-18, 1971. In attendance, and introduced by the Governor's Education Advisor, Dr. Alex Sherriff's, were all of the appointees and three of the ex-officio members. The representative of the UC system was unable to attend, and the representative of the State Superintendent had not yet been named. The initial roster of CTPL included the following members:

Members

Mrs. Barbara D. Anderson, Secondary Teacher & former member of the Committee on Credentials
Mrs. Virginia Braun, Private Citizen
Dr. Conrad Briner, Faculty Member
Mr. John Cimolino, School Board Member
Dr. Jack E. Conner, Faculty Member
Mrs. Kathleen Crow, School Board Member
Mrs. Eunice L. Evans, Private Citizen
Dr. Thomas L. Goodman, School Administrator
Mr. Stanley Green, Private Citizen
Mrs. Marcella T. Johnson, School District Administrator
Mr. Arthur Myers, Elementary Teacher
Mrs. Elaine M. Pfeifer, Elementary Teacher
Miss Mary Ann Stewart, Secondary Teacher
Dr. Harry O. Walker, University Faculty Member
Dr. William L. Winner, University Faculty Member

Ex Officio Members

Dr. Horace F. Crandell, Coordinating Council for Higher Education
Mr. Robert E. Smith, Chancellor's Office, Community Colleges
Dr. Staten W. Webster, Regents of the University of California
Dr. John Baird, Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges

(Not Yet Named), Representative of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (6: March, 1971)

Four of the newly named Commissioners served together as members of the Governor's Commission on Education Reform which had been formed in June, 1969 to provide suggestions and direction to the legislation being proposed by Assemblyman Leo Ryan and other education-related legislation. A fifth member of the Governor's Commission on Educational Reform, Dr. George Gustafson, was also in attendance at the initial meeting, and was asked to attend the future meetings of the Commission on an "on call basis."

The five people who had served on the Governor's Commission on Educational Reform (GCER) had a good idea of the history leading to the passage of the Ryan Act. They were certainly aware that while the GCER supported the Ryan Act, especially the independence of the Commission, the GCER was not successful in eliminating the Life Credential nor allowing nonteaching positions to be filled by un-credentialed persons. They were also aware of the equivocal support of the California Teachers' Association (CTA) for the Ryan Act, and especially for an independent Commission; in fact, the CTA had wanted the CTPL to be completely autonomous. They would remember that the California School Boards Association (CSBA) supported the Ryan Act, but lobbied strongly for a stricter accountability of the CTPL to the State Board, and for greater representation of laymen on the Commission.

It is probable that some of the other new Commissioners, in addition to the GCER members, were aware of the strong, sometimes hostile, position of the State Board on the proposed Ryan Act. In February 1970, prior to final passage of the bill, the major changes demanded by the State Board before it would support Assembly Bill 122, included (14: p. 250):

- appointment of Commissioners by the State Board;
- exclusive ultimate Board control and authority over credential issuance, suspension, revocation, and program approval;
- a study "of feasibility of utilizing an examination system," but without mandating the use of examinations; and
- no specification of maximum units of professional coursework which may be required be a college or university.

The amendments the State Board wanted were essentially the same as the college education deans and the California Council on Teacher Education had recommended. The School Administrators' spokesperson, former Assembly member Gordon Winton, issued a "fact sheet on AB 122" which severely criticized the bill, especially the central importance of the examination system, the nine-unit maximum on professional coursework, and the fact that it contained so many "gray areas" of confusion and uncertainty.

The first order of business was to hear from Governor Reagan; State Board of Education President, Henry Gunderson; recently elected State Superintendent Wilson Riles; and Leo Ryan. Governor Reagan told them that the law dramatically simplifies both standards and the processing of credentials, enables school boards to hire school superintendents who have the necessary training and experience, but do not necessarily hold teaching or Administrative Credentials. Wilson Riles pledged support and stressed "quality" as the most important factor in education. Henry Gunderson quoted Education Code Sections 13117 and 13117.2 which establish the responsibilities of the CTPL to the State Board, and presumptuously announced that the CTPL would be provided with the goals and objectives of the Board "so the two groups could work in harmony." Leo Ryan told the Commissioners, "The Commission is an independent body under the State Board which has responsibility for making decisions." (6: March, 1971)

The other business of the initial meeting included the election of John Cimolino as temporary Chairman; the appointment of a screening committee for the Executive Secretary position; a request that staff of the Department of Education provide secretarial, legal, and other staff functions to the CTPL, as provided in Code Section 13113.1 of the Ryan Act until such time as the CTPL had its own staff; a request for *Ex Officio* Member Crandell to work with other Commissioners and legal staff to draw up a set of operating procedures for the Commission; and an explanation by Dr. Gustafson that the Commission had $25,000 available for expenses for the period through June 30, 1971.

Three of the key developers of the Ryan Act attended the April 15-16, 1971, meeting of the Commission to give the Commission some additional thoughts about its function and future. Dr. James Koerner told of his involvement with Assembly member Ryan and Mr. Doyle, and

how the idea for a California Commission emerged as a result of these contacts. Then, as the minutes of the April 15, 1971 meeting describe, he gave caution, advice, and some suggestions to the Commission:

> *Dr. Koerner advised that "the landscape is littered with advisory commissions" and that proper reform will come only from outside the professional education community . . . Three groups must be placed into the mainstream in decision making for teacher certification reform-elementary and secondary classroom teachers, academic scholars, and laymen.*
>
> In closing, Dr. Koerner stressed: . . . *the importance of having scholars involved in moving toward reform in teacher certification. He stated that a shortcoming of the Commission was the lack of scholars among its members.* (6: April, 1971)

Later in the meeting, Commissioner Barbara Anderson strongly objected to Koerner's statements about the staff of the Department of Education Bureau of Certification, and Commissioner Green asked that his resentment of James Koerner's statement that there were no scholars on the Commission be placed in the minutes. (6: April, 1971)

Dennis Doyle, key staff aide to Assembly member Ryan, began his presentation by paying tribute to Dr. Koerner and his Massachusetts colleagues for the direct and unique contribution they had made toward the creation of the California Commission. Doyle stated that the major thrust of the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Act of 1970 were to establish two avenues through which a person could become a public school teacher in California: (1) passage of an appropriate subject matter examination, or (2) successful completion of an approved institutional subject matter program, in addition to completing a student teaching experience.

In the question and answer period, Doyle was informed that Henry T. Gunderson, President of the State Board of Education, had advised the Commission at its first meeting, that the Board would transmit a statement of its policy and general educational objectives to the Commission in accordance with Section 13117 of the law. Doyle responded by stating that this sounded ominous, and he assured the Commission that the Legislature expected it to be highly autonomous. When asked how the Commission was expected to finance, without

appropriations, the development of an examination system, Doyle explained it was the belief of the Legislature that there are a number of good examinations now in use which can be adopted, and, therefore, cost was not a factor. (6: April, 1971)

Lee Lowery, a key aide to state Senator Albert Rodda, described the lobbying against AB 122 as "tremendous," but now that the bill had become law, it had suddenly become "everybody's" legislation. In answering questions about the authority of the State Board, Lowery said, "The Board cannot tell you anything. They cannot say you shall do thus or so." Dr. Lowery stated that the concept of a diversified or liberal arts major in the new law has been of special interest to Senator Albert Rodda for several years, and that it was first introduced in legislation by him in 1965. He described, as of special concern to Senator Rodda, that very little implementation of this major had been accomplished by colleges and universities to date. "Hopefully," Lowery stated, "the Commission will encourage institutions to develop such majors." (6: April, 1971)

The following day, the Commission discussed and approved the following statement to be sent to the Legislature.

> *The Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 is an Act of long-range effect. The Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing is moving with care and deliberation to implement the provisions of the Act. No substantial provision of the Act has yet been put to a practical test. Therefore, the Commission recommends that the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970 be allowed to stand without amendment until such time as need for amendment becomes apparent through the experience of the Commission, and until the Commission recommends amendment. (6: April, 1971*)

The Commission also heard reports from staff of the Department of Education at the April 15-16, 1971, meeting. The Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification staff prepared a written report, "Proposed Programs and Activities for the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Commission." The Commission also heard a report from the Executive

Secretary of the Committee of Credentials, Mr. Richard Shipp, who reported on the functions of the Committee of Credentials, the types of cases handled, and comparative caseload history. (6: April, 1971)

At the Commission's meeting of April 28-29, 1971, Assembly member Leo Ryan was welcomed for the second time. He presented the historical background of teacher credentialing, and stated that the state should not be involved in the detail of determining how teachers are trained, nor how they do their work in the classrooms of the state.

Commissioner Briner commented that although the law provides for full Commission implementation by January 1, 1973, he believed that Commission members would rather have the Commission become operative sooner than that. He asked if this could be done by assuming responsibilities for specific tasks at an earlier date. Assembly member Ryan stated that, by resolution, the Commission was authorized to take over any part of the law; that it was up to the Commission to determine the priorities for the work to be done.

The following day the newly elected State Superintendent, Wilson Riles, addressed the Commission. Prior to and following Superintendent Riles' presentation, the Commission discussed Assembly Bill 2800, a bill sponsored by the State Board of Education, which would make the Superintendent the Executive Secretary to the Commission, and appointments to the Commission would be made by the State Board upon nomination by the State Superintendent. While the bill was claimed to be not yet in print, the discussion must have raised the level of anxiety about the context of Dr. Riles' address. (6: April 28-29, 1971)

Commissioner Green asked Dr. Riles how AB 2800 would affect the Commission. Riles stated that the Commission would be advisory to the State Board, and its members would be appointed by the Board on the nomination of the State Superintendent.

Commissioner Briner stated he would like to ask Riles' opinion concerning the matter of the Commission being independent. "How do you interpret this?"

> *Riles stated no one is independent, and referred to the Governor and Legislature with the checks and balances which were built into our form of government. He declared that "this Commission and any other commission should have the*

> *freedom to explore and advice and provide recommendations, but independence-no: we will have to work with each other.*

Earlier in his presentation, Riles listed the number of functions that had been removed from the State Department during Rafferty's administration: the State College System, Vocational Rehabilitation, Community Colleges, and the Data Processing Center. Blaming the losses on mismanagement, he charged that the separations had not solved any problems. In closing he stated that:

> *"If you leave the Department, I will cooperate in every way possible, but you cannot expect to have top priority if you should leave," and "Nothing leaves the Department without my opposition."* (6: April 28-29, 1971)

The Commissioners must have been puzzled by Riles' statement, "If you leave . . ." Even though they were meeting in the Department of Education building, and relying on State Department of Education staff, as per Education Code Section 13113.1, the Commissioners had been told by Ryan, Koerner, Doyle, and Lowery, in no uncertain terms, that the Commission was an independent body, other than that the Commission's proposed Title Regulations must be approved by the State Board after January 1, 1973. Prior to that you may "declare all or selected provisions of the Teacher Preparation Law of 1970 to be in effect by resolution." (Section 93 of the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970)

At the May, 1971 meeting, the Chairman of the Screening Committee for the executive secretary position reported that 167 applications had been received from individuals in thirty-six states. A list of seven strong candidates had been selected for further interviews. The Committee had selected three from those candidates for final interview by the Commission. After interviewing the three candidates in Executive Session, the Commission reopened the meeting and announced the appointment of Dr. George Gustafson as the Executive Secretary.

By the May, 1971 meeting, the Commissioners had been advised by Ryan, Doyle, Koerner, and Lowery about their general responsibilities, and by Carl Larson and Blair Hurd of the more specific responsibilities related to licensing and accreditation. Dennis Doyle had alerted the

Commissioners to the time frame of implementing the Ryan Act as stated in Sections 92 and 93 of that Act. They knew that the Ryan Act was to be operative on or before January 1, 1973, later extended to July 1, 1973. They were also aware that they could make operational any section of the Ryan Act before July 1, 1973, simply by passing a resolution. Title 5 Regulations could follow later.

By the May, 1971 meeting, the Commissioners were also aware of their powers and duties, described in Section 13114. These powers and duties formed the basis for the formation of committees and the responsibilities of those committees.

At the May, 1971 meeting, Jack Conner, elected Chair of the April meeting, stated that the work of the Commission would be done in large part through committees. He asked for volunteers to the committees, and on the basis of choice he named the following committees to begin the work of the Commission: the Teacher Education Programs Committee, the Examinations Committee, the Identification of Personnel Committee, and the Budget Committee. During the next few months, he established committees on Licensing, the Evaluation of Teaching Competence, the Committee of Credentials, and the Teaching of Reading. (6: May, 1971)

The Teacher Education Programs Committee and the Evaluation of Teaching Competence Committee were assigned the task of developing standards for the paper and on-site approval of programs of professional preparation; the Examinations Committee was assigned the dual tasks of developing standards for the Verification of Subject Matter Knowledge, via passage of an examination or through completion of a Commission-approved subject matter program; the Committee on the Teaching of Reading was responsible for developing standards for the "knowledge of teaching reading" requirement for the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Authorizations; the Identification of Personnel Committee was responsible for developing procedures to identify people to serve on the Committee of Credentials, and to serve on advisory panels to recommend standards and procedures for the certification of educational personnel; the Committee on Credentials was responsible to set procedures for the transition of the Committee of Credentials from the Department of Education to the Commission; the Licensing Committee was responsible for establishing procedures for the receipt of all credential applications,

and for the issuance of credentials based on college recommendations or on direct application.

During the beginning meetings, the Commissioners heard comments from the various presenters that must have been confusing, as well as comments that, in the future, would prove to be inaccurate.

All of the Commissioners were aware of the multitude of tasks, and the tight time frame for the completion of those tasks.

Developing a System for the Staff Review and On-Site Evaluation of Programs of Professional Preparation

The statutes required the Commission to establish guidelines (standards) for institutions to follow in program development; to review and approve the program document submitted by the college; and, at a later date, to complete an on-site evaluation (accreditation) of the program of professional preparation. While other teaching and services authorizations would be legislated in the future, in 1971, there were twelve teaching and services authorizations which a California accredited institution of higher education (IHE) could offer its candidates. Programs for these twelve authorizations needed to be operational by September 15, 1974.

The Teacher Education Committee, chaired by Commissioner Mary Ann Stewart, was faced with resolving the conflict in the statutes between the preamble calling for "broad minimum standards" and the powers and duties specifying "objective, independently variable standards of measurement and evaluation of teaching competence." The Committee elected to develop guidelines that followed the more prescriptive competency-based model of teacher education. There were a number of reasons for this decision in addition to the existing movement toward performance-based teacher education throughout much of the United States. Ryan, in the San Francisco meeting leading up to the passage of his bill, pointed out that teachers will have the "opportunity and responsibility to demonstrate that teaching performance is measurable in terms acceptable to the teaching profession." (14: p. 156) Ryan's intent was clearly contained in the powers and duties section of the statutes.

The direction toward performance-based teacher education was evidenced in a number of other ways. In May, 1971, following a

presentation by members of the Department of Education's Committee on Accreditation, Chairman Conner stated:

> *The emphasis of the Commission should be primarily on the results of teacher preparation programs rather than upon what is happening on university and college campuses. The Commission's role may be best expressed through the medium of examinations and behavioral objectives.* (6: May, 1971)

At the December, 1971 Commission meeting, it was agreed that the Executive Secretary be directed to develop guidelines for appraising teacher performance as it relates to licensing which is required of the Commission in the Ryan Act. It was specified that the language of such guidelines be constructed in such a way that "lay people may understand." (6: December, 1971)

From mid-1971 through mid-1972, the Committees on Teaching Reading and the Evaluation of Teaching Competency had also been studying the issue of evaluating teaching competence. In October 1971, J. Alden Vanderpool, the CTA representative, made brief comments on what colleges were doing relative to evaluating teacher competence. In November 1971, following a report on interstate reciprocity, it was pointed out that the concept of performance standards could take care of much of the apprehension concerning interstate agreements. During this same time, the Commission was attempting to interest private foundations and federal funding sources to determine those teacher competencies crucial to the teaching of reading to disadvantaged youth. The move to a performance-based model of teacher preparation seems to have been a conscious and unanimous Commission decision.

The general and specific guidelines for the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Authorizations were the first to be developed. These guidelines were developed mainly by Commissioner Stewart and Commission staff. The general guidelines included:

1.0-Institutional Requirements;
2.0-Professional Course Requirements;
3.0-Student Teaching Requirements;
4.0-Professional Competence Requirements and
5.0-Reading Course Requirements.

Each of the general included many specific guidelines. For example, Guideline 1.0-Institutional Requirements required the institution to do the following:

- provide for participation in program planning by teachers and the lay public;
- provide staff development for staff and cooperating (master) teachers;
- provide adequate staff, material, and faculty allocations;
- provide for a systemic program of advising and counseling;
- provide for a final review of each candidate's performance; and
- develop a plan for systematic evaluation of candidates and graduates.

Guideline 4.0 left little doubt about the Commission's position on performance-based teacher education:

> *Teacher preparation programs are recently moving in the direction of competency-based instruction programs . . . programs aimed at developing professional competencies of teachers are encouraged to move in this direction.* (6: June, 1972)

The Commission selected advisory groups to develop the guidelines for the other ten programs of professional preparation. However, the general guidelines 1.0, 2.0, and 4.0 were to be included in the guidelines for all programs of professional preparation. The task of the advisory group was to develop the specific guidelines, appropriate to the teaching or services authorization for which the group was responsible. Each advisory group included college faculty, public school educators, and members of the lay public, all of whom had expertise related to the appointed task.

Following the Commission's approval of guidelines, they were sent to the field for review and written response prior to a public hearing. Following the public hearing and adoption, the Commission staff developed a manual for each specific program of professional preparation. The manual included the general and specific guidelines, along with examples, explanations, and classifications. The manuals were distributed to the IHEs and Commission staff members were

assigned to IHEs to assist in their development of programs of professional preparation. The documents which the IHEs were to submit to the Commission were to be titled "The Program Approval and Review Document" (PARD) for the specified teaching or services authorization.

The Staff Review (Approval) Process

In March 1973, the Commission adopted procedures for the review and approval (or rejection) of the PARDs. Each staff consultant was to review each PARD in accordance with the Commission's guidelines. Staff was to prepare one staff recommendation for each PARD for submission to the Teacher Education Committee for recommendation to the full Commission. In addition, every Commissioner was assigned at least one PARD for review and information.

By January 1974, the Commission had approved forty single subject and forty multiple subject programs of professional preparation. The Commission had received an additional nineteen single subject and nineteen multiple subject PARDs. Two-hundred one (201) specialist and services programs were being developed, but none had yet been received by the Commission for review.

The Commission had the authority to add additional Specialist Instruction Authorizations and did so by adding the Agriculture Specialist and Bilingual/Crosscultural Specialist in 1973. Other authorizations requiring legislation were added, including a bilingual/crosscultural emphasis that could be added as an authorization to a Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Authorization; a Bilingual Certificate of Competence, a Visually Handicapped Specialist Instruction Authorization, and several others. In each case, the Commission developed guidelines and manuals, assisted in program development, reviewed and approved the final PARD. It was a lengthy and time - consuming task for staff of the IHEs and Commission alike.

In May 1973, the Commission received the first written criticism of the guidelines for programs of professional preparation. The academic assembly of the Sonoma State College School of Arts and Sciences declared:

> *That the Teacher Licensing and Credentialing Law of 1970, as interpreted by the Commission and/or staff and provisionally implemented by the proposed professional programs,*

> *places severe restrictions upon the development of academic single subject and multiple subject majors which must be designed t o further implement provisions of the Ryan Act, and that these restrictions create serious reservations about the quality of training, both academic and professional*. (6: May, 1971)

Implied in the Sonoma criticism was the concern for the nine-unit limit on professional coursework. According to Dennis Doyle, imposing the nine-unit limit had met heavy opposition:

> *Schools of education saw the Ryan Act as a direct threat to their very existence. The limit to the number of courses that could be required as prerequisites to admission to student teaching proved particularly galling to the schools of education since it reduced much of their power leverage.* (2: p. 265)

However, the first indication that the members of the California Legislature expressed a concern about the balance between subject matter preparation and professional preparation came from a 1976 Ryan Act Task Force interim report:

> *Further, the question of subject matter competency vs. practical classroom ability has prompted lengthy discussions. The Task Force members question whether or not teaching qualities are being underemphasized. Should oral and/or practical classroom examinations, internships, and in-service training requirements be broadened?* (5: page 2)

This report was a small break through. However, it must have been a very welcomed response by teacher educators who remembered the days of the education major of the 1950s, and the continual emphasis on subject matter preparation since the passage of the Fisher Act in 1961.

In mid-1974, the Department of Finance completed a program review of the Commission, conducted as part of its ongoing evaluation cycle. The objective of the study was to provide the information needed to make sound and rational decisions regarding the future role and

direction of the CTPL. The report of the program review criticized the Commission for not having a majority of programs of professional preparation operational by September 15, 1974. The report recommended that the Commission grant interim approval to programs of professional preparation upon the certification of the president of the institution that the program complies with Commission guidelines, and that the Commission stream line the process for reviewing PARDs, which was done. The Commission responded to the first recommendation by seeking and securing legislation to extend the September 15, 1974, date to September 15, 1976, and extending the approval date of Fisher programs to correspond to the 1976 date. In February 1976, the *ex officio* member representing the UC system, Dr. Gary Fenstermacher, spoke to the concern of the UC system regarding the program approval process:

> *This concern arises out of the complexity of the manuals for program approval. It is recommended that the Commission undertake a simplification of the program review and approval process. Simplifying the program approval process and the External Assessment process should be one of the major tasks to face this Commission over the next year or two.* (6: February, 1976)

In May 1976, Fenstermacher again raised concerns about the program approval process with the following statement:

> *Has the Commission adopted a single philosophy of teacher education? Although the public posture of the Commission is that it does not officially subscribe to a particular philosophy of teacher education, an examination of the Commission's program manuals indicates that the Commission is on record as supporting performance-based teacher education-to the exclusion of many other approaches to the preparation of teachers. Thus it appears that the Commission has adopted, de facto, a behaviorist philosophy of education. Is the Commission willing to be on record as committed to a single philosophy? Is this one-dimensional philosophy commitment consistent with the*

> *intent and spirit of the Ryan Act? Is it proper for this agency to commit itself to an exclusive philosophical position on the education of teachers? Should we not concern ourselves with the encouragement of diversity, with a rich range of program philosophies?* (6: May, 1976)

By June 1976, two-hundred four (204) programs of professional preparation had been approved. The approval of multiple subjects and single subject programs with a bilingual/crossculture emphasis had been approved in fourteen institutions, and three local educational agencies (syn: school district or county offices of education) had been approved to evaluate applicants for Designated Subjects Credentials, and to provide in-service education for holders of a Designated Subjects Credentials. By June 1978, the Commission had approved five-hundred seven (507) programs of professional preparation at seventeen institutions; including 171 multiple and single subject programs, three-hundred nineteen (319) specialist or services programs, and seventeen local education agencies for Designated Subjects Teaching Authorizations.

At the March 1978, Commission meeting, the issue of "encouragement of diversity" was again raised by the *Ex Officio* Commissioner Dr. Irv Hendrick, who had replaced Gary Fenstermacher, when he said to the Commission:

> *Although the Commission does provide for experimental programs, and theoretically all institutions are free to submit such programs under this policy, I fear that the substantial effort to reorient teacher education toward the competency-based behavioral psychology model, and the corresponding rejection of other models, in the early part of this decade may have helped produce a long-term debilitating effect on institutional attempts to build distinctive programs.* (6: March, 1978)

External Assessment: On-Site Approval of Programs

The second stage of the Commission's program approval system was called External Assessment. This process was named External Assessment because the members of the on-site team were external to both the Commission and the IHE undergoing the assessment.

The Commission's introduction to the on-site review of programs of professional preparation occurred at the May, 1971 meeting. Dr. Jim Stone, Chair of the State Board of Education's Accreditation Committee, brought members of the Committee to the meeting. Using a fictitious name for a college that had been though an on-site visit, Stone and the members explained the accreditation procedures. Following the presentation, one of the Commissioners expressed the hope that "the Commission would not add another elaborate campus visitation procedure to the one already carried on by the Department's Accreditation Committee." (6: May, 1971)

The Department's Accreditation Committee continued to do on-site visits during the 1971- 72 school years. The Commission, at the request of the State Board of Education, requested funds for the Accreditation Committee to continue on-site visits in the 1972-73 school years. However, the Department of Finance denied the request. In December 1972, the State Board passed a resolution which recognized the Commission as the agency now responsible for accreditation; terminated the Accreditation Committee as of December 15, 1972; and praised the work of the Accreditation Committee and all who had served on accreditation teams during the thirty-year history of the Department's accreditation efforts. In January 1973, the Commission granted approval until September 1974, of all previously accredited programs. Later, the Commission successfully sought legislation which authorized them to approve those (Fisher Act) programs to September, 1976.

In January 1975, the Commission held an External Assessment Design Conference. Persons from identifiable constituencies of teacher preparation programs, state and national accreditation bodies, and specialists in evaluation were invited. The participants of the Design Conference recommended process standards for a discrepancy model of program evaluation; the on-site team of assessors would determine how closely the college had implemented the program submitted to and approved by the Commission. The recommendation for the discrepancy model of program evaluation was approved by the Commission, along with other recommendations regarding the composition of the on-site teams, the procedures for gathering information, and the format for reporting findings to the IHE and the Commission.

Four IHEs went through Pilot Phase I of External Assessment in February and March of 1975: UC, Irvine; Sonoma State College; CSU, Long Beach; and Point Loma College. In April, representatives of the four IHEs and members of the on-site teams made a presentation to the Commission of their perceptions of the External Assessment process. Dr. Brian Shears, Chairman of the Sonoma State College's Department of Education, was the most critical of the External Assessment process when he told the Commission:

- *Sonoma was the first institution to become involved with the External Assessment process. It was too hasty a process, poor communication and organization . . . rating scales are confusion, and there are erroneous ratings.*
- *written report was disappointing in quality and erroneous in content . . . faculty members' complaints focused on the untrained, unprepared evaluators.*
- *what is needed is better planning sessions and training . . . the institution did receive constructive criticism.* (6: April 1975)

The representatives of the other three IHEs--Dr. John Nelson of CSU, Long Beach, Dr. Ken Bailey of UC Irvine, and Dr. Philip Fitch of Point Loma College--expressed some of the same concerns as Dr. Shears. There was agreement among all four about the lack of training of the assessors, need for a better time frame for completing the assessment, and a need for improved communication with all involved in the process. They also made positive points about external assessment. Dr. Bailey told the Commission:

> *The External Assessment is miles ahead of anything he has ever been involved with. Concepts are good . . . basically effective for staff in-service.* (6: April, 1975)

The members of the on-site teams found fault with the time required to do interviewing, the interview form, the lack of communication from the Commission staff as to the time the assessment process would take, and the difficulty of securing information from candidates, some of whom were still in Fisher programs, and some of whom were in Ryan

programs. The members of the on-site teams were pleased that their constituency (student, teacher, administrator, college faculty) were included on the teams. (6: April, 1975)

There were other critics of the external assessment process who questioned a system that measured the degree to which the college's program met the Commission's guidelines, but did not measure the quality of individual candidates. There were also critics of the guidelines as being too prescriptive. It was a time that the Commission felt that it desperately needed a successful External Assessment effort. However, the results of Pilot Phase I of External Assessment "hurt the Commission's credibility at a time when it needed it most." (15: p. 52)

Following the presentations of Pilot Phase I, the Commission directed staff to develop plans for Pilot Phase II. A redesign conference of institutional and constituency spokespersons, acting upon the results and evaluation of the first pilot year, developed plans for a second pilot year during which the multiple and single subject programs at nine IHEs would be assessed.

Following the External Assessment of the nine IHEs, staff summarized the activities involved and everything learned in Pilot Phase II into a final report that also included recommendations and implementation of Pilot Phase III. This report was presented to the Commissioners in June 1976, for their review prior to a presentation to the full Commission by those involved in Pilot Phase II at the July meeting. Those speaking to the Commission at the July meeting had also received a copy of the final report. Following the presentation, a question was raised about a request from the field for a moratorium on External Assessment. Representatives of two institutions which had been assessed in Pilot Phase II, Dr. Joe Shieffer of CSU, Northridge and Sister Alice Tabriner of the College of Notre Dame, indicated that "most of the problems experienced by the teams have been met in plans for Pilot Phase III." (6: July, 1976)

In August 1976, Blair Hurd was promoted to Director of Teacher Education and Licensing, and Dr. Richard Mastain was named the New Chief of Programs. Mastain's first task was to hire a person to coordinate the External Assessment process. Hurd, LoPresti, and Mastain agreed to hire Dr. Philip Fitch of Point Loma College. Fitch's college had been through external assessment, he had served as an on-site team member in

Pilot Phase II, he was respected by his teacher educator colleagues, and he had excellent people skills. In brief, he would help to build trust in the External Assessment process.

The recommendations and implementation of Pilot Phase III were approved by the Commission. These recommendations included a quality dimension in External Assessment that would be reported to the IHE, but not considered in determining approval of the program. Other recommendations included the assessment team structure (eight persons to assess each program); the identification of four priority areas (community and institutional resources, advising and evaluation, field experiences, and professional competencies); institutional alternatives (the option to propose alterations of assessment); building an assessor pool and minimizing potential conflict; the assessment time frame; the report development process; the training process; and the development of an *Assessment Handbook.*

In September 1976, workshops were held in northern and southern California for institutions of higher education participating in Pilot Phase III. During Pilot Phase 111, fifty-eight credential programs, including multiple and single subject and specialist and services were assessed at twelve IHEs.

Commissioners Jack Evans, Mary Ann Stewart, Harold Wilson, and Leo Cain observed External Assessment first hand at one or two of the twelve institutions. The Chair of the Programs Committee, Stanley Green, observed external assessment at three IHEs, and told the Commission at the May, 1976 meeting, “The Commission is being well served by this process.” (6: May, 1977) The comments of the other Commissioners who had observed during Pilot Phase III were also very positive. Commissioner Stewart, who had worked with staff in developing the Assessment Handbook, attended the External Assessment at the University of the Pacific and “found it fascinating.” She also commended the staff for their “admirable restraint with difficult situations.” (6: May, 1977)

Pilot Phase III was considered by the Commission as a success, and this was based on the quality of the reports and first-hand observation by many Commissioners.

Seventy-five (75) programs at thirteen IHEs went through External Assessment in 1977-78, and eight programs at four were reassessed. The

Commissioners continued to observe the process and, with a few exceptions, thought the process continued to be good to excellent. The comments from the IHEs being assessed were generally positive, although not as laudatory as that of Dr. Philip Vairo, Dean of the School of Education at CSU, Los Angeles:

> *The assessment process was managed par excellence by Dr. Fitch . . . We are also indebted to Dr. Sid Inglis . . . as our staff consultant and the expertise he provided during external assessment.*

Commissioner Raquel Muir, following her experience as Co-Chairman of a National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) evaluation team, reported to the Commission: "The Commission is doing an exemplary job in external assessment . . . and I'm extremely proud of the Commission's external assessment." (6: April, 1978)

However, critics of external assessment, both within and outside the Commission, were emerging. In April 1978, Commissioner Carolyn Denham, herself a university administrator, asked that the Commission reconsider its discrepancy model for external assessment. She suggested that assessors look for discrepancies between programs and Commission guidelines, rather than discrepancies between approved program plans and the present operation of the program. Several members of the Legislature had expressed concerns about the size of the visiting teams, the cost to the Commission and the IHEs, and the lack of the Commission's evaluation of the performance of program graduates. At the August 1978 meeting, the Commission was told that the control language in the 1978-79 budget recommended that the Commission submit to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee an adequate plan by October 1, 1978, "to evaluate programs and performance of persons credentialed by the Commission." (6: August, 1978)

Much of the criticism within the Legislature stemmed from a member of the Legislative Analyst's staff who had observed one external assessment for part of a day, and confirmed the biases which she brought with her. In sharp contrast to that, there were strong CTPL staff views that the Commissioner and staff had worked diligently to improve external assessment each step along the way; that nearly every member

of the on-site teams felt very good about their participation and about the efficacy of the process; that the final reports had improved in content and accuracy each year; and, finally, that college staff felt external assessment, while still too cumbersome, was a fair and open process. With so much effort by so many people, CTPL staff felt that it would be a legislator or an emissary of the Legislature to, at the least, observe an external assessment throughout the full three days of the process.

Given the concerns raised by Commissioner Denham and the Legislature, and at the suggestion of the Legislative Analyst, the Commission entered into a special series of small research contracts with Dr. Michael Scriven, Director of the Evaluation Institute at the University of San Francisco. The research was to take place during the 1978-79 year of external assessment.

The coordination of external assessment during the 1978-79 year was assigned to CTPL staff member, Dr. David Greene, following the completion of Dr. Fitch's two-year leave of absence from Point Loma College. The work load was reduced to the assessment of forty-four programs at twenty-two colleges. Of these, twenty-five programs underwent initial assessment and nineteen programs were reassessed.

In November 1978, Dr. Denham presented a paper to the Commission regarding her views of what external assessment should be. She had also presented her proposal to the members of the California Council on the Education of Teachers at its annual meeting the preceding month. Executive Secretary LoPresti assigned staff members Dr. Alan Jones, Dr. Paul Finkbeiner, and Dr. Robert Kane to work with Dr. Denham in preparing a staff analysis of her proposal. (6: November, 1978)

In early 1978, the Commission received an analysis of the Agency's 1979-80 budget by the office of the Legislative Analyst. The analysis was critical of several aspects of the Commission's operation, including external assessment. Staff believed the analysis was so flawed that Bur Hurd and several other staff members prepared a 60-page statement outlining the errors and obviously biased statements of the Legislative Analyst staff member who prepared the report. (The same staff member who had spent a half-day observing external assessment.) Executive Secretary LoPresti reported the following to the Commission in April, 1979:

> *The detailed response to the analysis which we prepared, and which was shared with you at the last Commission meeting, has served as a very constructive vehicle for a series of meetings we have had with the Legislative Analyst, staff from the Department of Finance, and the Legislative budget committees, as well as several key legislators.*
> *Chuck Moss, Dick Mastain, and I met personally with Mr. William G. Hamm, the Legislative Analyst, and members of his staff, and carefully reviewed all of the issues raised in the analysis by that office. . . . We have been able to work out a series of recommendations for the 1979-80 budget which are far more agreeable and equitable to our agency.* (6: April, 1979)

However, the Commission was directed by budget control language to again submit an external assessment redesign plan by December 31, 1979, with the stipulation that the redesign must be approved by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the Department of Finance prior to that date in order for the Commission to spend funds on external assessment beyond January 1, 1980. (6: April, 1979)

In July 1979, the Commission approved a plan entitled "Developmental Activities for 1979-80 Assessment." The plan included plans for a Critical Analysis Workshop to be held August 15-18, 1979. Participants for the Critical Analysis Workshop were selected for their established reputation in the field of program evaluation. The format for the Critical Analysis Workshop was to devote days one and two to the critical analysis of the Scriven reports, the Denham proposal, and staff recommendations. Day three was a joint meeting between members of the evaluation group, members of the CTPL Programs Committee, Scriven, and staff to allow the evaluation group to present their conclusions and recommendations and allow for discussion by all parties involved.

Following the Critical Analysis Workshop, staff worked with a cadre of the evaluators (an evaluation advisory board) to develop the External Assessment and Redesign Plan. The Plan was submitted to the Programs Committee in September by staff, along with members of the evaluation

advisory board, and following revisions, the Plan was approved by the Programs Committee in October, adopted by the Commission in November, and submitted to the Legislature and Department of Finance in mid-November, 1979.

In December 1979, CTPL Coded Correspondence 79-8035, "Plans for Program Approval and Evaluation," was sent to the field. The Plan, reflecting many of the recommendations from the Critical Analysis Workshop, and including recommendations from Commissioner Denham's proposal, focused on three major components: (1) the evaluation will be carried out by small teams of external constituents and based on compliance with Commission requirements considered absolutely necessary for the preparation of public school personnel; (2) the evaluation of the preparation of graduates of programs and their performance, required of all preparation institutions and monitored by the Commission; and (3) a program document, reduced to those requirements considered to be absolutely necessary for the preparation of public school personnel.

In January 1980, the Commission held regional workshops to explain in detail all aspects of the Plan and related changes in Commission policies and procedures. The response to the Redesign Plan was positive from the Legislature, the Department of Finance, teacher preparation faculty, and the Commission's constituent organizations.

In reflecting on the activities of the Commission during the 1970s, former Commissioners Marcella Johnson and Stan Green expressed to the author that External Assessment was one of the Commission's finest accomplishments. They both felt that the Commission refined and improved the system each year, that the Commissioners and staff grew tremendously in the process, and that the foundation for a continually improving Program Evaluation system had been established (19 & 20. Interviews in April, 1994).

Developing Measures for the Verification of Subject Matter

The Ryan Act provided for two ways to verify subject matter knowledge: the primary avenue was passage of a subject matter examination. The secondary avenue was the completion of a subject matter program approved by the Commission. The Commission's task

was twofold: (1) to develop an examination system; and (2) to set standards for the development and approval of subject matter programs.

Developing an Examination System Without Funds

The original intent of Leo Ryan and Dennis Doyle was to have every applicant for a teaching credential verify subject matter knowledge by passing an examination. However, other legislators, such as Senators Rodda and Dymally, would not support AB 122 (the Ryan Act) unless there was an alternate avenue to verify subject matter knowledge. The California Teachers' Association would only support an examination system if there was also an alternate route. The alternate route became the completion of a subject matter program at an institution of higher education approved by the Commission. The alternative to the examination was called a "waiver" program because it waived the examination for the applicant.

The two major tasks were assigned to the Examination Committee. The goal of the Examinations Committee and the Commission was to complete these two tasks by the operative date of the Ryan Act-July 1, 1973. The Commission was also cognizant of the date of September 15, 1974, at which time students who could not reasonably complete the requirements for a "Fisher Act" Credential became subject to the provisions of the Ryan Act. The Examination Committee's work plan included the formation of an advisory panel to develop a "Scope and Content" statement for each subject field in which the statutes required an examination.

The Commission invited nominations for advisory panels from the institutions of higher education, district and county superintendents, teacher-related organizations, legislators, the California PTA, the Anti-defamation League of B'Nai B'Rith, the NAACP, California Indian Educators Association, National Urban League, the Association of Mexican American Educators, the Japanese-American Citizen League, the Intertribal Council of California, and other interested citizens. (6: November, 1971)

From more than 500 nominations, the Commission selected advisory panels to develop Scope and Content Statements for the Multiple Subjects Teaching Authorization, for each of the eleven Single Subject Teaching Authorizations, for the Administrative Services and the Pupil

Personnel Services Authorizations, and for the Knowledge of Teaching Reading requirement. Additional advisory panels were added in 1973 when the Legislature separated the Physical and Natural Science Single Subject Credential into Physical Science Single Subject and Life Science Single Subject. Also, in 1973, one of the members of the advisory panel for the Social Science Scope and Content, Assembly member Mike Antonovich, proposed legislation, which was passed, to add two additional single subjects, History and Government. Legislation in 1974 added Agriculture as a single subject, bringing the total to fifteen single subjects.

Subject Matter Advisory Panels were charged to submit their recommendations regarding the existence or absence of suitable examination by January, 1973. (9: 1971-72)

Upon the completion of each Scope and Content Statement by an advisory panel and acceptance by the Examination Committee and the Commission, a public hearing was held. Following the public hearing, the Commission either adopted the Scope and Content Statement or returned it for revision. After the Scope and Content was formally adopted by the Commission, an advisory panel was asked to review the examinations in the Commission offices to determine the existence or absence of a suitable examination. Early on, the Commission had established the Exam and Measurement Panel, a group of test experts, to also review the Scope and Content Statements and assist in the review of possible examinations.

In July 1971, the Examination Committee directed staff to do a survey of existing examinations. On the basis of that survey, twenty publishers were contacted and two-hundred twenty-three (223) examinations were acquired for review by the advisory panels. Very few of the advisory panels were satisfied with an existing examination and recommended that new examinations be developed. An exception was the Multiple Subjects' Advisory Panel, which found one examination that came close to matching the Scope and Content Statement. A documented analysis of the Commons Examination of the National Teacher's Examination indicated that, with strengthening, the examination possessed the potential for use. (6: December, 1971) Also, the advisory panel to develop a Scope and Content Statement (SCS) for the Teaching of Reading Examination recommended the adoption of an

existing examination. The Commission concurred and the examination was adopted, with slight changes, with the contractor bearing the cost of modification. As of January 1974, two examinations were available for utilization on an interim basis; nine SCSs had been adopted; three SCSs were about to go to a public hearing; two advisory panels, mathematics and social science, had been replaced with newly selected advisory panels who were now in the early stages; two advisory panels, history and government, were just beginning; and one advisory panel, agriculture, was yet to be selected.

Recognizing the inadequacy of existing examinations, in 1971, the Commission requested, for its 1972-73 budgets, a general loan fund to develop examinations. Funds were not provided, and the Commission was faced with adopting an interim plan.

In June 1972, the Commission issued a request-for-proposals (RFP) to administer an examination system. In December 1972, a contract to administer the examination system was signed with the Educational Testing System (ETS), owners of the National Teacher Examination (NTE). In July 1973, the Commission adopted the National Teachers Examinations for the interim Examination System “with the proviso that the Commission may replace those examinations with others at any time in the future.” (6: June, 1973)

In October 1973, the common and area examinations of the NTE were adopted until December, 1974. Each succeeding year, thereafter, through 1979, the Commission, without funds, had little choice but to adopt the NI'E for another year.

In adopting the National Teacher Examinations, the Commission was disappointed with the lack of match between the SCSs and the area examinations. The disappointment was magnified by the fact that the carefully selected advisory panels had worked with diligence and dedication, and yet the efforts of the advisory panels, the Examination Committee, and the Commission had resulted in a less than satisfactory product. The Commission recognized that a large chunk of its credibility rested on the perceived effectiveness of the examination system. The Commissioners must have remembered Doyle’s response to a Commissioner’s question at the April, 1971 meeting, of how the Commission was expected to finance an examination system. Doyle

explained, "It was the belief of the Legislature that there are a number of good examinations now in use which can be adopted." (6: April, 1971)

Individuals and organizations which had severely criticized the concept of an examination system prior to the passage of AB 122 were often ready to say "I told you so." James Koerner, who supported a system of qualifying examinations which would demonstrate field mastery, wanted an examination system that would require "an emphasis on the essay and demonstration examination." Koerner discussed the National Teacher Examinations, and found them severely lacking: "If a better instrument than the NTE cannot be developed for examining prospective teachers, perhaps we should abandon the whole idea." (14: p. 252).

Criticism of the slowly developing examination system was not confined to critics outside of the Commission. In May 1972, CTPL Chairman Conner was already admitting the limitations of the examination system.

> *Our advisers say that none of the tests they have studied are good enough. Maybe some new ones will have to be invented. For the time being we will use examinations that already exist, just to get going; we have to be ready with the whole series of examinations before July, 1973. Meanwhile, we will be searching for better exams, and maybe making up new ones.*
>
> *The first thing that comes to mind is the machine-graded multiple-choice test. Its best feature is its speed of reporting grades. Its second best feature is that it can't know the examinee personally. There's a lot of opposition to tests of that kind, because some say that they test facts but not understanding. Having made up tests for many years, and having taken tests of all kinds, I have little confidence in any test. Some of the machine- graded ones aren't bad. It depends on the mind of the maker. (1: p.* 23)

In 1972, the Commission requested funds for fiscal year 1973-74 to develop examinations. Those funds were made available in the form of a

loan of $342,000. It was estimated this amount would be needed to modify some examinations and to develop new ones where no existing examinations were available. Bids were let and because the actual costs were double the anticipated cost the Commission rejected all bids and decided to use the NTE program on a two-year interim basis. The unexpectedly high cost of developing examinations caused the Commission to significantly alter its examination specifications in an attempt to lower costs.

In September 1974, the Commission received a strong message from the legislative conference committee in response to a request for examination development funds:

> *It is recommended that the Commission curtail its expensive examination development program in favor of a program directed towards modifying existing examinations.*
>
> And that:
>
> *The Commission administers such examinations as a secondary alternative, rather than as the primary system for credentialing teachers.* (6: September, 1974)

About the same time the Commission received a report from the Department of Finance. The report was the result of a program review of the CTPL, and was conducted as a part of the ongoing evaluation cycle by the Department of Finance, intending to serve as a status report of the implementation of the Ryan Act. The Department of Finance recommendations related to the Examination System included the following:

> *In the case of reading an existing examination which was adopted with slight changes and the contractor bearing the cost of modification. We recommend the Commission further negotiate with contractors who are unwilling to absorb the cost of modifying existing examination. We recommend the Commission adopt the existing examinations without modifications until demand and legal ramifications can be determined on an empirical basis.* (18: p.19)

However disappointing the recommendations of the conference committee and the Department of Finance were, the Commission continued to request funds from the Legislature for examination development. The only success was the authorization in 1975-76 to budget $50,000 from its own Teacher's Credential Fund to develop an examination for the Agriculture Single Subject. There were no acceptable examinations in history or government and none were ever developed.

The Commission established cut-off (passing) scores for the common examination of the NTE in January, 1973 and a composite score. The composite score was later dropped and a liberal appeal policy was adopted.

In November 1974, the Commission adopted cut-off scores for the area examinations at the scaled score representing the 50th percentile of the national data supplied by Educational Testing Service. (6: November, 1975)

Prior to the adoption of the cut-off scores, a member of the Examinations Committee expressed the frustration that many other commissioners must have felt:

> *Committee adoption of this recommendation was done with great pain and suffering-with no confidence that we were making a permanent decision that was correct. It seemed that some decision was necessary and that this was the best one we could come to at this time. We are not making this recommendation with any enthusiasm, and we are hoping to accumulate an experience table that will induce us to change it if appropriate in the near future.* (6: November, 1975)

In light of the Commission's concern about the efficacy of the cut-off scores, it also adopted a liberal appeal policy for the area examinations. The foreword of the appeal process conveyed a message of empathy by stating:

> *Recognizing that on some occasions, individuals who in fact have "minimum subject matter knowledge" are unable to achieve a passing score on Commission adopted examinations and recognizing that minimum subject matter knowledge may*

> *be demonstrated in any number of ways. The following criteria will be included in the appeal process.* (6: June, 1976)

The Department of Finance Report to the Commission in 1974 had carried warnings about legal opposition to the examinations. The Commission and the Educational Testing Service both recognized the need for studies to validate the examinations. In 1976, the CTPL approved $20,000 for a study to establish valid cut-off scores. (6: November, 1976)

In the spring of 1977, the Commission began a limited validity study of the common examinations, and three area examinations. Ninety (90) public school teachers and one-hundred forty-two (142) college professors from throughout the state were called together to review test items on two counts: (1) does the item relate to the adopted Scope and Content Statement; and (2) does the test item require knowledge that is crucial to the teaching of the subject in question? Additional validity studies were conducted in 1978 and 1979 of the most frequently used examinations. The results of these validity studies indicated a high correlation between the content of the examinations and the Scope and Content Statements; and that the examinations did measure the knowledge areas for which they were offered. (9: 1977-78, 1978-79)

In early 1979, the Commission adopted new and significantly different Title 5 Regulations for appeal upon failure to pass a subject matter examination. The new appeal regulations, much more stringent than the initial ones, enabled an applicant who had failed a subject matter examination to file a petition of appeal on the grounds of fraud, discrimination, clerical error in scoring, or other improper acts or circumstances related to the administration of the examination, and also allowed an applicant who failed a subject matter examination, and who did not meet the appeal standards outlined above, to request to be examined by a board of examiners. The new appeal provisions seemed to reflect the Commission's increasing confidence that the cut-off scores, based on five years' experience, were correct, or at least very close. (CTPL Coded Correspondence No. 78-7951, April, 1979)

In May 1979, the Commission adopted Title 5 Regulations that required every applicant for a Single Subject Credential in French, German, or Spanish to pass an oral proficiency examination; every

applicant for a Single Subject Credential in English to pass a writing proficiency examination; and every applicant for a basic teaching credential who had not been recommended for such credential by a Commission-approved college to pass an English writing proficiency examination.

During the period July, 1974 through June 30, 1979, a total of 75,000 candidates took examinations as a possible route to qualify for a California Teaching or Administrative Services Credential. Approximately 29,000 of those candidates scored at a level where they could use the examination results as the basis for receiving a credential or receiving an added authorization to an existing credential.

The examination system incurred only a few legislative changes during the 1970s. In 1979, statutes were passed to eliminate the examination route for the Administrative Services Credential, legislation that had been proposed in 1975 by the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) and by the CTPL in November, 1976.

During the years 1971-79, hundreds of public school teachers, administrators, college and university faculty, and lay citizens served on advisory panels, and hundreds more attended one of the thirty public hearings held on Scope and Content Statements and other examination related issues. In order to keep its constituents informed, the Commission mailed over 60 separate pieces of examination related correspondence to an audience of more than 2,000 individuals, school districts, county offices, college deans and presidents, education-related organizations, and interested citizens.

In 1994, Dick Mastain, former Executive Secretary of the agency, reflected:

> *"Whatever judgment is made of the examination system, the Commission acted decisively, openly, forthrightly and with dedication to purpose; even though the Commission recognized, probably more so than anyone else, the shortcomings of the NTE. The Commission and its staff learned a great deal during those years about the strengths and weaknesses of the examination system, learning that, perhaps one day, would lead to an examination system that included a variety of assessment procedures, including essay type questions and demonstration of performance."* (17: 1994)

Policies for the Development and Approval of Subject Matter (Waiver) Programs

The Ryan Act specified that the Commission would "waive" the subject matter examination when the candidate completed a Commission-approved subject matter program. These included the diversified liberal studies program for the Multiple Subjects Authorization and the subject matter programs for all of the Single Subject Authorizations.

The Scope and Content Statement for the selection or development of the diversified liberal studies (DLS) examination was adopted in February 1972, and the commons examination was adopted in May 1972. In March 1972, Senator Rodda, Chairman of the Senate Education Committee, spoke to the Commission on the history and background of the diversified liberal studies major. He felt very strongly that DLS degree was the appropriate major for elementary teachers. In exchange for his support of Assembly Bill 122, he had insisted on two inclusions: (1) an alternative to the examination; and (2) the diversified liberal studies major for elementary teachers. (6: March, 1972)

During the hearings on AB 122 in San Francisco, Senator Rodda had expressed strong feelings about the diversified liberal studies degree. He related that several years of effort had been made by the Legislature to persuade colleges to actually offer a diversified or liberal arts major. He noted bitterly that those effects went back at least to 1961, and he suggested that the college was deliberately obstructing the will of the Legislature. In response, representatives from several state colleges had pointed out that the Chancellor's Office would not approve the granting of a Bachelor's Degree based upon diversified liberal studies major. It was also pointed out that the diversified major was not acceptable for admission to many graduate schools.

The Commission was also faced with the strong feeling that many IHE faculty members had questions or concerns regarding the development of new subject matter and professional preparation programs. However, higher education faculty reaction to the examination was even less enthusiastic than to subject matter programs and their wish were to provide their candidates with an avenue other than the examination.

At the April, 1973 meeting, the Commission had authorized the Examinations Committee to review the diversified liberal studies programs on the basis of the eighty-four semester-units that were to be equally distributed among the following four areas:

1. English, including grammar, literature, composition, and speech;
2. Mathematics and the physical or life sciences;
3. Social sciences, other than education and education methodology; and
4. Humanities and the fine arts including foreign languages.

In implementing the provisions of this section, the Commission may provide for a three semester-unit variance in any of the four areas required.

By June 1973, 16 IHEs had submitted their DLS programs for review. By July 1975, the D/LS programs in 60 IHEs had been granted waiver status. (9: 1974-75).

At the December, 1972 meeting, the Commission accepted the recommendation of the Examinations Committee that the subject matter content of the single subject waiver programs conform to the Scope and Content Statement for the specified subject.

By November 1973, the Commission had approved the SCSs for only seven single subjects. The Commission made special provisions for those single subject waiver programs in which a SCS was not yet adopted. As a temporary measure until the SCS were completed, the Commission granted a waiver to candidates holding ay subject matter degree which the institution judged to be reasonable preparation to teach the subject in public schools of California. (6: November, 1973)

In response to the interim waiver policy, colleges often submitted subject matter programs that were not new, but rather had been developed to meet the Fisher requirements. It was not unusual for an IHE to submit 10 to 15 degree programs and verify that each of these degree programs provided appropriate preparation for a specific single subject credential. An excerpt from the Commission's July, 1974 Minutes shows the submission of fifteen degree programs verified by one IHE as providing appropriate preparation for the Social Science Single Subject Authorization. (6: July, 1974)

Degree Programs Submitted for the Single Subject Social Science Authorization

American Studies	History
Anthropology	Latin American Studies
Asian Studies	Philosophy
Child Development	Political Science
Comparative	Psychology
Cultures	Sociology
Economics	Speech & Hearing
Environmental Studies	Urban Studies

In response to a query from the Commission regarding the interim waiver policy, the Office of the Attorney General told the Commission that the statutes required the Commission to request additional information about each subject matter waiver program. This decision prompted the Commission, in March 1974, to adopt a policy for waiver programs (to become known as the Permanent Waiver Policy) that was to become effective after July 1, 1975. This policy required the colleges to secure the advice of a consultant group composed of public school teachers of the subject; to use the State Department of Education's curriculum framework, along with the Scope and Content Statement, to determine the appropriateness of the subject matter waiver program; and to assure a reasonable breadth of subject matter coverage within the relevant single subject category.

At the January, 1975 Commission meeting, *Ex Officio* Commissioner Dr. Gary Fenster-macher reported that among the faculty and representatives of the University of California, the matter of greatest consternation was the Commission's Permanent Waiver Policy.

> *There is a degree of conflict and disagreement among the Universities' various campuses and between academic departments. The permanent Waiver Policy does not seem to be detrimental, but does seem to set a precedent for other forms of intervention into the degree programs of the University. It would appear to be safe to assume that the University of California is responsive and sympathetic to the Commission's need to evaluate the activities of the program off*

> *teacher preparation, but the technique to be used is questioned.* (6: January, 1975)

Following the July 1, 1975 operational date of the Permanent Waiver Policy, the review and approval of subject matter programs became more stringent. Staff was required to complete a multiple-criterion form in the review of each waiver program that became a part of the Examinations Committee's agenda each month.

In March 1976, the Commission revised the Title 5 Regulations on waiver programs. The revision was directed to subject matter categories which included several distinct disciplines such as life science, physical science, social science, and English. The IHE was required to develop the program so that the candidate completing a major in one discipline (such as physics) would have to study in other disciplines within the category of physical science (chemistry, earth science) to the extent of at least half the study in the major discipline.

At the May 1976 meeting, *Ex Officio* Commissioner Gary Fenstermacher raised the issue of IHEs granting equivalence to waiver programs when he stated:

> *Has the Commission adopted an official stance on the matter of equivalence t o waiver programs? It seems that the Commission is slowly but surely legitimating the notion that institutions may certify academic preparation equivalent to an approved waiver program-despite a clear rejection of this procedure by the Planning and Evaluation Committee a few months ago. Of course, it has been necessary to provide for out-of- State students. Yet, could it not be that by providing equivalence for out-of-State candidates, we are placing California students at a disadvantage by requiring of them either examination or the exact waiver program as approved?* (6: May, 1976)

Fenstermacher went on to suggest that to require all candidates to take the examination who had not completed an approved waiver program would be a more fair and consistent practice.

By the end of the 1970s, the Commission had approved diversified liberal studies waiver programs in nearly all of the 70 IHEs with

approved professional preparation programs. However, the approval of single subject waiver programs was quite another story. While 1,400 waiver programs had been approved under the very liberal interim waiver policy, only five-hundred thirty-one (531) single subject waiver programs were approved under the more stringent Permanent Waiver Policy. The "conflict and disagreement" reported by *Ex Officio* Commission Fenstermacher at the July, 1975 Commission meeting, was reflected in the small number of single subject waiver programs submitted by the nine campuses of the University of California, who averaged less than five single subject waiver programs per campus as compared to an average of twelve single subject waiver programs per campus for the California State University and College system. (9: 1979-80)

In late 1979 and early 1980, the Commission staff did a study of 531 single subject waiver programs to determine the match between the detailed courses required for completion of the subject matter waiver program, and the courses commonly taught in the public schools. The major finding of that study was as follows:

> *While all waiver programs met the Title 5 Regulations and the Commission's present (permanent) waiver policy, many had little match between the courses required for completion of a single subject waiver program and courses commonly taught in the public schools.*

Great effort and time were expended by the Commissioners and Commission staff in setting standards and procedures for the development, review, and approval of waiver programs. In addition, many colleges made commendable efforts to develop waiver programs. However, the results were far from satisfactory for either the Commission, the IHEs, or for the teacher candidates.

The interim waiver policy, in effect prior to July 1, 1975, met the intent of the preamble of the Ryan Act: "Broad minimum standards . . . to encourage both high standards and diversity. . ."

However, many of the 1,400 single subject waiver programs submitted and approved under the interim waiver policy seemed to some observers as an indictment of both the Commission and the IHEs that

submitted them purporting to be "appropriate preparation for teaching the subject."

Conversely, the 531 single subject waiver programs submitted and approved under the "complex, detailed, and prescriptive" Permanent Waiver Policy were found in the 1979-80 study to have little match with subjects commonly taught in the public schools.

The 1979-80 study of waiver programs did not include the diversified liberal studies waiver programs; such study would come in the mid-1980s. However, as a program consultant and as Chief of Programs during the years 1974-79, Richard Mastain had an opportunity, as did other staff, to talk with candidates and graduates of the Multiple Subjects Credential Program, which for most included completion of the diversified liberal studies waiver program. These opportunities came when Commission staff were on 10 to 20 college campuses each year for the three- to four-day onsite evaluations (External Assessment). The most common complaints were that the diversified liberal studies waiver program was not cohesively planned and implemented, and that faculty assigned to teach the courses in DLS program were most often junior, non-tenured staff whose first priority was not the preparation of public school teachers.

Mastain believed that there were a number of lessons to be learned from the Commission's efforts to set standards and procedures for the development and approval of subject matter waiver programs. Some of them include the following:

1. *Study the issues carefully before adopting policy. The interim policy and the Permanent Waiver Policy were changed a number of times, and even with the changes, the policies and procedures did not produce the hoped-for results. The continually changing waiver policies decreased the credibility of the Commission. The Commission was under a tight timeline to have the Ryan Act operational by September 15, 1994. The Commission was cognizant of the colleges' concerns that they needed clear and accurate directions, now, about the transition from Fisher to Ryan that they could pass on to their candidates. In retrospect, the Commission might have adopted a policy that was accepting of one or more Fisher degrees that were most*

closely aligned to one of the single subject categories, allowing the college to make that choice and verification. Such a policy would have allowed time for conferences and discussions to sort out the very great complexities involved in the development of subject matter waiver programs that would provide appropriate preparation for California public school teachers.

2. *Recognize who the people are that must be involved if the policy is going to be implemented. A careful study of the issues would have made it clear that the development of subject matter programs without the full involvement and cooperation of the faculty of those subject matter fields would not be successful. (17: 1994)*

The Commission had been successful in involving college subject matter experts on every advisory panel in the development of the Scope and Content Statements. These experts could have also given advice on the best way to gain the support and cooperation of their subject matter colleagues in the designing and implementing of appropriate subject matter waiver programs. However, the interim waiver policy gave the do-anything-you-want message and the Permanent Waiver Policy was prescriptive to the point of damaging future communication with academic departments.

The complaint often heard from the faculty of academic departments was "The Commission is infringing on our academic freedom." The complaints, often heard from the deans and faculty of the schools of education were, "The Commission should do on-site evaluations of subject matter programs similar to the Commission's evaluations of the professional preparation programs." There was much to be done in improving subject matter preparation for teachers and in finding ways to better balance or intermesh subject matter and pedagogy at the beginning of the 1980s. Perhaps the experiences and things learned in the 1970s would lead to significant strides in the 1980s.

Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study

The Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study was one of the most significant educational research studies of the 1970s; both in terms of the

quality of research, and the impact on in-service in teacher education. The BTES findings drove the NIE's staff development efforts for ten years and added much to the credibility of the NIE. The genesis of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES) was the Commission's responsibility to establish standards both for the issuance of credentials and for the approval of teacher education programs. The initial concerns were raised in the Committee on the Teaching of Reading, chaired by Commissioner Marcella Johnson, a reading specialist in the Los Angeles Unified School District, and in the Committee on the Evaluation of Teaching, chaired by Stan Green. Executive Secretary George Gustafson contacted the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) regarding funds to determine those teacher competencies crucial to the teaching of reading to disadvantaged youth.

The OEO approved funds for the study. However, when the National Institute of Education (NIE) was established in 1972, as the Federal agency responsible for education research and development, funding for the project was moved to the NIE. Dr. Virginia Richardson, who was with the OEO at the time the original project was proposed and funded, joined the NIE in 1972, and was instrumental in the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study becoming one of the NIE's initial research projects. Dr. Richardson later became Head of NIE's Teaching and Teacher Education Division, and thereby the oversight officer of the BTES from the beginning to the final period of dissemination.

The BTES was initially planned to fulfill two purposes: the identification of generic teacher competencies, and the evaluation of teacher education programs through the follow-up evaluation of graduates of those programs. The intended focus on recent graduates of teacher education programs was the basis for the name of the study--the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study.

The study was conducted in three phases. Phase I, 1972-73, was devoted to planning. The Commission developed a design for the research and held a conference where it was critiqued by prominent researchers, teacher educators, teachers, and administrators. From suggestions at the conference, the Commission revised the design to focus the research on grades two and five, and to consider the teaching of mathematics as well as reading. These four areas, reading and mathematics at grades two and five, remained the focus of the research

throughout the study. The Commission also decided to follow a request-for-proposals (RFP) process to conduct the research, rather than establish its own research staff; to convene a research advisory board composed of leading researchers throughout the United States; and to hire a second contractor to conduct a program audit of the activities of each major research contractor (7: pp. 2-5).

During Phase II, 1973-74, researchers collected data from ninety-seven teachers for five major areas of interest. These were student achievement, student background, school characteristics and climate, teacher background, and teaching behavior. During Phase III, between 1974 and 1977, the Far West Laboratory analyzed the findings and extended the research to concentrate on a small sample of teachers. This research concentrated on classroom climate, teacher planning, instructional decision-making, consistency and appropriateness of teaching behaviors, how instruction time was used, and student engagement in instructional time.

The findings of the BTES are summarized by Fisher, Berliner, and their colleagues at Far West Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development in Chapter 1 of the Commission's publication, Time to Learn. They describe fourteen major findings from the study and organize them into two groups: the first set of findings reports relationships between academic learning time and student achievement; the second set covers teaching processes and classroom environment in relationship to student learning (7: pp. 15-29).

In March 1978, the Commission held a seminar on the progress of the BTES. Dr. David Berliner, former director of the BTES at Far West Laboratory; Dr. Charles Fisher, current Director of the BTES Project at Far West Laboratory; and Dr. Robert Bush from Stanford University and member of the Research Advisory Board, discussed the findings and implications of the study. The researchers pointed out that two of the goals of the BTES were to: (1) explore the quality of research on teaching and learning; and (2) influence and improve the quality of teacher preparation in California. They stated that the Commission had definitely been instrumental in supporting quality research through the process of the BTES, and they listed articles and papers that discussed and lauded the findings and implications of the BTES. (6: March, 1978)

In regard to influencing and improving the quality of teacher preparation in California, the researchers stated that the BTES ought to be taken seriously by teacher education programs. However, the researchers cautioned that although the knowledge gained from the project would help California take a leadership role in improving teacher training programs, it should not be used to develop and shape policy. In reflecting on the way teachers learn, they felt that eventually beginning teachers should begin their careers with a credential that limited them to grades and subjects. After gaining substantial experience and following additional training, teachers could earn a more comprehensive credential that would allow them to undertake a wider range of teaching responsibilities (2: p. 288).

The staff coordinator of the BTES from the beginning, Dr. Marjorie Powell, justifiably satisfied with her efforts from 1972 through early 1978, left the Commission to join the research division of the California State Department of Education. The Commission then hired Dr. Ann Lieberman, Associate Director of the Horace-Mann-Lincoln Institute and Associate Professor with the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Teachers' College, Columbia University, to coordinate the final two years of NIE support for the Dissemination of Research Phase. (6: August, 1978)

In 1976, the Commission had convened a Research Utilization Board composed of school personnel, teacher educators, and researchers. Based on their recommendations, the Commission developed a dissemination plan for the 1978-79 and 1979-80 school years. In August 1978, the Commission reconstituted the Research Utilization Board to assist and advice in the two-year dissemination effort.

The dissemination efforts of the Commission during the first years of the study included the BTES Report, providing extensive summaries of the various technical reports, and the BTES Newsletter, designed to summarize research results with a range of audiences. In addition, staff members of the Commission, ETS, and Far West Laboratory made presentations at California and national professional meetings (7: p.5).

In 1978-79, the Commission solicited preparation of twelve professional papers on the findings and implications of the BTES research. Each paper was prepared by a researcher or educational practitioner familiar with the BTES research, and the information

provided in these papers had been used as the basis for meetings with educational constituencies throughout California, and for publication in abstract form in four BTES Newsletters.

In addition to meetings with educational constituencies throughout the state, seven regional conferences were held in the Spring of 1979 to discuss BTES findings and implications within the educational community of California. The BTES Newsletters, research publications prepared during the earlier years of research and other information were widely distributed.

The Commission also announced a grants competition through which small grants of no more than $5,000 each were awarded to teachers and other educational practitioners during the 1979-80 year.

The purpose was to assist in the utilization of findings from the BTES research in educational settings. These grants were the primary focus of the second year of the Utilization of Research Phase of BTES. (9: 1978-79)

During the 1979-80 year, the Commission sponsored sixteen small grants to local schools, practitioners, and institutions of higher education. In each case, the grants were for implementation of classroom-based activities utilizing findings from the Study. In addition, the Commission published several BTES Newsletters and the book, Time to Learn, which contains articles on the findings and implications of the multi-year research project. (9: 1979-80)

The dissemination efforts by the Commission were enhanced by publications such as the 1979 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE), entitled Classroom Management. This 1979 Yearbook was prepared by a special Committee on Classroom Management which included among its membership Ann Lieberman and Gary Fenstermacher, formerly the University of California representative on the Commission. The NSSE Yearbook contained twelve references to the BTES, with information quoted from BTES reports authored by David Berliner, Patricia Elias, Charles Fisher, Carolyn Hartsough, Nadine Lambert, Fred McDonald, Ray Rist, Barak Rosenshine, and William Tikunoff. (6: April, 1979)

The BTES gained national, even worldwide, attention and credibility. The study had accomplished more than was ever hoped for in 1972. The study had:

- Created a new climate of confidence that teachers could make a significant difference in student learning. This repudiated findings of Coleman's 1966 study that teachers had little influence on student learning;
- Identified skills and practices that teachers needed to understand and utilize in order to maximize student learning;
- Established the importance of the Commission's work and bolstered their sense of worth; and
- Advanced professionalization by documenting the importance of the teacher.

Dr. Virginia Richardson stated in a telephone interview by Richard Mastain in May, 1994 that she was pleased with the Commission's supervision of the BTES throughout the eight years of the Study. Commissioners Mary Ann Stewart and Carolyn Denham chaired the committee responsible for the oversight of the BTES. They, along with the other Commissioners, were disappointed that the findings of the BTES could not be translated directly into policy. However, the BTES provided Commissioners and staff with the personal growth and conceptual seeds that would form the basis for the legislative reform package of the 1980s. (21: 1994)

The Committee of Credentials

The Ryan Act required the Commission to appoint a Committee of Credentials, consisting of two elementary public school teachers, two secondary public school teachers, one public school administrator, one present member of the governing board of a public school district, and one representative of the public. The Committee of Credentials was, under the direct supervision of the Commission, responsible for the granting, issuance, suspension, and revocation of credentials.

The concept of the Committee of Credentials was not unique to the Ryan Act. Such a committee had been in operation within the State Department of Education for many years. The staff of the Legislature's Sub-Committee on School Personnel and Teacher Qualifications had attended a series of Committee of Credentials meetings in 1966. The publication of the Sub-Committee, The Restoration of Teaching, documents the abuses of Assistant Superintendent Everett Calvert and

other officials in their failure to follow basic principles of due process. As a result of the report of such abuses, Assembly member Leo Ryan successfully carried legislation in 1967 creating a Committee of Credentials with a very different composition that included four public school teachers, one public school administrator, one school board member, one lay person, one member appointed by the Department of Education, and the Superintendent of Instruction. Ryan's legislation also specified recognized due process legal procedures which the newly constituted Committee of Credentials was to follow. (Statutes 1967, Chapter 1694) (11: p. 123)

In addition to Ryan's legislation regarding the composition and function of the Committee of Credentials, the Legislative Analyst's office recommended in 1966 that the investigations office of the Bureau of Credentials be abolished. Following the Analyst's recommendations, all of the personnel and the duties of the Investigations Office were transferred to the California Office of Criminal Identification and Investigation. (11: p. 124)

At the July, 1971 Commission meeting, Richard Shipp, Executive Secretary to the State Department's Committee of Credentials, presented an overview of the workload and procedures of the Committee of Credentials. (6: July, 1971) The Commission was further alerted to the functioning of the Committee of Credentials as they heard presentations from Richard Anthony, legal counsel for the California Teachers Association, and Lawrence Karleton, a Sacramento attorney who had represented many clients before the Committee of Credentials. (6: July, 1971)

Following the presentations by Shipp, Anthony, and Karleton, the Commission Chairman appointed a committee to consider the options presented and to recommend procedures to the Commission for the operation of the Committee of Credentials.

The Committee was chaired by Commissioner Mrs. E. L. (Mike) Evans and included Commissioner Barbara Anderson, who had served on the Committee of Credentials in 1970. Mrs. Anderson was fully aware of the background of the 1967 Ryan legislation, of the political sensitivity of the cases that would come before the Commission's Committee of Credentials and of the need to develop very clear lines of

authority and communication between the Commission and the Committee of Credentials.

The committee on the Committee of Credentials presented recommendations to the Commission at the September 1971 meeting, which included a chart illustrating the flow of administrative decisions and list of detailed administrative procedures to be followed by the Committee of Credentials which included: Mrs. Dorothy H. Gibson (School Board Member), Mrs. Marian Mosley (Elementary School Teacher), Mrs. Jane Salera (Public Member), Mr. Laurence A. Scott (School Administrator), Mrs. Janice B. Stewart (Elementary School Teacher), Dr. Albert Weissberg (Secondary School Teacher), Mr. Fenton Williams, Jr. (Secondary School Teacher). Following discussion, the Commission adopted the recommendations of the committee. (6: September, 1971)

The Commission's Standing Committee on the Identification of Personnel Resources was responsible to gather nominations and to propose members for the Committee of Credentials. At the October 1971 meeting, the Commission appointed the persons submitted by the Committee. The newly named Committee of Credentials met for the first time at the December, 1971 meeting of the Commission. Richard Shipp introduced the members of the Commission's first Committee of Credentials:

Three members of the Commission's Committee of Credentials--Gibson, Scott, and Williams--had previously served on the Department of Education's Committee of Credentials. These appointments helped to ensure a smooth transition from the "old" to the "new" Committee of Credentials.

Mrs. Dorothy H. Gibson	School Board Member
Mrs. Marian Mosley	Elementary School Teacher
Mrs. Jane Salera	Public Member
Mr. Lawrence A. Scott	School Administrator
Dr. Albert Weissberg	Secondary School Teacher
Mr. Fenton Williams, Jr.	Secondary School Teacher

Throughout the 1970s, the Commission appointed one of its members to serve as liaison to the Committee of Credentials. The first appointee, Commissioner Mrs. E. L. Evans, was followed by

Commissioner Mary Ann Stewart, Dorothy Gibson, and Marcella Johnson. It was obvious from the Commission's minutes and the annual reports that the Commissioners took their responsibilities of overseeing and supporting the work of the Committee of Credentials very seriously.

In October 1972, the Commission established additional guidelines for the Committee of Credentials based on the heavy workload encountered during the first ten months of the Committee's operation. The focus of the guidelines was for the Executive Secretary to give the Committee of Credentials the authority to have staff take care of a multitude of minor complaints.

During the 1972-73 fiscal year, the Committee of Credentials took actions on seven-hundred thirty (730) cases. The specific disposition of these cases was as follows:

Granted Application	524
Denied Application	53
Suspended Credential	43
Revoked Credential	94
Further Investigation	16
TOTAL	**730**

In addition, the Executive Secretary to the Committee of Credentials issued a considerable number of private reprimands for offenses that were within the Committee of Credentials' and the Commission's guidelines for such actions by the staff.

However, problems were brewing during 1972, among members of the Committee of Credentials. In January and February, the Commission received letters of resignation from Gibson, Scott, and Williams, the three members who had previously served on the Department of Education's Committee of Credentials. The story broke in the Hayward, California Review on March 21, 1973, and was soon picked up by other newspapers. The reasons for the resignations were explained in the newspaper article, which followed a three column heading entitled "Permissiveness at the Teacher Level." The first two paragraphs of the article are quoted below.

> *During the past several months, three members of the California Committee on Teacher Credentials have quit in protest.*

> *Each of the three believes that the Committee's four-member majority has displayed a consistent and improper pattern of permissiveness. This permissiveness, they charge, has resulted in allowing known sex offenders, and others guilty of unprofessional conduct, to continue teaching in California's public schools.* (13. March, 1973)

The Commission appointed Mrs. Olga Gutierrez to replace Fenton Williams and Rod McClain to replace Laurence Scott. Mrs. Gibson stayed on until April 1974, when she became a member of the Commission.

The Commission increased the supervision of the Committee of Credentials by having Commission members attend the full three-day work session of the Committee of Credentials. In addition, the Commission reviewed the actions taken by the Committee of Credentials with increased care. The lesson learned from this incident influenced the work of the Committee and the oversight by the Commission throughout the 1970s.

During the years of 1972-73 through 1978-79, the Commission received an average of 4,200 complaints each year. These complaints came from a variety of sources, including the Department of Justice, police departments, school districts, parents, and the public. Many of the complaints were handled by staff to the Committee of Credentials under the guidelines developed by the Committee and approved by the Commission. During the years 1972-73 through 1978-79, the Committee of Credentials handled an average of six-hundred sixty-five (665) cases each year. During that same period of time, the Commission took action to accept or reject a hearing officer's decision on an average of eighty-one cases each year. (9: 1972-79)

A major reason for the large number of cases that are reviewed by the Committee of Credentials and Commission staff was the fingerprint that was required with each application for a credential. Instituted in 1951, California was one of two states that required a fingerprint during the 1970s. Also, in California, police departments are required by statutes to report the arrests of public school educators to the Department of Justice, which in turn is required to notify the Commission of said arrests.

On the recommendation of the Committee of Credentials and at the request of the Commission, in early 1974, the General Services Management Office did a study of the operations of the Professional Standards Unit. At the December, 1974 Commission meeting, the management analyst assigned to the study, Michael J. Dillon, presented the final report of the study. He concluded his presentation with this summary:

> *It is apparent that the Committee of Credentials has been preparing and processing cases in the best management procedures and that there is a need for additional staffing in order to reduce the backlog.* (6: December, 1974)

On the basis of the study, the Commission authorized to add staff to assist with the heavy workload.

The Committee of Credentials' discipline cases fall into two general categories: (1) Mandatory denials or revocations based upon the statutory presumption that persons convicted of certain specified offenses are unfit to hold credentials, and in which no fitness hearing is required. Under a court decision of 1966, a certificate of rehabilitation under Penal Code (PC) 4852.01 or a termination of probation and dismissal of the information or accusation under PC 1203.4 will entitle such a person to a hearing of his/her fitness to teach notwithstanding the earlier conviction. Except in such cases, the Commission had no discretion, but to deny or revoke the credential. These mandatory cases go directly to the Commission as part of its monthly agenda; and (2) In the second category of cases, the Commission performs an investigatory function through its Committee of Credentials to determine whether probable cause exists which justifies disciplinary action. This category of cases includes failure to fulfill contracts of employment; immoral or unprofessional conduct; a persistent defiance of, and refusal to obey the laws regulating service in the public school system; arrest for and/or conviction of non-mandatory criminal offenses; or for any cause which would have warranted denial of an application for a credential or its renewal.

The actions of the Committee of Credentials could take included granting or denying the application, revoking or suspending the credential, issuing a public or private reprimand, or closing the case. If

the decision was to revoke or suspend the credential, based on the investigation and the hearing before the Committee of Credentials, the defendant could either accept the decision or request a hearing before the Department of Justice Hearing Officer. The decision of the Hearing Officer then came to the Commission for acceptance or rejection. If the Commission rejected the Hearing Officer's decision, the Commission was obligated by statute to investigate and hear the case from beginning to end.

The Commission was ever watchful of the work of the Committee of Credentials. Each month the recommendations of the Committee of Credentials were reviewed by the Commission. If it disagreed with a decision, the case was returned to the Committee. If it disagreed with a number of recommendations, the Commission would meet with the full Committee to discuss their differing perceptions. These meetings often resulted in changes in the guidelines or changes in the Title 5 Regulations. The Commissioners who served as liaison to the Committee of Credentials were responsible for an effective two-way flow of communication between the two bodies. The guidelines were very specific in detailing the type of cases that could be cleared by the staff analyst, and required the Chief of Professional Standards (formerly titled the Executive Secretary to the Committee of Credentials) to be consulted when questions arose. These guidelines also specified the type of cases that the Chief could clear, and the situations in which the case must be sent to the Committee of Credentials.

In February 1978, state Senator John Stull sent a letter to the Commission, district superintendents, teacher organizations, school boards, and others announcing a special subcommittee hearing on the topic, “Teacher Dismissals and Credential Revocations--Why so Few?” The letter reminded the reader of the intent of the Stull Act of 1972, mandating regular evaluation of credentialed employees, and of Senate Bill 969 (Rodda), also of 1972, that established procedures for dismissal of credentialed employees. The letter went on to explain that the Ryan Act charged the CTPL with the responsibility of revoking credentials “in order to ensure that our students are not being taught unprofessionally by those physically or morally unfit for the task.” (6: April, 1978)

Stull’s letter stated that background data for his and Senator Rodda's concerns included dismissal and credential statistics going back five

years for the teaching profession, and current data for discipline imposed on members of fifteen other professions. On the basis of this data, Stull concludes that the odds an active teacher would suffer disciplinary action were 1 in 4,500, while for doctors and lawyers it was about 1 in 600.

> *This type of discipline is five to ten times less common for teachers than for almost every other profession we checked; only cosmetologists come close, with odds of 1 in 3,200 while the median is about 1 in 600.* (6: April, 1978)

The legislative subcommittee meeting was held on March 10, 1978, with a stated purpose "to ascertain why formal discipline appears to be relatively lax in the teaching profession." The Commission was asked to respond to a set of specific questions contained in an addendum to the letter from Senator Stull.

Executive Secretary Peter LoPresti made the presentation to the subcommittee on March 10, 1978. He made clear that the responsibility for determination of competency as a condition for continued employment was made by the school district through locally convened Commission on Professional Competence. He explained that the CTPL was not a part of this process and that present statutes did not require notice to the Commission of adverse actions based on incompetence. LoPresti gave a lengthy explanation of the procedures followed by the Commission and the Committee of Credentials, including the fingerprint requirement and its uniqueness to California. He concluded with a presentation of data on disciplinary action taken for the years June 30, 1974, through June 30, 1977 which showed the Commission and the Committee of Credentials took 627 actions to deny, suspend, or revoke credentials during the three-year period for a yearly average of 209 actions. LoPresti also pointed out that in cases where the Committee does not vote to grant, deny, suspend, or revoke, the Committee often sends a letter of reprimand as part of the process to close the case. In addition, the staff of the CTPL was authorized to send letters of private admonition. In the 1976-77 fiscal years, approximately 1,700 letters of admonition were sent to credential holders. (6: April, 1978)

Shortly after the subcommittee hearings, the Commission added a stipulation to the Title 5 regulations requiring the governing board of a school district to send to the CTPL a transcript of the findings and

conclusions of the Commission on Professional Competence together with any evidentiary material, including investigative reports, on which such recommendations were based. (6: June, 1978)

At the August/September, 1978 meeting of the Commission, the Licensing Committee was directed to review the work of the Committee of Credentials and "return with details concerning the Licensing Committee doing a quarterly review of what the Committee of Credentials is doing, including how cases have been processed, actions taken on various kinds of cases by the Committee and administratively." (6: August 31, September 1, 1978)

In 1978, following a movement to give all California regulatory commissions' greater public representation, legislation effective January 1, 1979, was passed to increase the number of public members of the Committee of Credentials from one to three, while the number of teachers was reduced from four to two. The total number of members remained at seven, including one school board member and one school administrator.

At the March, 1979 Commission meeting, Commissioner Robert Salley told his colleagues that legislators feel the Commission is too lenient regarding revocations, suspensions, or denials of credentials. It was suggested that more information be provided in the Annual Report regarding the breakdown of the different types of cases, and the actions taken after the careful consideration given each case by the Committee of Credentials. At the same meeting, the Commission discussed the need to clarify the differences between the issue of incompetent teachers as dealt with by the local commissions on teacher competence and the issues of criminal actions taken by the Commission.

Two situations in 1979 produced considerable newspaper publicity regarding the responsibilities and function of the Commission and the Committee of Credentials. One situation involved a teacher walk-out in the South San Francisco Unified School District in which the San Mateo County District Attorney requested the CTPL to investigate the charges of the South San Francisco School District against each of the teachers involved in the walk-out. Upon refusal of the CTPL to investigate the charges, the San Mateo District Attorney requested and received a writ of mandate from the Superior Court of San Mateo County. The writ of mandate required a hearing by the San Mateo County Board of

Education and a report of its findings and recommendations to the Commission. The conflict between the CTPL and the San Mateo County District Attorney's office produced considerable newspaper coverage.

The second situation involved the revocation of a teacher's credential based on sexual misconduct with a minor. The follow-up letter to the teacher from a CTPL staff member announcing the revocation action included a paragraph that was judged sympathetic to the teacher who in turn released the letter to the newspaper and used the letter in a one-million dollar lawsuit (unsuccessful) against his former school district's governing board.

These two situations offer dramatic evidence that no matter how a mistake or small error in the handling of discipline cases can be explosive. These two situations had the following repercussions: the reassignment of the Chief of Professional Standards; the designation of the CTPL's Licensing Committee as responsible to establish close observation and scrutinize the practices of the Committee of Credentials; revisions in the Title 5 regulations; an updated set of policies and procedures for the close monitoring of the Committee of Credentials; supplementary budget language calling for a review of the professional standards procedures and a report of proposed changes, due December 1, 1979, to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee; six pieces of CTPL-sponsored legislation for 1980; and several bills being proposed for 1980 by members of the Legislature.

While national data on the discipline of credential holders was not available for the 1970s, data from the 1988 edition of the Manual on Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in the United States (a publication of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification) shows that more than 60% of all disciplinary actions of credential holders throughout the United States took place in the only three states with a fingerprint requirement for initial certification. During the 1970s, only two states, California and Nevada, had a fingerprint requirement. However, the fingerprinting evidence from California convinced the State of Florida to pass legislation for fingerprinting. The staff of the Florida Department of Education report significant differences in disciplinary actions taken before and after the fingerprint requirement went into effect. (16: p. C-14)

The Commission's Committee of Credentials was recognized in the 1970s as the most effective Professional Practices Board in the nation. The Committee of Credentials reviewed more cases and took more actions to deny, revoke, or suspend than all of the others states (except Nevada and Florida) combined.

Each year the Commission listened to the advice of legislators; read and learned from proposed legislation related to the work of the Committee of Credentials; discussed the recommendations for changes from the Committee of Credentials and staff; and heard from the cadre of lawyers who frequently represented defendants before the Committee. On the basis of these efforts, the Commission continually improved and refined the regulations and procedures related to the work of the Committee of Credentials.

The Commission learned a great deal during the 1970s about the difficulty and sensitivity of the work of the Committee of Credentials. Some of the lessons learned included the following. It is probable that inaction or an over-reaction on a single discipline case will be explosive and allow legislators and others to seek a quick remedy, while forgetting the positive aspects of your efforts:

- Keep the members of the Legislature, especially the members of the Education Committees, fully informed of the work of the Committee of Credentials;
- Invite those members of the Legislature who have been of greatest assistance, as well as those who evidence the greatest interest, to sit in on a Committee hearing;
- Take all the time, care, and energy necessary in selecting members of the Committee of Credentials; and
- While membership on the Committee of Credentials requires the wisdom of Solomon, the patience of Job, and the stamina of a marathon runner, the Committee also requires the support of and continual feedback from the body ultimately responsible for all decisions--the Commission.

The Issuance of Credential

One of the major functions of the Commission is the issuance of teaching and service credentials to applicants recommended by a California college with a Commission approved program, and to those

applicants who are found qualified upon direct application to the Commission. The 70 staff members who comprised approximately 70% of the total Commission staff in 1971, are responsible for this function. The fee of $20 collected with each application was, by statute, deposited into the Teacher Credential Fund and served as the sole support for the activities of the Commission.

The 70 members of the licensing staff, transfers from the State Department's Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification, were ready to begin work in their new quarters at 1020 “O” Street in August, 1971. However, two matters demanded immediate attention: (1) the Commission was faced with a three- to four-month application "backlog," which meant 90 to 120 working days from the time the application was received to the issuance of the credential; and (2) the processing costs were exceeding the $20 fee. Major steps were taken to speed up the process and reduce costs, including contracting with the Department of General Services to microfilm over 300,000 files representing 3,500,000 microfilm exposures.

A second major step was discontinuation of the computer, a return to manual processing of all applications, and insistence upon a complete application (all incomplete applications were returned rather than being placed in limbo pending receipt of the missing information). The results of these actions are stated in a 1973 study of the licensing operations by the Department of Finance:

> *Management determined that a 10-day turn-around time in processing an application was a goal to be achieved. This time period contrasts to actual procession time of about 90 days during the latter days under the Bureau of Teacher Education and Certification. During the review, it was determined that the turn-around time was 10-15 days for the majority of applications.* (19: pp. 5-6)

The functions of the licensing branch were carried out by staff in four units, which included: Certification Officers; Storage and Retrieval; Microfilm; and Information Services.

The statistical data shown in Table 1 is one indication of the Licensing Branch’s workload. However, the problem of issuing credentials under pre-Fisher and Fisher Statutes, while preparing to issue

credentials under Ryan Act Statutes, added considerably to the workload. In addition, the differences between the credential structure (titles, requirements, and authorization of credentials) of Fisher and Ryan were great, and this also added to the workload. Finally, the Commission's attempt to severely limit direct application in favor of college recommendations took a serious toll on the time and energy of the licensing staff.

Table 1
Licensing: Comparative Workload Data (1971-72 through 1977-78)

	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78
Total mail Received	242,685	199,681	202,945	263,066	204,070	228,989	200,5209
Applications Received (fee mail)	112,955	109,944	110,952	122,704	122,142	137,761	118,238
Total Credentials Issued	133,219	115,526	98,445	120,219	106,735	141,263	134,686
Personal Interviews	7,199	10,336	11,070	11,150	9,177	10,756	10,517
Correspondence Mailed	90,162	43,371	27,389	19,350	29,005	24,686	23,379
Incoming Calls	40,081	41,749	43,647	46,182	45,234	60,233	68,666

In mid-1974, the Department of Finance completed a review of the Commission's activities, which included the following statement regarding operation of the Licensing Branch.

> *Another major consideration in establishing the Commission was to expedite the processing of credential applications. When the licensing function was located in the Department of Education, the average time required to process a credential was in excess of 90 days. Under the administration of the Commission, the time required to process a license has been reduced to between 25 and 30 days. One must conclude that in the licensing area the Commission has also lived up to the expectation of the Legislature.* (16: p. 38)

The commendation from the Department of Finance was most welcomed by the Commission. However, the constricted time frame, the differences in the Fisher and Ryan Credential structures, and the effort to severely limit direct application would produce criticism.

In 1973, a journal article by Dr. Sid Inglis at CSU, Sacramento who joined the staff of the Commission in 1974, reported the following in response to a survey of academic and teacher educators:

> *A third problem was obtaining prompt, incisive, and reliable answers from the Commission. This was particularly difficult for colleges that were attempting to assist students in the planning of their programs. Time and again the students have stated on campus after campus, "no one seems to know anything." While exaggerated, this comment illustrates the frustrations felt by many during 1972-73, the critical year of transition . . . after their experiences with the Fisher Act many felt that the lack of decisive answers would delay the implementation of the Ryan Act many years into the future.* (10: p. 7)

The Transition Time Frame

The Ryan Statutes stipulated that the "Act shall become operative on January 1, 1973, or at such earlier date as the Commission . . . may determine" (Chapter 557 of 1970). The Commission had asked for and secured an extension. However, to avoid confusion, the Commission took formal action in January 1973, to make operative the entire Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970. (6: January, 1973)

A second crucial statutory date was September 15, 1974. No credential, based on the rules and regulations in effect on December 31, 1971, was to be issued after this date. In addition, candidates for a Fisher Authorization were to meet requirements, or partial fulfillment, for the Clear Credential by September 15, 1974. When the Commission realized that the September 15, 1974, date was not realizable, they sought and secured legislation to change the date to September 15, 1976.

The rush to implement the Ryan Act by January 1973; the need to change the date from September 1974 to September 1976; and the lack of availability of some examinations and some approved programs did cause anxiety and confusion. In order to counter as much of this anxiety

and confusion as possible, the Commission approved existing Fisher programs to September 1976, and instituted a "lock list." The lock list was a listing of candidates that the IHEs verified were or would be eligible for a Fisher Credential.

The operative term during the entire transition periods was "No one shall be adversely affected." The Commission adopted appeal procedures and issued frequent communiqués to the field to guard against anyone being adversely affected. In addition, the Commission issued two documents, one listing information related to Fisher Credentials, and the other information related to Ryan Credentials. In April 1973, the Student CTA Chapter developed an "Advisory Handbook for Students" and distributed it throughout the State.

The Credential Structure: Requirements, Titles and Authorizations

The differences in the titles, the requirements, and the authorization of Credentials within the Fisher Credential structure and the Ryan Credential structure were a factor in the level of difficulty in implementing the new credential structure.

There were some instances in which the title, requirements, and authorization of a Fisher Credential were very close (matched) to the title, requirements, and authorization of a Ryan Credential. Some examples included the Pupil Personnel Services Authorization, the School Nurse Services Authorization, and the Designated Subjects Teaching Authorization in Vocational and Technical Education.

The Fisher Standard Elementary Authorization and the Ryan Multiple Subjects Authorization have some similarity in requirements and authorization. However, the Standard Elementary Authorization limited its holder to teach at the elementary school, whereas the (Ryan) Multiple Subject Credential authorized levels kindergarten through grade 12 and adult (in a "self-contained" classroom).

The three components in which there was the greatest disparity between the two credential structures included the authorizations to teach subjects in a departmentalized setting; the authorization for teaching students with handicapping conditions; and the authorization for service as a school administrator.

The authorization to teach subjects in a departmentalized setting at one time followed any of following three patterns: (1) the state issues a Secondary Teaching Credential which authorizes the holder to teach any subject (the pre-Fisher General Secondary Teaching Credential); (2) the state issues a Secondary Teaching Credential which authorizes the holder to teach a very specific subject, such as speech (the Fisher Standard Secondary Teaching Credential); or (3) the state issues a Secondary Teaching Credential in a broad subject category, such as English, which authorizes the holder to teach anything subsumed within that category, such as composition, literature, speech, creative writing, drama, forensics, humanities, language arts, theater arts, journalism, and debate (the Ryan Single Subject Teaching Credential).

The Ryan Act originally provided for eleven single subject "umbrella categories." History, government, and agriculture were added by statutes, and physical and natural science were split into two authorizations, bringing the total to fifteen single subject categories by 1974. The Commission was continually bombarded with requests to add additional single subject authorizations, including health, dance, and religion. The Commission spent considerable time considering requests for additional single subject authorizations. In May 1976, the Commission adopted a policy to evaluate requests to add a single subject authorization which included criteria for scholarship, support, and breadth. Following adoption of the policy, the only request came from proponents for a single subject authorization in health. The authorization to teach health was subsumed within both the physical education and the life science single subjects. The staff did a review of physical education and life science subject matter waiver programs to determine the degree to which health science or health education was included within those programs. On the basis of staff's finding that very little health education coursework within the approved subject matter programs for physical education or life science, the Commission did not oppose legislation, and health was added as a single subject.

As a compromise between the broad authorization of the General Secondary and the very specific authorization of the Fisher Standard Secondary Authorization, the "umbrella" concept of the single subject also produced problems. In April 1975, the California Educational Placement Association expressed concerns about the restrictiveness of

the single subject authorization. In September 1977, a number of school districts would not accept applications from individuals holding single subject authorizations in such subjects as history. In late 1979, the Commission did a study to compare the assignment flexibility of Fisher Standard Secondary Authorizations versus the Ryan Single Subject Authorization. Personnel administrators claimed that the Fisher Standard Secondary Authorization provided more assignment flexibility. What the study found was that the holder of a Fisher Standard Secondary authorizing the teaching of speech, for example, became a part of the English department and, in time, was assigned to teach any subject within the English department, even though it was not legal. The Commission previously had requested and received a legal opinion from the Attorney General stating, "The Commission is not empowered to promulgate rules which define and limit the assignment of teachers by governing boards." (CTPL Coded Correspondence 78-7910, September, 1978)

The discrepancies between the pre-Fisher and Fisher Authorizations to teach children with handicapping conditions were very great. There were twenty-eight Special Education Teaching Authorizations issued under prior statutes. There were five Ryan Special Education Teaching Authorizations and one Ryan Services Credential with a teaching authorization. All of the Ryan Special Education Teaching Authorizations required, as a prerequisite, a basic (elementary/ secondary) teaching credential, whereas the Fisher Restricted Special Education Teaching Authorization did not require a basic teaching credential. There were other differences that made it difficult, if not impossible, to "match" a Fisher Special Education Authorization with a Ryan Special Education Authorization. The task of making sense out of the discrepancies and of clarifying the authorizations of all special education authorizations fell to the Licensing Branch.

The discrepancies between the Fisher and Ryan Authorizations to serve as school administrators were also considerable, although not nearly as troublesome as the Single Subject or Special Education Authorizations. The Ryan statutes provided for a single credential, issued on the completion of a Commission approved program, and authorizing service in any administrative position. Fisher statutes provided for two credentials, a standard supervision, and a standard administration. The

Standard Supervision Credential required six years of college, five years of teaching experience, and authorized the holder to serve as a supervisor at those levels and subjects authorized on his/her teaching authorization (that is, elementary, secondary, or both, if the basic credentials were held). The holder could serve as a school principal with a major in an academic subject matter. The Standard Administration Credential required seven years of college and authorized the holder to serve in any administrative position.

The lack of "match" between the Ryan Credential structure and prior credential structures required effective and frequent in-service to Licensing staff to ensure that the information disseminated to the field was accurate and consistent.

The credential structure was continually expanding to accommodate new authorizations, by statute or regulation, such as the Bilingual Certificate of Competence in 1975; the special education mainstreaming requirement for teachers and administrators of 1977; the visually handicapped authorization in 1979 and the adapted physical education authorization in 1979. All of these changes required new regulations, staff in-service, and dissemination to the field.

College "Recommend" versus Direct Application

The approved program concept, as envisioned by Ryan and Doyle, was that the Commission would approve professional preparation programs on the basis of a paper (staff) review, and an evaluation by an on-site team. When a candidate completed the approved program, he/she would be recommended by the college, thus eliminating or at least limiting the review of transcripts submitted on direct application to the Commission. The Commission supported the concept and made serious efforts during the 1970s to minimize direct applications.

However, there were just too many exceptions in which direct application was necessary to ensure that no one was adversely affected in the transition. The exceptions included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Candidates to whom the Commission had made a commitment;
- Candidates who completed requirements for a Fisher Credential before September 15, 1974;
- Applicants who had completed three years of teaching in the last

ten years, on the basis of a full professional credential;

- The renewal of pre-Ryan Credentials issued on the basis of partial fulfillment or postponement;
- Candidates who, for various reasons, could not secure a college recommendation;
- Applicants for Emergency Credentials;
- Applicants for a Special Education Credential authorizing the teaching of educationally handicapped students when based on holding a valid teaching authorization and verifying one year's experience teaching educationally handicapped children.

In addition to the exceptions cited above, there were two statutory changes that produced a multitude of direct applications. The Gualco Bill (Chapter 919 of the Statutes of 1975) enabled applicants to make direct application up to September 15, 1977, for all Specialist Instruction Credentials, other than the special education Specialist Instruction Credentials, authorized teaching in programs for communicatively handicapped and physically handicapped students. The direct application required verification of twenty-four semester-units, beyond the Baccalaureate Degree, in specified categories of skills and knowledge. Six of the twenty-four semester-units could be earned on the basis of verified experience. The Commission issued thousands of these credentials on direct application. Later legislation enabled applicants for the Learning and Severely Handicapped Credentials and the Bilingual/Cross-Cultural Specialist Credential to apply directly to the Commission until September 15, 1980.

The second statute was the Dixon Bill (Statutes of 1978) which enabled holders of a Single Subject Teaching Credential to add one or more subsumed subjects on the basis of twenty semester-hours or ten semester-hours of upper division coursework in a specific subject subsumed under one of the fifteen single subjects. In some cases the college verified the coursework and recommended for the added authorization. In most cases, however, the applicant applied directly to the Commission.

In November 1976, staff reported to the Commission that during the period July 1, 1975, through April 30, 1976, the Licensing Branch had issued 25,000 initial issuance teaching credentials on direct application;

and during the same period 16,000 teaching and service credentials were issued on the basis of institutional recommendation.

In January 1977, *Ex Officio* Commissioner Fenstermacher asked the Commission to reconsider the present policy on direct applications and institute the following:

1. Establish an open and unrestricted policy for direct application;
2. Set the fee for direct application higher than the fee charged for a college-recommended application;
3. Designate on the credential document: Direct application or College Recommend.

The Commission did not adopt Fenstermacher's recommendations one and three. However, it did adopt a policy that any direct applications to reissue lapsed credentials, received after January 1, 1978, and would be subject to a fee penalty.

Turn-Around Time and Staffing

The time it takes from the receipt of an application to the issuance of a credential (turn-around time) averaged less than thirty-five days during the 1970s. In the 1974-75 fiscal year, the Licensing Branch processed 120,000 applications with a staff of sixty-four. In comparison, the Department of Education's Bureau of Teacher Education and Licensing processed 133,000 applications in 1969 with a staff of One-hundred seventeen (117) people. (6: January, 1975) The average turnaround time for 1976-77 was forty-two working days, while the average turnaround time for 1977-78 was eighteen working days.

Commissioners, Staff and Observers

All Commissioners, except *ex officio* members, are appointed by the Governor, subject to confirmation by the Legislature. Forty-five (45) individuals served as Commission voting members, and 17 individuals served as *Ex Officio* Commission members during the period 1971 through 1979. The composition remained the same from the beginning through December 31, 1977. A bill by Assembly member Teresa Hughes (formerly a Commission staff member) was passed in 1977, to add an *ex officio* representative from the Board of Governors of the California private colleges. In 1978, following a movement to give all California

regulatory commissions' greater public representation, the number of public members on the Commission was expanded from three to seven. This was accomplished by reducing the higher education membership from four to two and teachers from five to three. In 1979, the Commission initiated legislation that expanded the Commission to seventeen voting members, increased the higher education representation to three, and added a category for school service personnel other than administrators. The ex officio member for community colleges was eliminated. The following shows the composition of the Commission for the years 1971 through 1979.

Table 2
Composition of the Commission on Teacher Preparation & Licensing (CTPL)

Voting Members	1971-77	1978	1979	Nonvoting *Ex Officio* Members	1971-77	1978	1979
Classroom Teachers	5	3	3	State Superintendent			
School Administrators				UC Regent			1
Other School Service Personnel	0	0	1				
				Private Colleges	0		
College Faculty Members		2	3	Postsecondary Commission (CPEC)	1	1	1
Public Representative	3			Community Colleges	1		0
TOTAL	15	15	17	TOTAL	5	5	5

(6: March, 1978; December, 1978)

Dr. Ken Lane was one of the more frequent Commission observers throughout the 1970s. His perceptions of the early years of the Commission follow:

> *The early years of the Commission were plagued by intense political and ideological in-fighting, primarily resulting from the Reagan administration's dual basis for making appointments. Some appointments are based upon previous volunteer service . . .*

> *Until about 1973, the Commission was dominated by the bloc of members who were openly hostile to the teacher educators and teacher representatives who made up most of the public audience at its monthly meetings . . .*
>
> *Information and suggestions from educators in the audience were not welcome at Commission meetings, except for a limited number of required public hearings. In committee meetings, matters under discussion often dealt directly with schools of education, yet some Commissioners doggedly refused to recognize the very people who could provide the data they sought.* (14: pp. 297-298)

The perceptions of the only two Commissioners to serve throughout the 1970s, Marcella Johnson and Stan Green, are somewhat different from those of Dr. Lane.

> *The distrust between both groups was most apparent. Many political appointees seemed to be on a power trip. Because of this, other members had to be continually alert so that teachers would be prepared . . . as provided for in the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1979.*
>
> *We needed the field and its imprint. Soon, we had the cooperation and participation of the audience. The Commission soon found that we both needed each other.* (19: 1994)
>
> *A block which included ultra-conservative political appointees sought, from the beginning, to control the Commission and its committees. The other Commissioners--conservatives, moderates, and liberals combined--had to devote considerable time and energy to blocking these attempted takeovers. Both factions included professional educators and, though some such feelings did exist, I consider it incorrect to label either side as "anti-professional educator."*
>
> *From the outset, relations between the Commission and the audience at meetings were poor, evidencing lack of trust on both sides. The audiences were predominately members of the California Council on Teacher Education whose opposition to the Ryan Act and to the existence of the Commission was well*

> *known to Commissioners. It was, therefore, understandable that suggestions from the audience, although freely permitted, were received with skepticism and suspicion.* (20: 1994)

In mid-1973, John Kelly and Stan Green rallied a group of Commissioners to win the chairmanship for Marcella Johnson. The Commission had gone through some growing pains and discord, and needed a person such as Marcella Johnson to bring the members together for a united effort. Her geniuses and soft-spoken manner, coupled with the fact that she was an experienced public school educator, enabled her to help build trust among the Commissioners, staff, and constituents.

In 1973, Dr. Sid Inglis did a survey of college faculty regarding the Ryan Act. Inglis reported the response to one of the questions in the following quote.

> *A number of respondents felt that the success of the Ryan Act would depend upon the Commission itself. Some felt that this was conditional on the Commission's ability to avoid purely political considerations and to act collaboratively upon institutional proposals with flexibility and foresight . . . without being co-opted by them.* (10: p. 9)

The Commissioners sought to make wise decisions in their selection of chairpersons, and seemed successful: Mr. Art Meyers, an elementary school teacher, chaired the Commission from July 1975 through June 1977; Dr. Francisco Jimenez, a college teacher, chaired the Commission from July 1977 through June 1979; and Mr. Robert Salley, a secondary school teacher, chaired the Commission from July 1979 on into the 1980s.

Table 3 in the Appendix lists the voting members of the Commission and Table 4 the *Ex Officio* members from the first meeting in 1971 through 1979.

Commission Staff Leadership

Dr. George Gustafson, the Commission’s first Executive Secretary. Several doctoral dissertations have described Dr. Gustafson as having a “confrontational personality.” Teacher educators did not find him easy to work with, largely because of his adamant insistence on prescriptive

guidelines for programs of professional preparation. It was, however, in large part his desire to "identify objective, independently verifiable standards of measurement and evaluation of teaching competence" that led to the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES). The National Institute of Education, the funding agency for the BTES, must have thought highly of him because they hired him when he left the Commission in August, 1973.

Dr. Peter LoPresti, Executive Secretary from December, 1973 through the end of the 1970s. He issued monthly Executive Secretary Reports, which were clear and complete. He had excellent human relations skills, and he used these skills to build bridges and trust with the Commission's constituents.

As a nine-year-old immigrant who came to New Haven, Connecticut speaking no English, he had a special contribution to make to the Commission's major efforts in preparing bilingual/crosscultural teachers. As the administrative head of the agency, he was sometimes described as "a very humane and kindly benevolent dictator." He was a tough administrator in that he expected the best of every employee. However, the toughness was balanced with a firm pat on the back or a sincere "thank you," recalls Dick Mastain in 1995.

Dr. Blair Hurd, Assistant Bureau Chief, Department of Education, prior to joining the Commission; Commission Consultant, 1971 through 1973; Chief of Programs, 1974-1976; Director of Programs & Licensing, 1976 until his death on March 19, 1979. Blair Hurd was well liked and respected by the entire staff and by educators throughout California because of his knowledge, his spirit of service, his good humor, and his integrity. Chairperson Francisco Jimenez eloquently expressed what everyone thought of Blair when he reflected on Blair's life at the June, 1979 Commission meeting:

> *Blair Hurd was a truly spiritual man and his spirituality was profoundly ethical. It was expressed in his boundless compassion for his fellows, in his high sense of the worth of each human being, and in his deep commitment to ideals of justice.*
>
> *Because Blair Hurd's orientation in life was profoundly spiritual, he possessed an inner strength upon which he drew to actively study and analyze the impressions that came from*

> *without. He was not blown about by every wind of fashion or propaganda, but was accustomed to weighing and savoring each experience in the light of distinctive personal standards which he did not compromise for political reasons or personal gain.*
>
> *It is this inner spiritual strength, combined with a brilliant mind that explains why Blair Hurd was able to produce such vast amounts of work of such high quality. It explains why his work was never poorly done; why he never went astray, wasted his talents, or showed any symptoms of frustration.*

Mastain summarizes that "there are many other staff members who made great contributions n the 1970s. Some of them have been mentioned in other sections of this Chapter. However, space does not allow further comments about the many other staff members who made outstanding contributions to the Commission's efforts during the 1970s."

Commission Observers

Beginning in the early 1970s there were a number of individuals who attended each of the monthly Commission meetings to observe, to offer suggestions, and to report back to their respective constituents. In time they became known as members of COCO (Committee of Commission Observers, Mr. O. "Bud" Dickerson; Dr. Jane Hebler, Dr. Sidney Inglis; Mr. Fred Joyce; Dr. Kenneth Lane; Dr. Joe Schieffer, Dr. Curt Stafford; Dr. J. Alden Vanderpool).

Those who attended Commission meetings most frequently included the following:

Dr. James Cusick	California Council on the Education of Teachers
Mr. O. "Bud" Dickerson	Los Angeles Unified School District
Dr. Jane Hebler	California Council of University Faculty Members
Dr. Sidney Inglis	California State University, Sacramento (1972-74)
Mr. Fred Joyce	Association of California School Administrators

Dr. Kenneth Lane	California Federation of Teachers
Dr. Joe Schieffer	California State University, Northridge
Dr. Curt Stafford	San Jose State University
Dr. J. Alden Vanderpool	California Teachers Association

The observers were an important part of the Commission's decision-making process, as evidenced by Commissioner Jack Evans' farewell letter to the Commission.

> *Please say my goodbyes to the audience who so loyally attended each of the monthly meetings, and thank them for me for the challenges, the questions, the concerns, the support, and the counsel they provided; and, yes even for the aggravation they caused us at times. For without all of this taking place, the commission would soon forget what the real world is like.* (6: November, 1978)

In his 1979 dissertation, Ken Lane wrote the following:

> *The Ryan Commission has nevertheless given California an open forum where these same teacher educators can freely express their views and influence policy. Not only can teacher educators express their opinions before the Ryan Commission, they often do so vehemently and at great length. The citizens serving on the Commission have gradually become more receptive and thoughtful than was the case in 1971, when Governor Reagan made the first appointments. Today, few educators complain that their voices are not heard and considered by the Ryan Commission.* (14: pp. 325-326)

Special Challenges

In addition to the major tasks of the Commission during the 1970s, there were other "special challenges." Some of those special challenges were crucial to the Mission of the Commission, some were just continually bothersome, while others were of a nature to threaten the very existence of the Commission. A summary of some of the special challenges follows.

Relationship with the State Board of Education

The Commission sent approximately sixty sets of Title 5 Regulations to the State Board during the 1970s, and on only a few occasions were the regulations "stayed," with a request for additional information. Presentations were made to the State Board by the Commission chairperson and the Executive Secretary three or four times a year. The State Board representative to the Commission, Mr. George Hogan, was an effective go-between for both agencies--he kept open the lines of communication. In 1974 and 1975, the State Board discussed the feasibility of bringing the Commission's activities back under the State Board. In 1974, the discussion resulted in an article being written by Len Kreidt of the CTA, titled "State Department Wants Credentialing Unit Back." The CTA article opposed the move and supported the Commission. In 1975, the State Department of Education staff recommended that the time was not appropriate. The chairpersons of the Commission and Peter LoPresti worked very hard to maintain good relationships with the State Board and with the Superintendent. Wilson Riles worked well with the Commission, irrespective of his comments in April, 1971. The staff of the two agencies worked very well together on tasks of mutual interest, such as bilingual education and special education. In summary, what started as a confrontation between the two agencies became a very good working relationship by the end of the 1970s.

School District Involvement

The Ryan Act made provisions for a great deal of involvement in teacher preparation and licensing activities. The inclusion of six public school educators on the Commission was an indication of the Ryan Act's intent to have public school personnel involved with Commission activities. The statutes called for public school educators to be involved in developing standards for subject matter programs and programs of professional preparation; to serve as members of visiting teams to evaluate programs; and to participate in internship programs. The Commission, by regulation, authorized school districts (and IHEs and county offices) to serve as Commission-approved Local Education Agencies (LEAs) for the purpose of evaluating candidates for the Designated Subjects' Vocational, Trade, and Technical Credential. The

LEAs were also authorized to provide the in-service needed for renewing the credential. The Commission, by statute and regulation, also authorized LEAs to do the language and cultural assessment for the bilingual Certificate of Competence. The Commission authorized school districts to verify experience in lieu of six of the twenty-four semester-unit requirements, as per legislation of 1975, authorizing the issuance of specialist credentials on direct application. In many other ways, school districts were becoming more and more involved with the preparation of teachers, with assessment for purposes of certification, and with verification of experience in lieu of transcript credit. This involvement can be a positive force if it is done collaboratively with colleges, and if the Commission holds school districts to the same high standards to which it holds colleges. The statutes provide for on-site visits to colleges and to school districts, and, in fact, many of the LEAs were monitored or went through External Assessment. Effective collaboration between school districts and colleges and will continue to be a challenge in the 1980s.

The Preparation of Vocational, Trade, and Technical Teachers: Designated Subjects Credentials

Prior to the Ryan Act, applicants for a credential to teach vocational, trade, or technical education courses went to UC, Los Angeles or UC, Berkeley for evaluation and in-service education. The Ryan Act and Commission regulations made provision for a Local Education Agency to be approved by the Commission to evaluate the work experience and the education and/or training of the applicants, and, if qualified, to recommend for the Preliminary Designated Subjects Credential. The LEA, in order to be approved by the Commission, was required to offer a program of personalized in-service for the “Clear” Credential. Maintaining the quality of each of the eighteen Commission-approved LEAs for the Designated Subjects Credential was a special challenge of the 1970s.

The Preparation of Bilingual Teachers

The Ryan Act did not establish a credential authorizing the instruction of limited or non-English speaking students. However, the Commission was authorized to adopt a bilingual authorization within the

provisions of the Specialist Instruction Teaching Credential. In 1972, the Dean of the School of Education at CSU, Sacramento, Dr. Tom Carter, recommended to the Commission the development of standards for a Bilingual/Crosscultural Specialist Instruction Credential. The Commission sent letters to a wide audience asking: "Is there a need for a bilingual credential?" Based on responses, the Commission approved the adoption of the Bilingual/Crosscultural Specialist Credential; selected an advisory panel to develop guidelines; and adopted the guidelines and sent them to the field for review in December, 1972. In May 1973, the guidelines were adopted following a public hearing, and California became the first state in the nation to adopt guidelines for a bilingual credential.

In 1973, the Bilingual/Crosscultural Teacher Training Act was passed. The bill allocated $20,000 to the Commission and required the Commission to develop a career ladder and to get at least five colleges involved in preparing bilingual teachers. Manuals for the development of bilingual programs were developed and sent to the colleges. By June 1975, thirteen colleges had Commission approved bilingual/crosscultural programs.

The need for bilingual teachers in late 1975 was estimated to range from 9 to 12,000. In 1976, the Commission established a Bilingual Emphasis Authorization that could be added to a basic teaching credential, and adopted Tide 5 Regulations for an Emergency Bilingual Teaching Authorization. Also, in 1976, legislation was passed which mandated the employment of certified bilingual teachers as of September, 1977 and the legislation authorized the Commission to issue a Bilingual Certificate of Competence. The acquisition of the Bilingual Certificate of Competence was to be based on an assessment as opposed to transcript credit. The Commission approved the 24 IHEs with approved bilingual programs to conduct assessments for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence. In addition, the Commission approved specific Local Education Agencies to assess for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence.

Bilingual supply and demand information was reported to the Commission at the October, 1978 meeting. The Commissioners were told "that the current production of bilingual teachers in California is

meeting only 40% of the need, and that we can expect to move up to meeting only 60% of the need next year." (6: October, 1978)

During 1978-79, the Commission sought to address the state's continuing need for bilingual teachers. This resulted in an increase in the number of institutions of higher education with Commission-approved bilingual teacher preparation programs from 33 to 36, and an increase in the number of assessor agencies approved to recommend candidates for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence from 19 to 31. The Commission also conducted on-site monitoring visits to all assessor agencies approved to recommend candidates for the Certificate of Competence.

The Commission extended great efforts to provide qualified bilingual teachers for California's classrooms. Legislation by Mascone, Chacon, and others contributed to the supply effort. However, the gap between supply and demand grew rapidly each year, irrespective of exhaustive efforts. It remained a special and unfulfilled Commission challenge at the close of the 1970s.

The Eminence Credential

The Eminence Credential was included in the Ryan Act as a compromise to the request of the Governor's Commission on Educational Reform to have a single teaching credential and no credential requirement for non-teaching assignment. In response to a question about the uses of the Eminence Credential, Commissioner Conner replied:

> *Maybe so . . . This is a place . . . where school boards and their administrators can do a better job than any state agency. We can hardly require that every candidate be specially prepared to teach minority group children, but a district can give hiring preference to someone who has prepared himself specially. This may be one of the uses of the "Eminence Credential."* (1: pp. 23)

While the Commissioners seemed pleased at first to have the option provided by the Eminence Credential, they soon became disenchanted. Time and again the chairperson assigned a committee of Commissioners or staff to review the procedures and criteria for issuing the Eminence

Credential without ever achieving complete satisfaction. The Eminence Credential remained a special challenge for the 1980s.

The Children's Center Permit

The special challenge in this case was how to resolve a conflict between a social concept and an educational concept. State Senator Gary Hart and other legislators wanted to expand the opportunities for more children to attend preschool programs. In order to staff the increased number of preschool programs, it was necessary to also increase the number of available holders of the Children's Center Permit. The Emergency Children's Center Permit required sixty semester hours of coursework, including the twelve semester-hours in subjects related to early childhood education; or thirty semester-hours of coursework, including the twelve semester-hours in early childhood education, and one year of successful experience as a teacher or a non-teaching aide.

The regular Children's Center Permit required a Baccalaureate Degree. Senator Hart thought the requirements for the Children's Center Permit were excessive. He learned of the Child Development Associate (CDA) sponsored by the Early Childhood Division of the United States Department of Education.

Senator Hart liked the idea that the Child Development Associate Permit was to be recommended on the basis of a performance evaluation of the candidate. The Commission's position was that the standards for the CDA were far below the existing standards for the Children's Center Permit. It was also expressed that while the CDA would be an upgrade of standards in some states, it would be the opposite in California.

The Commission held a number of conferences with preschool teachers and other early childhood experts to try to resolve the conflict between the standards for the Children's Center Permit and the CDA. The Commission, on the recommendation of participants in the conferences and work sessions, proposed Title 5 Regulations that were not acceptable to Senator Hart and other legislators who felt that the Commission had disregarded the following budget language:

> *By November 15, 1977, the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (a) recognize the Child Development Associate as adequate preparation for a Children's Center Instructional Permit* . . . (6: June, 1977)

Finally, compromises were reached and the Title 5 Regulations were adopted in October, 1978. Commissioner Nancy Lowensohn abstained from voting on the Title 5 Regulations, and made an eloquent statement regarding her reasons. Excerpts from her statement are included below:

> *The discussion of CDA and children's center licensing has brought forth many other entanglements. These entanglements, often extraneous to the issue, threaten the very existence of this Commission. CTPL's seeming disregard for the budget language of last year infuriated key legislators . . .*
>
> *As a classroom teacher, I think the survival of the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing is of over-riding importance to the profession. I do not want it made impotent through lack of funds. If the survival of the Commission is predicated upon compromise, however distasteful, we must seek compromises. This vote compromises me, and I must abstain . . .* (6: October, 1978)

The issue of the Children's Center Permit was, indeed, a special challenge. Senator Hart unquestionably wanted to promote a very worthwhile social objective--more children's centers for more preschool children. The Commission wanted to maintain standards for those who teach in children's centers--a worthwhile educational objective.

Summary

Many of the Commission meetings began with a minute of silence to reflect on the tasks ahead, followed by a verse or thought appropriate to the work of the Commission. The selections usually focused on some aspect of schooling such as the following:

> *Children and young people are our greatest treasure. When we speak of them we speak of the future of the world. Together, with the people of all lands, we must work to protect the common treasure. And more than that, we must nurture that richness, the life of a single child is worth more than all of my music.* (Pablo Casals)

At the January, 1979 Commission meeting, Executive Secretary LoPresti recounted the intense efforts made and accomplishments

achieved in fully implementing the Ryan Act. He then proceeded to talk about the goals for the 1980s. These goals were based on three planning seminars the Commission had held in 1978, and on all of the discussions, reports, research efforts, and agendas that occurred from March, 1971 to January, 1979. Each goal he proposed should be read with the question in mind: "What happened to that goal in the 1980s?"

Goals for the 1980s and Beyond

1. Develop procedures for the evaluation of credential recipients.
2. Secure legislation that authorizes the Commission to monitor and ensure the appropriate and legal assignment of credentialed personnel.
3. Analyze the entire program approval process, including the guidelines for program development, the paper-review, and the on-site evaluation.
4. Refine the necessary balance between the College Recommend process and the Direct Application process.
5. Determine the impact of eliminating the life credential, and requiring in-service education as a basis for the renewal of a credential.
6. Conduct research as the basis for determining policy and setting standards for subject matter waiver programs and programs of professional preparation. (The BTES highlighted the unique contribution that a state agency can make in contract research.)
7. Continue to recognize the crucial and sensitive work of the Committee of Credentials; and provide support, oversight, and revised statutes, regulations, and procedures commensurate with the difficulty of the Committee's work.
8. Conduct research to determine the reasons for the lack of exploratory programs, and on the basis of that research, make the necessary revisions in regulations and procedures, and seek legislation, if needed.
9. Develop an exemplary examination system to verify subject matter knowledge that has the support of the public school educators, college faculty, and the community of test expert.
10. Analyze and update the Ryan Act, including the following:
    - The limit on professional education credits in teaching credential programs;

- The stipulation that credential programs must be available within the degree program at public institutions;
- The existing gap between pre-service and in-service teacher education; and
- The existing statutory partitioning of subject matter learned as a college student, and the organization and application (pedagogy) of that subject matter necessary as a classroom teacher.

11. Become the recognized leader in providing the climate, statutes, regulations, and motivation for the most creative and effective teacher preparation programs in the nation.

Table 3
CTPL Members 1971 through 1979

Name	Categories	First Meeting	Last Meeting	Name	Categories	First Meeting	Last Meeting
Barbara Anderson	SST	3/71	12/71	Robert Salley	SST	3/76	
Mary Ann Stewart	SST	3/71	3/78	Nancy Lowensohn	EST	3/76	
Art Meyers	EST	3/71	7/77	Francisco Jimenez	CF	3/76	
Elaine Pfeifer	EST	3/71	12/71	Carolyn Denham	CF	3/76	
Conrad Briner	CF	3/71	6/72	Marcella Johnson	PM	3/76	11/79
Jack Conner	CF	3/71	11/74	Raquel Muir	EST	6/76	
Harry Walker	CF	3/71	12/73	John Eckhard	PM	9/77	
William Winnett	CF	3/71.	12/71	David Levering	CF	1/78	
Virginia Braun	PM	3/71	12/73	Thomas Stang	SST	1/78	
Eunice (Mike) Evans	PM	3/71	12/74	Avril Mae Allan	EST	4/78	
J. Stanley Green	PM	3/71	11/79	Oscar 0. Canedo	SBM	4/78	-
Marcella Johnson	SA	3/71	1/76	Seymour M. Rose	SBM	4/78	8/79
John Cimolino	SBM	3/71	12/76	Dominadora Antony	PPS	8/79	8/79
Kathleen Crow	SBM	3/71	7/73	E. J. Oshins	PM	12/79	
Mary B. Liu	SST	12/71	2/76	Margarita Gamiz	PM	12/79	
Paulette Johnson	EST	12/71	7/74	Michael Shapiro	PM	8/79	
Daniel Martinez	CF	12/71	2/76				
Robert Kelley	CF	4/73	6/74				
John L. Evans	SA	2/74	11/78				
Dorothy Gibson	SBM	2/74	3/77				
Vance Lewis	PM	2/74	12/75				
H. Homer Aschmann	CF	8/74	9/75				
Curt Stafford	CF	12/74	12/75				
Robert Renz	PM	12/74	12/75				
Sam Itaya	EST	12/74	12/75				
Ugo P. Lea	CF	12/74	11/76				

Abbreviation Code of Categories

Secondary School Teacher	SST
Elementary School Teacher	EST
College Faculty	CF
School Administrator	SA
School Board Member	SBM
Pupil Personnel Services	PPS
Public Members	PM

Table 4
CTPL Ex Officio Members 1971 through 1979

Name	Affiliation	First Meeting	Last Meeting	Abbreviation Codes of Categories	
Horace Crandell	CFHE	3/71	3/72	Council for Higher Education/California Post Secondary Commission	CFHE/ CPEC
Robert Smith	CC	3/71	11/76		
Staten Webster	UC	3/71	8/74		
John Baird	CSU	3/71	2/72		
Arthur Polster	CFHE	4/72	10/72	Community Colleges	CC
George Hogan	SPI	2/72	7/78		
Leo Cain	CSU	3/72	4/77	California State University Trustees	CSU
E. P. O'Reilly	CFHE	11/72	3/76		
Gary Fenstermacher	UC	12/74	9/77		
Harold Wilson	CFHE	5/76		Superintendent of Public Instruction	SPI
John Greenlee	CSU	5/77	6/79		
Irv Hendrick	UC	11/77	-----		
Sanford L. Huddy	CC	1/77	1/78	Private Colleges	PC
Elias Wiebe	PC	7/78			
Harvey Hunt	SPI	8/78		University of California	UC
R. E. Smith	CC	11/78			
John Nelson	CSU	8/79			

REFERENCES

1. Biella, Arnold P. (1962). Interview with Conner, *California School Boards Journal,* (May): 21-26.
2. Brott, Ralph E., Jr. (1989). *The Cyclical Nature of Education Reform: A Case Analysis of Educator Certification in California.* Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
3. California Governor's Commission on Educational Reform, *Report of the Governor's Commission on Educational Reform,* January, 1971.
4. *The Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing: Program Review.* California Department of Finance. Sewers, Richard. (1974).
5. California Legislature, Assembly, Interim Committee on Education. (1976). *Ryan Act Task Force Interim Report.*
6. California Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing. *Minutes*. March, 1971 through December, 1979.
7. California Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing, *Time to Learn,* Carolyn Denhart, Ann Lieberman Co-Editors, May, 1980.
8. California Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing, *Teacher Preparation and Licensing 1980-90's, What Might Be,* A report of Seminar II, April 20-21, 1978.
9. California Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing, *Annual Reports 1971-72 through 1979-80.*
10. Inglis, Sidney Arthur, Jr. (1968). *The Impact of the Ryan Act Upon California Institutions of Higher Learning.* California Journal of Teacher Education, November 1973, 1-10.
11. Inglis, Sidney Arthur, Jr. (1968). *Implementation of the Fisher Act: An Exploratory Study of the Decision-Making Processes of the California State Board of Education.* Ed. D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
12. Inglis, Sidney Arthur, Jr. *Oh, Why the Ryan Act?* California Journal of Teacher Education, October 1974, 1-19.
13. *Hayward Review,* March 21, 1973
14. Lane, Kenneth Steven. (1979). *Professional License in Teaching: A History of California's Ryan Act of 1970.* Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

15. LoPresti, Peter L. (May 1977). *"California: The Impact of the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.* Phi Delta Kappan: 674-677.
16. National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. (1988). *Manual on Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in the United States,* (Ed. R. K. Mastain).
17. Richard Mastain, Personal Reflection, 1994
18. California Department of Finance. *"An Evaluation of the Licensing Operations of the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing."* April, 1973.
19. Marcella Johnson, interview, 1994
20. Stan Green interview, 1994
21. Virginia Richardson interview, 1994

Chapter 7
The Educational Reform Movement of the 1980's (1981-1988)

Ralph A. Brott

The Legislature Takes the Initiative

In the late 1970s, while the Commission was attempting to formulate its role and to gain consensus on policy goals, the Legislature was eager for action. Taking the initiative, the latter body passed two major pieces of legislation which saddled the Commission with the reputation of failing in its leadership role. These legislative acts were the requirements that administrators undergo training and that educators be required to pass a basic skills test. The Commission's first two attempts at legislated reform, in 1982 and 1983, either met defeat at the hands of the CTA or were partially incorporated into the Hughes-Hart Reform Act, SB 813 of 1983. The release of the Commons Commission recommendations shifted the dynamics by expanding the pool of those interested in major structural change and set the stage for comprehensive reform in educator preparation, induction and continuing professional development.

Administrative Services Credential Requirements

One of the goals of the Ryan Act was to simplify the credentialing structure and to provide options to coursework for completion of requirements. Three or four different administrative credentials were condensed into a single Administrative Services Credential that authorized any type of administrative service at any grade level. The minimum requirements were a teaching or pupil personnel credential, three years of successful teaching or pupil personnel service, and completion of a Commission approved program of professional preparation for the credential. The legislation also allowed for the professional preparation program to be waived by passage of an approved written examination.

As part of the implementation of the law, the Commission established procedures for the development of a set of professional preparation competencies and the adoption of specific program approval guidelines for each credential. A representative advisory panel was

formed to assist in the development of the guidelines and professional preparation competencies for school administrators. These guidelines and competencies were adopted in 1973. Most programs were 24-36 semester units and most were closely aligned with master's degree requirements at the university. There was no requirement for any further courses or experiences to serve in any administrative position, or to maintain the credential.

In 1977, the advisory panel was reconvened to consider the appropriateness of the content of the examination that was being used as a legal alternative to the professional preparation program. At the recommendation of the panel, the examination option was eventually eliminated in 1979.

In September 1977, Assemblyman Dennis Mangers received legislative approval to establish an Assembly Education Committee Task Force on the subject of the elementary and secondary school principalship. The Legislature charged the group to focus on school principals and to specifically "review the adequacy of pre-service training, evaluation, and continuing professional development of school principals." The report contained five major categories of recommendations, of which one category was primarily directed to the Commission dealing with the improvement of pre-service training and credentialing. Within that category, the recommendations included; identification of competencies necessary for school leadership, procedures for measuring them, regularly updating the competencies, requiring field experiences, insuring the mastery of competencies and eliminating the examination for the credential.

As a result of the Mangers Report, House Resolution No. 17 was passed in 1979, directing the Commission, in conjunction with representatives of postsecondary educators and school administrators, to implement the recommendations related to pre-service training and credentialing. Further, the Commission was directed to "study the issue of the differing competence and duties of school administrators versus school on-site principals and whether legislation requiring separate qualifications and credentials would be appropriate and to report its findings and recommendations to the Assembly."

The year of 1979 became the year of the Task Force or Select committee. The Legislature formed a task force to further study the

Mangers Report. The State Department of Education formed a Principal's Task Force to develop a set of competencies for school principals. The Commission formed an Ad Hoc Committee on School Site Administrator Training and a Select Committee on School Principal Competencies. There was a certain amount of sharing of information between these various groups, because some individuals were members of more than one of them. In preparing a response to House Resolution No. 17, the Commission reviewed information and ideas presented from the major groups that had been meeting to study the school principalship in 1979-80 and considered recommendations arising out of the study. The Commission took action to:

- Begin the process of revising program approval criteria for administrative services credentials with identification of competencies most clearly related to entry level training as a school principal.
- Set forth an explicit requirement for school-based field experience as part of the formal training.
- Identify appropriate in-service training and development for school administrators.
- Encourage the development of school principal internship programs.
- Sponsor legislation providing a two segment administrative services credential for entry level administrative service and advanced training and service.
- Sponsor legislation providing for renewal requirements for all persons employed in administrative positions.

Subsequently, the Commission sponsored a bill with the purpose of accomplishing most of the above recommendations. The bill was authored by then-Assembly Member Marian Bergeson. It was signed into law in 1981 as a part of AB 777 (Greene). The result was the establishment of Education Code provisions requiring preparation programs for two sequential credentials – the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and the Professional Administrative Services Credential. Although the law was passed in 1981, there were some delays in approval of administrative regulations; the two-tier structure was not fully implemented until July 1, 1985. Significantly, this was the

first two-step credential in the nation and laid the foundation for the two-step teaching credential. Perhaps more importantly, it was a credential that incorporated research on the way educators learn. (3: 1988)

Policy Goals of the Commission

When the Legislature took the initiative, the events overlapped with the Commission's efforts to formulate a legislative agenda. Obviously, the Commission felt the pressure, and in turn, pressured its Executive Secretary for action. Beginning in January 1979, Executive Secretary Peter LoPresti initiated an informal discussion format that allowed the Commission to address issues in depth. In what would be described as an ambitious strategic plan today, he presented a vision and proposed ten major goals. These were to: (1) develop an individual teacher assessment system, (2) determine the relationship between subject matter preparation and teacher effectiveness, (3) revise the program approval process, (4) assess the Life Credential's usefulness, (5) redefine the agency's role in enforcing professional standards, (6) determine the Commission's role in disseminating the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, (7) re-evaluate the examination system, (8) analyze and update the Ryan Act, (9) define the agency's leadership role, and (10) attain financial stability for the agency. Interestingly, many of the issues had been suggested in a report by the Legislative Analyst's Office and, in varying degrees, these issues came to dominate the Commission's activities for the next ten years. Some would be initiated by the Commission, but sometimes unhappily, many issues would be raised by events or interests outside the agency. (1: January, 1979)

In a flurry of activity following LoPresti's initiative, staff positions were created and major organizational changes were made within the agency. Program review procedures were redesigned; a major bilingual education study was launched; a committee was formed to address the skills teachers needed to handle classroom confrontation; and a process was started to develop long range goals. A legislative committee was created to keep track of the increasing amount of legislation relating to credentialing. The Commission also started initiating its own legislation.

In its first effort, the Commission proposed to add the number of higher education representatives on the body, increase credential fees, and impose "registry" that would require teachers to periodically register

and pay fees to the Commission. The first proposal would have given higher education greater influence, and the last two would have provided new sources of revenue.

A Change in Executive Secretary

Even with LoPresti's initiatives, many observers felt that under LoPresti's accommodating leadership, the Commission had become "captured" by the entities that it regulated--teacher training institutions. The Commission not only included knowledgeable and articulate members from higher education sector, but had a number of audience participants representing teacher education organizations or institutions. LoPresti, with his proclivity for cooperation with higher education, viewed this situation positively. At the same time, the Commission membership was questioning LoPresti's ability to undertake legislative initiatives and was pressuring him to be more assertive.

At the same time, the Legislature was becoming increasingly restless and discussing major changes in credentialing and the Ryan Act. Legislators and their staffs were hearing complaints and details of the agency's operation from individuals and interest groups. As a result, bills were being introduced that placed the agency in an undesirable position. The Commission's agenda was absent from legislative consideration and the broader policy considerations were being submerged by complaints and damage control. (1: January, 1979)

By the beginning of 1980, little action had been taken on the broad initiatives that LoPresti had so eloquently listed at the beginning of 1979. When Robert Salley assumed the chairmanship in mid-1979, he and other Commissioners urged LoPresti to take bold actions and place the Commission in the forefront of innovation and leadership. Either unable or unwilling to take broad initiatives, and after many rumors, LoPresti tendered his resignation on April, 1980 during Executive Session. (1: May, 1980). In August, John F. Brown was named Executive Secretary. In addition to being an Afro-American with high qualifications, Brown had been recommended by Assemblymember John Vaconcellos. (1: January, 1980)

Financial Problems

Because of diminishing enrollments in schools, the state was experiencing a surplus of teachers and fewer candidates were undertaking teacher training. With funding tied directly to the number of credentials it processed, the agency encountered severe fiscal constraints as the applications diminished. Taking advantage of their newfound links with John Vasconcellos, Brown, Salley and Vice Chair David Levering met with Assemblymembers Vasconcellos and Hart and their staffs. Both the finances and the role of the agency were discussed, and apparently, the legislators agreed to seek general funds for the agency. The idea progressed, however, the Department of Finance refused to go along and the Commission suffered through several years of financial anguish until credential applications increased again in the mid-1980s. (1: September & November, 1980)

Questioning from the Legislature

The primary urge to establish leadership was in response to the negative view of the Commission developing in the Legislature. After changing Executive Secretaries and seeking general funds, Chair Robert Salley distributed a memo from Assemblymember Marian Bergeson who proposed a Task Force on Teacher Preparation and Licensing. Its purpose would be to review "the entire teacher credentialing area" with the goals of streamlining the law, reassessing the Commission's duties, giving more discretion to colleges and universities, giving maximum flexibility to school districts and finding ways to encourage teachers to undertake continuing education in the name of professionalism.

Genesis of Reform Ideas

By the early 1980s, the Commission's reform ideas already had evolved over several years. One of the major thrusts was the five-year Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES) that was initiated in 1972. This study was initially prompted by the Commission's desire to establish standards based on the recognizable qualities of a good teacher. However, as the study evolved, researchers realized that the study was too broad, and its focus shifted and concentrated on the ways that elementary children learn. After going through various phases, it eventually concentrated on classroom climate, teacher planning,

instructional decision making, consistency and appropriateness of teaching behaviors, how instruction time is used, and student engagement in instructional time. (4: May, 1977)

Near the end of the study in 1977, the researchers stated that although the knowledge gained from the project would help California take a leadership role in teacher training programs, the results should not be used to shape policy. Nevertheless, they felt that beginning teachers should start with a limited credential, and after gaining experience and additional training, be awarded a more comprehensive credential to undertake a wider range of teaching responsibilities. However, the researchers did not urge limiting teachers to grade levels or subject matter specialization and felt that two kinds of credential structures were needed--general and specialized. Rather than stressing one way to prepare teachers, they recommended that two or three teacher education models be developed. (1: March, 1978) Although the BTES results were not recommended for guiding policy, they provided the Commission with many of the seeds for its eventual reform package. Most prominent was a need for a two-step credential and additional training paths to the classroom.

Ad Hoc Committee on the Fifth Year of Study

In 1980, the Commission established an "ad hoc Committee on the Fifth Year of Study" to assess the content of the fifth year teacher preparation. Significantly, this committee started addressing the way that teachers learn their craft and adopted several "beliefs and positions." The most meaningful position was that teacher training should not be thought of as a one-year period, but rather a continuum of pre-service and in-service. It should extend over a 3-5 year period and include education courses, student teaching, and an extensive supervised internship. The two-tier credential was proposed. A preliminary internship credential would be issued upon completion of education course work and student teaching. After completing an internship, a permanent "professional" credential would be issued and would be subject to periodic renewal requirements. During the internship, both the preparing university and the school district would be mutually responsible for providing a support system and for the candidate's success. (1: December, 1980) To implement such a system, several major obstacles would have to be

overcome--especially issues involving roles and responsibilities. Combining pre-service and in-service would require cooperation between the Commission and the State Department of Education, and between universities and school districts.

The California Council on the Education of Teachers followed the committee's proceedings closely and was immediately ready to protect higher education's turf. Teacher educators were threatened by initiatives that might reduce course work (jobs) or their exclusive authority to recommend candidates for credentials. While agreeing that a supervised internship would be valuable, the California Council recommended that the requirements for a permanent credential be satisfied either through formal course work in an "approved" college or by completing an alternative "Commission approved" in-service program that had been collaboratively designed and implemented by a school district, a teacher training center and the university. In January, 1981, after a year of meetings, Vice Chairman David Levering wrote the following quote to his fellow Commissioners about the glacial pace of the proceedings.

> *The discussion of issues to the fifth year of study, which is scheduled for January 8, 1981, will mark the fourth recent effort by the Commission to achieve some level of consensus regarding those issues, and to formulate proposals for action. At the December 1980 meeting, some frustration was expressed by our Chair Robert Salley at the glacial pace of our deliberations . . .*
>
> *As one of the primary contributors to this marathon of talk; I feel some responsibility for our plight. I must confess considerable difficulty in sorting out the tangles of this particular issue in that many of them relate to other discussions and other issues* . . . (1: January, 1981)

Dr. Levering laid out four hypotheses to guide policy. Levering's first hypothesis addressed "Mr. Ryan's contention" that subject matter and initial teacher preparation could be squeezed into four years. Levering argued that his arrangement contributed to students' already overly pragmatic determination to learn only what they "need," and he felt that the first four-years should be devoted exclusively to subject matter. Under four-year arrangements, there had been many complaints

from academic professors that education courses were cutting into their curriculums. If teachers were to be selected from the "upper intellectual strata," the pool should come from graduates rather than undergraduates. Levering concluded that undergraduate subject matter preparation should be separated from graduate teacher preparation. This position advocated the status quo. (1: January, 1981)

Levering's second hypothesis stated that the separation between pre-service and in-service needed to be linked. Evidence suggested that pre-service programs end too abruptly and adversely affect the teacher's socialization process. Many experienced teachers needed to have their skills improved, but many in-service programs appeared to ineffective. He suggested that Life Credentials be eliminated and in-service renewal requirements be imposed.

In his third hypothesis, Levering stated that, "We should stop talking about professional education as the 'fifth year'." The committee had heard considerable "evidence" suggesting that teacher training should be spread over two- to three-years and include college preparation, an internship and ongoing support. There was a consensus that a preliminary credential should be issued upon completion of the initial training and a permanent credential issued after the internship. He noted that the internship and support systems would require substantial expenditures.

Levering's fourth hypothesis pleaded for people to overcome the self-serving forces that fragment the educational governance structure between universities, schools and agencies and hinder solving many problems in schools. "Beginning teachers, experienced teachers, college faculties, and boards of education must be encouraged to identify more completely with the traditions and direction of their profession." (1: January, 1981)

Studies, Hearings, Commissions

During the mid-1980, studies, conferences, hearings and a commission were inaugurated to find solutions to stem the rapid turnover among beginning teachers. According to national data, forty percent of new teachers left teaching after five years, and only fifty percent remained in the classroom after ten years. These studies concentrated on ways to attract quality people, train them well, retain them in the

classroom and continually upgrade their skills. Although their conclusions are remarkably similar, they did not always agree with the self-interests of stakeholder groups.

With the election of a new State Superintendent and with a number of national reports such as *Nation at Risk*, declaring America's the system in crisis; education captured the public's attention and became a legislative priority. Within California *Nation* inspired two immediate studies. In 1981, the influential California Business Roundtable engaged Berman, Weiler Associates, a research firm, to study on how to improve California's education system. Its report, *The California Roundtable's Proposal for a New Certification Process*, suggested a major credential reform. Specifically, it recommended that all prospective teachers undergo a three-year internship period and be assisted and evaluated by mentor teachers; that there be two levels of credentials; that local districts assume a major responsibility in teacher training; that secondary teachers pass a subject matter examination every seven years to be recertified; that a bachelor's degree be required for emergency credentials; and that a special certificate be created individuals with special skills and experience.

National and California Panels

During the summer of 1981, the Commission appointed two distinguished panels, the National Panel and the California Panel, to review the Commission's accomplishments and make recommendations on the future directions for the Commission's activities. The National Panel met in July and the California Panel met one month later in August. Both panels expressed disappointment with the Commission and urged it to take a leadership role in teacher education.

Aside from the disappointment expressed about the Commission's progress, these two panels reinforced and added to the wide array of recommendations that would eventually become part of its eventual reform package. The most important recommendations involved creating a two-step credential (Preliminary and Clear), giving beginning teachers support and issuing Clear Credentials on the basis of an assessment of performance. In addition, these panels recommended that all teachers be required to take a basic skills test, pre-service and in-service education be linked, professional growth

requirements be imposed, internship type programs be initiated and recognition be given to excellent teaching.

In the recommendations aimed at teacher training institutions, the most prominent were to establish mission statements, goals and objectives and strong links between pedagogical instruction and field experiences. They were also advised to become more responsive to the needs of schools, integrate subject matter and pedagogy, and raise admissions standards to attract high quality candidates.

The Panels recommended that the Commission be reconstituted with a majority of professional educators (teachers). On a more practical side, it was recommended that the Commission seek adequate funding, become substantially involved in legislative efforts, establish a pedagogical knowledge base, explore internship models for teacher training, compile annual status reports, undertake writing policy papers, continue program approval, seek ways to deregulate teacher training, impose more methodology requirements, replace the National Teachers Examinations with California's own examinations, reduce mis-assignment of teachers and curtail Emergency Credentials.

It appears that the Panels accepted recommendations from all quarters, did not prioritize any, and eliminated few. Some are almost contradictory, such as exploring internship models opposed to imposing additional methodological requirements and continuing program review opposed to deregulation of teacher training. However, the recommendations did represent various views held by the various stakeholder groups and the dilemmas facing the agency. The importance of these forums is that they reinforced the Commission's reform notions and help lend legitimacy to its legislative agenda. Indeed, most of the proposal was eventually enacted in one form or another.

Also in 1981, the Educational Round Table on Educational Opportunity was formed in by University of California President David Saxon to study issues and problems relating to education. In its August, 1983 report, *Improving the Attractiveness of the K-12 Teaching Professional in California*, stated that while "an attempt to improve the public image of teachers may make teaching more attractive in the short run," significant improvement "will require fundamental changes in the profession itself to make it more of a profession." As in some of the

previous reports, it called for higher standard of entry, a career ladder, high quality training programs, mentors for new teachers and meaningful evaluations for teachers throughout their careers.

California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST)

During 1981 and 1982, Assemblymember Gary Hart made two attempts to require teachers to pass a basic skills test. Hart was the author of the 1976 law mandating that all students meet local district proficiency standards in reading, writing and mathematics to receive a high school diploma. Students who were scheduled to graduate in June of 1981 were the first class impacted by Hart's pupil proficiency law.

In advocating for the teacher proficiency law Hart shared what he viewed as compelling evidence to support a teacher proficiency test requirement. Starting in 1978, the Lemon Grove School District administered district-devised tests in grammar, spelling and mathematics to prospective teachers and aides who had been screened for job interviews on the basis of a promising written application. Test difficulty was set at the 8th grade for reading and writing and the 7th grade for math. The teacher applicants were required to answer 80% of the questions correctly–35% of the candidates failed one or more of the tests. Classroom aide applicants were required to get a 75% passing mark–55% of them failed one or more of the tests. Test difficulty was then revised downward to 7th grade for reading and writing and 6th grade for math. Still, over 20% of the prospective teachers, and over 30% of the prospective aides, failed one or more of the exams. Results from the Los Angeles Unified School District were similar. For three consecutive years, at least 13% of persons holding a teaching credential and applying for initial employment with the district failed a district-devised test in basic English usage.

Meanwhile, Professor James Coleman and other education researchers reported, in *"The Case for Teacher Education at Selective Liberal Arts Colleges,"* October 1980, Phi Delta Kappa Magazine that "the verbal ability of teachers is one of the only school 'input factors' that significantly affects verbal achievement of students." The same researchers found that both verbal and quantitative scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test and Graduate Record Exam of undergraduates preparing for teaching careers were declining at a rate that exceeding the

national decline among all examinees. In 1980, SAT scores of high school seniors who planned to major in education were 48 points below the national average in math and 35 points below in the verbal component. An April, 1981 *Newsweek Magazine* article, "Teachers Are in Trouble," reported that 89% of citizens surveyed for the Gallup Poll believed teachers should be required to pass a competency test prior to employment.

In arguing for passage of AB 757, Hart shared teachers' writing samples given to him by concerned parents. The parents were alarmed by what they considered significant errors in the teachers' notes and wondered out loud whether these teachers would be capable of assisting children to pass the local district proficiency test. In presenting the teacher proficiency measures to the Legislature, Hart said, "If standards in basic skills are appropriate for high school graduates, they should also apply to all those involved in classroom teaching." AB 757 was vigorously opposed by the California Teachers Association until Hart amended the measure deleting the requirement that all practicing teachers pass the exam. The measure then passed with just a handful of "no" votes.

The California law specified that, starting March 1, 1982, persons enrolled in educator credential programs would have to pass the test to receive a credential. Those who had already received a credential, but had not yet been hired would be required to pass the test prior to employment. The teacher testing law specified that the California State Department of Education was responsible for developing a model basic skills examination and the Commission was responsible for its administration. Hart had confidence in the State Department of Education, particularly in the Department's testing division, because the Department had previously provided high quality guidance to school districts reading development of local pupil proficiency exams.

The compromise between Hart and the California Teachers Association averted problems encountered by other states in the use of the basic skills exams. In "*Teacher Education and Teacher Testing*" Gregory Anrig, President of the Educational Testing Service, described what he called "troubling signs in the teacher testing movement." Anrig observed that twenty-one states required students to pass a test before entering a teacher education program, and that thirty-two states, by 1988,

would have a testing requirement for teacher certification. Beginning a conversation that would last into the next two decades, he cautioned against making continued accreditation of teacher preparation programs dependent upon the test performance of prospective teachers who were completing such programs. He said, "such use fails to recognize that from 60 to 80 percent of the college preparation received by a prospective teacher is in academic departments other than department of college of education." Anrig also wrote:

> *A further area of concern regarding teacher testing has arisen in Arkansas and Texas. In the course of enacting comprehensive educational reform laws in both states, a requirement was included that all practicing teachers – regardless of years of service and satisfactory ratings by their school supervisors – would have to pass a one-time "functional academic skills" or "literacy" test to retain their teaching certificate. Such a testing requirement is unprecedented for any other occupation requiring state licensure or certification. To put an experienced teacher's professional career on the line solely on the basis of a mandatory, one-time test is both an injustice to the teacher and a misuse of tests. Educational Testing Service and the NTE Policy Council, in an unprecedented action for test development organizations, have refused to allow the use of NTE tests for this purpose in either Texas or Arkansas.*
>
> *Another profound concern to all of us in education is the effect of the teacher testing movement on access of minorities to the teaching force of American schools. Educational Testing Service has recently published two research reports – one on the general impact of the state testing policies on the teaching profession and one specifically on the impact on teacher selection of NTE use by states. These reports present data that document the effect of current state testing policies on Black and Hispanic access to teaching . . . The ETS research reports conclude that, by the year 2000, if there is no significant change in the current status of teacher preparation, the percentage of minorities in the teaching force of the United States could be cut almost in half from its current level of*

> *approximately twelve percent. This decline will be taking place at the same time as the proportion of minority students enrolled in American schools is increasing dramatically.* (5: 1986)

Shaping the First Comprehensive Legislative Reform Proposal

In the Fall of 1981, in a flurry of Commission activity, five "concept papers" were prepared and presented to the Commission, providing the basis for the Commission's proposed legislation. Newly hired consultant, David Wright, presented the first paper on professional preparation programs, advocating the creation of a two-step teaching credential. A five-year preliminary credential would be issued only when the candidates had met performance and subject matter standards. Colleges would be responsible for assessing the beginning teacher's teaching knowledge and competence based upon standards set by the Commission. To insure the quality of the preparation programs, the Commission would continue to conduct periodic program reviews. To encourage them to improve their programs, colleges would be given greater flexibility.

Coordinator Richard Mastain proposed changes for subject matter programs. He proposed that the term "waiver" should be replaced with the phrase "approved program of academic preparation." Subject matter requirements could be satisfied either by completing an approved program in California or by passing an examination (appealing, in particular, to out-of-state candidates). Mastain proposed that subject matter programs be approved by the Commission on a basis of core and supplemental courses, rather than on broad determination of "scope and content." Mastain suggested that the question of using examinations to measure subject matter competence be re-examined.

Coordinator Sidney Inglis discussed the preparation leading to the advanced "professional credential." After gaining employment, the beginning teachers would have a "network of assistance," and the issuance of the permanent credential would be based on teaching ability. Support and assessment components were linked to pre-service and in-service growth and development. Program requirements would include an individualized program of study requiring 24-semester units at a college or university, to be jointly designed by the teacher, school district

and college. Beginning teachers would be given two years to complete their programs and both by the school district and the college would "sign off" to certify completion. The term "fifth year" was to be eliminated.

David Wright presented the fourth and fifth concept papers. He proposed eliminating the Life Credential and imposing "professional growth" renewal requirement every five years. Renewal would be based on "adequate and sufficient evidence of professional growth," to be determined locally and whose terms would be negotiated between the school district and local union. In the fifth paper, Wright proposed setting higher standards for Emergency Credentials. A Bachelor's Degree would be required rather than 90 college units. (1: December, 1981)

The Commission's First Reform Bill (Hart)--1982

By January 1982, the reform legislation was in draft form and the Commission spent the next two months refining their proposals. In the meantime, Assemblymember Gary Hart had formed a task force to study credentialing which included Commission representatives. In February, Chairman Salley reported that Hart's task force had been "very helpful" in looking over the material supplied by the Commission. He suggested that the process was moving "in a positive direction." (1: February, 1982) Whatever doubts there were about the Commission, it did not stop Assemblymember Hart from introducing Commission sponsored legislation in March, 1982 formulated from the concept papers. The bill was opposed by the California Teachers Association. Commission Chair Bob Salley stated:

> *Much of the California Teachers Association (CTA) opposition to the bill was a result of the Life Credential issue. Though Marilyn Bittle did not mention it, CTA locals across the state bombarded their members with the falsehood that "their Life Credential was going to be taken away". . . The bill intended to do no such thing. It did, however, eliminate the possibility of obtaining a Life Credential after June 30, 1983 . . .*

Almost immediately, under pressure from the CTA, Hart removed the provision to eliminate the Life Credential. However, negotiations

resulted in a compromise proposal – a Life Credential would not be issued until a teacher had taught for two years under the advanced credential. In an effort to dissuade the CTA from its position, Salley, Executive Secretary John Brown and Consultant David Wright met with CTA President Ed Foglia and CTA lobbyist Sharon Bowman and Assemblymember Hart. They attempted to convince Foglia that retaining the Life Credential would neutralize any effort to encourage ongoing renewal. Foglia responded that all teachers should engage in renewal; however, the credentialing system should not be used to force that purpose. He felt that many teachers already undertook renewal activities, and "those who don't--we ought to attempt to educate them to the necessity of renewal." The Commission's efforts were to no avail and Hart did not think it was feasible to move the bill against the CTA's opposition. The California School Boards Association (CSBA) was supportive of the reform measure, especially proposals to promote ongoing professional development, limiting Life Credentials and create a supportive environment for new teachers. However, CSBA was against requiring a Bachelor's Degree for Emergency Credentials and restricting teachers to areas of their expertise. The California Federation of Teachers (CFT) favored the bill, but in contrast to the CTA, wanted the Life Credential eliminated. (6: 1989)

After Chairman Salley attended the Assembly Education Committee hearing in April, he reported that he was "not too impressed with the level of examination of the issues involved." CTA wanted to remove the 24-unit requirement for the advanced credential, but Hart assured the Commission that he would not remove this requirement. However, going against the Commission's wishes, provisions were added to make it easier for out-of-state teachers with degrees in education to obtain a credential. A month later, the bill passed out of the Assembly Education Committee and went to the Ways and Means Committee where it also passed. (1: April, 1982)

By late June, before the bill went to the Senate Education Committee, Hart changed his mind about eliminating the Life Credential and stated: "I've always said that I philosophically opposed the Life Credential . . . But I felt that in the Assembly, the bill's survival would be in jeopardy if the Life Credential were done away with."

CTC's role taking a stand against the CTA backfired. In August, Hart's bill was defeated in the Senate Education Committee. CTA declared that the 24-unit requirement as "anti-teacher." Chairman Salley was livid. At the Commission's next meeting, he stated:

> *I think that our effort is pro-public education and for the profession and that what we have is an effort to say to the public that the profession is important. It is important enough that we are willing to address one of the critical problems in the training process. Those are real problems that we tried to address clearly, and to be attacked as anti-teacher is truly unfair*. (1: August, 1982)

The *Sacramento Union's* Michael Fallon told of Senator Ed Davis' resentment of CTA lobbying. Davis criticized the CTA's influence on the Education Committee . . . "I've wasted two years on this committee," said Davis, adding that he would ask to be removed from the committee and be reassigned. Fallon's article mentioned another dimension to CTA's opposition. "The Commission has heavy representation of federation (California Federation of Teachers) members and this appears to be one factor in the CTA's determined opposition to the bill. (7: 1982)

More accurately, three Commission members had CFT affiliation (teacher representatives Robert Salley and Nancy Flannigan and faculty representation David Levering); all three were involved in the Commission's leadership and were the driving force behind the Commission's reform agenda. These appointments had been a result of the CTA's poor relations with Governor Jerry Brown. The CTA had not supported Brown when he ran for governor initially, and had opposed him when he ran for a second term. In contrast, CFT was affiliated with labor, had strong ties to the Democratic Party, had supported Brown's candidacy and consequently, had the advantage when appointments were made to the Commission.

CTA President Marilyn Bittle wrote an article in the organization's monthly newspaper, *Action*, praising the CTA's role in defeating Hart's bill. In October, CTA offered Robert Salley an opportunity to write a rebuttal for the next issue of *Action*. In his response, Salley wrote:

> *. . .Unfortunately, President Bittle continues to perpetuate some of the misunderstandings about that bill.*

> *When Marilyn Bittle criticizes the Hart bill for requiring a new teacher to be "placed on hold" for five years while taking 24-units before getting an advanced credential, she displays a failure to understand the present law which also has a two-stage requirement, the Preliminary and the Clear. Presently, after a four year degree and professional preparation, a candidate receives a Preliminary Credential. He or she then has five years within which to take an additional full academic year to receive a Clear Credential.*
>
> *However, the present system is deficient. Many, if not most, teachers prepared in California colleges take professional preparation during a graduate year.*
>
> *Therefore, they bypass a Preliminary Credential and receive a Clear without ever really teaching. Then, by teaching only two years, they obtain a Life Credential and have no further obligations to upgrade their skills. The craft of teaching, as understood by most successful career teachers, is not learning in a semester of student teaching or in only two classroom years.*
>
> *President Bittle has suggested that all teachers continually renew themselves professionally on an ongoing basis already. We all know too many who do not. Upon reaching the top of the salary schedule in 10 or 15 years, they stop growing. Some stop well before that time.* (1: November, 1982)

The CTA was representing teachers who did not want to change or have additional credential requirements. Very few teachers believed that additional education courses would contribute significantly to their success in the classroom. When asked, teachers claimed that on-the-job training and information from practicing teachers were the most important sources of training, not college professor. As a result, most teachers held education in low regard and resented the intrusion of additional credential requirements. However, "A Nation at Risk" was about to be published. A national reform movement was about to be born. Even the CTA's formidable lobbying clout would not be able to avoid public clamor for improvement.

Learning from Experience

If the Commission was going to pursue a legislative reform, it had to develop better strategies. In this effort, the Commission's Legislative Committee held a workshop with several lobbyists representing the CTA, CFT, school boards, school nurses and librarians and Senate Education Committee staff. They were told that if the agency is going to pursue legislation, individual Commissioners must be active and get to know legislators, especially those from their own districts. The Commissioners also needed to know the strengths and weaknesses of their bill and the areas of potential problems. Legislators wanted to know about public support for reforms measured by the volume of mail, telephone calls and visitors.

Commissioners were told that they needed a broader base of support from teacher organizations and teacher educators. Some workshop attendees advised the timing was wrong for a major reform bill, since it was an election year. Others suggested that the Commission proposal contained too much and went too fast. Chances would improve if reform pieces were moved through the Legislature on a step-by-step basis rather than in a comprehensive package. Lastly, the Committee members were told that they had to build consensus among their own members. Legislators had received conflicting messages from different Commission members. In a general statement, a participant made the observation that professionalism cannot be legislated but, rather, had to come from training and individuals in the occupation. High standards and meaningful intellectual requirements make an expert teacher. The profession must be more demanding. When you raise requirements to have teachers who are able to hold their heads up and talk back to the public with real knowledge--then you will be able to provide them with the compensation they should get. (1: October, 1982)

Transitions in Leadership, Politics and Individuals

At the end of 1982, Robert Salley had reached the limit for service as Chairman. David Levering was elected as Chairman. (1: December, 1982) There was little change in philosophy or direction with this election. As Vice Chairman and a fellow CFT member, Levering and Salley had worked closely together for years. Moreover, Salley remained on the Executive Committee. However, by December 1984,

when Salley's and Levering's terms expired, the CFT coalition that had led the Commission since 1979 ended. For the first time, there was an openly contested election for chair. Jerry Brown-appointee Alice Petrossian and Deukmejian-appointee Mary Jane Pearson ran for the position while Petrossian filled the role of acting chair. Finally after a protracted process, in May 1985, Alice Petrossian won the position on an 8-5 vote.

It was well known that if Petrossian were elected, she would lead an effort to dismiss John Brown. As Executive Secretary, Brown had initially been successful in initiating several important projects, over time, however, he was perceived as unable to sustain major initiatives. He gave the impression of being unsympathetic to the needs of higher education and, as a result, failed to build credibility among its representatives. In July, 1985, Brown "resigned" in executive session and Licensing Coordinator Richard K. Mastain was asked to take over as Acting Executive Secretary. Several months later, Mastain assumed the position on a permanent basis.

At the same time, it sustained significant changes in leadership, the Commission developed nine new goals for the agency. These were to:

- Confer with agencies, groups and individuals with the purpose of improving agency policies; and governing stable funding;
- Review each credential area periodically;
- Introduce legislation to require teacher candidates to pass a performance assessment and a subject matter examination that included essay questions;
- Establish high standards for educator competence and moral fitness;
- Ensure that teachers are assigned to areas directly related to their preparation;
- Effectively communicate the Commission's views to individuals, groups and the public;
- Establish a system to collect and disseminate information on teacher education, credentialing and teacher assignments; and
- Improve agency efficiency through the use of modern office techniques and technology.

With a dynamic and aggressive chair, a new consensus seeking executive secretary and a new set of goals, the Commission was finally ready to build its reputation and exert leadership. It decided, first, to improve its links with important legislators by honoring them, including Assemblymember Chuck Bader and others who had been highly critical of its discipline procedures and had accused it of laxness. In January 1986, Bader addressed the Commission's first meeting of the New Year. He stated that, "our goals are identical, even though our conclusions about how to reach those goals may be different." He now offered to work with the Commission to improve the quality of teacher preparation, particularly on career progression extending from intern to a fully independent teacher, with an option to become mentor teacher, a curriculum specialist, or an administrator. According to one long-time observer, this strategy of honoring legislators was a smart move. To improve communications, the Commission issued its newsletter on a monthly basis in a more polished format.

Second, if the Commission was to gain passage for its reforms, it had to work more closely with interest groups. "Informal discussions" were held with representatives of associations, institutions and agencies giving the Commission opportunities to gather advice on its reform proposals. Some groups clearly mapped out their positions while others were less forthright--probably because they did not want to appear self-serving in public. The California State University representative stated that it was "extremely interested in taking greater initiative in working more with the Commission" and clearly avoided enunciating CSU's long-time agenda item--deregulating teacher preparation.

Other representatives were more specific. School boards wanted a two-year internship for beginning teachers, alternative routes to certification, more generalized credential authorizations, a subject matter test for beginning teachers, the elimination emergency credentials (while leaving districts "some way to put teachers in front of all classes") and continuing school board representation on the Commission. ACSA's specific concern related to additional representation on the Commission; it questioned the Commission's role in determining the competence of teachers – a role, it argued more appropriately a function of local school districts. The State Department made no mention of its desire to place credentialing under the State Superintendent but expressed concerns

about the teacher mis-assignment problem. CTA announced that it was again sponsoring legislation to put a majority of teachers on the Commission. After stating that its first priority was to reduce class size, CFT argued for eliminating the Teacher Trainee Program, replacing Emergency Credentials with the summer internship training program, provide incentives for minority teacher candidates, implementing "State Bar-type" subject matter examinations, ensuring that colleges adequately funded their teacher training programs, developing models that encourage teacher participation in decision-making, and moving towards a peer evaluation system. Los Angeles Unified School District's desires were directed toward staffing schools to meet its expanding enrollment. However, in the credentialing area, Los Angeles wanted to extend the Teacher Trainee Program into elementary schools and find ways to "deal with the mis-assignment of teachers."

A Name Change for the Commission

During the 1982 legislative session, Assemblymember Teresa Hughes introduced a bill to change the agency's name to the "Ryan Commission." Her intention was to honor Congressman Leo Ryan who had been killed while visiting Guyana in 1979. At first, the Commission attempted to persuade Hughes to change the name to the Ryan Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing and then the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing (Ryan Commission). However, when the bill eventually worked its way through the Legislature, the name had become the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). The name change took effect on the first day of 1983.

Deukmejian and Honig are Elected

In November 1982, there was a dramatic change in two of the state's two top elective offices. Conservative Republican George Deukmejian was elected Governor and Independent (former Democrat) Bill Honig was elected Superintendent of Public Instruction. Both Deukmejian and Honig were in sharp contrast to their predecessors Jerry Brown and Wilson Riles and both would have significant effects on future educational events. At the same time, Assemblymember Gary Hart was

elected to the Senate. All three had been opposed by teacher organizations.

Major Education Reform Bills

With the election of a new State Superintendent and with a number of national reports such as "Nation at Risk" declaring America's system in crisis, education captured the public attention and became a legislative priority. Several major reform bills were formulated, most prominently by Assemblymember Hughes, Senator Hart and two sponsored by State Superintendent Honig who persuaded Assemblymember Marian Bergeson and Senator Ed Davis to introduce his proposals. Honig's bills contained provisions for expanding the school year, increasing academic requirements, offering higher starting salaries for beginning teachers, relaxing procedures to dismiss teachers, reducing the probationary period to two years, expanding the state's testing program and toughening student discipline standards. Although the bills did not eliminate the Life Credential, they required the credential to be renewed every five years with local districts determining the requirements. Teacher unions found it difficult to accept the provisions for easier dismissal. Honig's proposals were estimated to cost $973 million while Governor Deukmejian had proposed an increase of $374 million.

When Honig's package did not receive the support of the CTA, a *San Francisco Examiner* article explained:

> *In the last five years the CTA has spent more than $1 million on political races and claims that 80 percent of the candidates it backed won.*
>
> *Now, with Honig's proposals, CTA's clout will be tested again. The organization strongly objects to some of the provisions of the plan, such as changes in requirements for tenure and teacher layoffs.*
>
> *Moreover, CTA faces criticism from some parents and school administrators who say the union's wage demands are one reason many districts are forced to close schools and cut programs to a minimum. That is the case in San Jose, where the teachers are the highest paid among the state's larger districts . . .*

> *Some school administrators say the CTA lobby has a stranglehold on Sacramento lawmakers to the detriment of local school policy . . . Honig further irked CTA officials by saying he planned to get rid of a significant number of incompetent teachers and to whip the state's lethargic educational system into shape.*
>
> *Now, Honig's #1 billion educational reform plans is in Legislature. For that package to be successful, Honig said, "I don't think we need their support, but what we don't need is holy war. If we were trying to eliminate collective bargaining, for example, they would be up in arms. But if you're talking as we're talking--reasonable changes--they may oppose it, but it is not a life-or-death thing to them..*
>
> *But [Executive Director] Flynn said CTA will support Honig's reforms, or those being offered by Governor Deukmejian and Senate Education Committee Chairman Hart, D-Santa Barbara, only if they are premised on there being adequate funds to support that."*
>
> *In addition, Flynn said, referring to several of Honig's proposals (he terms unacceptable), the CTA "will fight" with every ounce of vigor we've got, a series of anti-teacher measures disguised as reforms."* (8: April, 1983)

The Second Credentialing Reform Bill (Bergeson–1983)

Immediately after the defeat of its credential reform package in 1982, Coordinator David Wright presented the reform plans for the following year. Some accommodations were being made, but the Commission was steadfast on most of its positions. Rather than stating that Life Credentials would be eliminated, the draft bill now stated that the advanced teaching credential would have to be renewed every five years. For renewal, teachers would have to supply evidence of "successful service" and complete an "individual program of professional growth" developed jointly by the teacher and school district. Concern was expressed by the school districts about the cost of having an experienced teacher help a beginning teacher and the Commission's staff was directed to explore ways to implement a support system without incurring high cost. Nevertheless, the Commission felt strongly that school districts

should be mandated to be involved in advanced training. The body also felt the advanced requirement should be a combination of "systematic staff development" and college courses.

Soon after Senator Hart took office in January 1983, Commission vice-Chair Frances Berry (a constituent of Hart) arranged a meeting with Commissioners Levering, Salley, Executive Secretary Brown and herself. Hart was planning to introduce the Commission's reform package again in the same form as the previous session. Although willing to receive amendments, he was a little more cautious. He wanted to know their rationale for the bill and how it would be received by various interest groups. Deciding not to make the same mistake twice, Executive Secretary Brown had met with CTA officials to find ways to make the bill more acceptable to the organization. As a result, amendments were proposed to strengthen the provisions for beginning teacher support, insure that advanced programs would not be costly for school districts and teachers, add additional protections for beginning teachers, make the advanced certificates valid for life and clarify the minimum requirements for renewal. (2: February, 1983)

Another set of amendments responded to higher education. The primary one was to "sunset" the program approval process. This was a long-time agenda item of the University of California which viewed program review was an intrusion into its autonomy. Other proposed amendments, such as the requirements for 30-units of pedagogy and retention of courses in communication skills, health education, mainstreaming and knowledge of the U.S. Constitution, sought to protect higher education's turf. Another amendment proposed eliminating the State Board's authority to reject Commission regulations. (2: March, 1983)

In March, the Commission's Legislative Committee met with Hart and Senate Education Committee consultants Linda Bond and Karen Lowrey. Hart informed the group that the amendments eliminating Life Credentials and the requirements for professional growth had been eliminated from the bill.

Apparently, skeptical about the advisability of such proposals, Bond and Lowrey had wanted to determine whether research showed a link between professional development and improved teaching performance before proceeding with new mandates.

At the Commission's April meeting, Senate Education Committee Consultant Linda Bond made a presentation. She stated that Hart would like to incorporate some of the Commission's reform proposals such as the two-step credential into the Senator's major reform bill. However, Hart wanted other proposals such as eliminating Life Credentials and stiffening reciprocity requirements in another bill. Bond stated that as a former teacher, Hart had been persuaded by arguments that the school site "clinical" or bottom up professional development model was more effective than a top down model suggested by the Commission. She was against linking credential renewal to college courses but rather to linking them to periodic evaluations. Bond maintained that there should be more feedback to beginning teachers by administrators who were in a position to encourage teacher growth and at the same time, encourage teachers not interested in growth to leave the occupation.

While Hart was sifting through the Commission's reform proposal, Assemblymember Bergeson appeared ready to carry most of the package. When approached by Executive Secretary Brown, Bergeson expressed a willingness to place most of the Commission's entire proposal into her bill, but was still interested in "streamlining" the credentialing system. Brown suggested to the Commission that it choose either Hart's or Bergeson's bill for their reform package. Impatient and agitated, the Commission wanted action. In an abrupt switch, the Commission chose Bergeson's bill and immediately began seeking amendments. Most significant were amendments to reinstate the Commission's earlier Emergency Credential and renewal requirements. Instead of 90-hours of professional development to renew a credential, the Commission now wanted 150-hours as recommended in a Business Roundtable report.

When Bergeson's bill was heard before the Assembly Education Committee in April, the bill analysis stated that:

> *The major policy question is whether credentialing should be linked to continuing education. Some experts argue that credential retention should not be based on "continuing education" as there is no evidence to suggest that continuing education improves the quality of teacher performance.* (9: 1983)

In May, Bergeson's bill passed out of the Assembly Education Committee. Following the Commission's top down approach, new amendments proposed that the agency determine the courses and activities that would be acceptable for credential renewal and that each school would have a "professional development advisor" to certify each teacher's continuing education program. However, by this time, the bill was losing steam. The major reform bills were being given so much attention, other bills had taken lower priority. It was becoming increasingly clear that the Commission's only chance, in 1983, would be to include pieces of their reform into either Hart's or Hughes' major reform bills.

Major Education Reform Bills Take Priority

Meanwhile, the Legislature was debating over how to fund the major reform bills. Assembly Democrats were arguing for a tax increase and Assembly Speaker Willie Brown proposed a tax increase on cigarettes, liquor and people with high incomes. Republicans were resisting and said that the proposal didn't "face up to the fiscal realities of California or to the election of Republican Governor Deukmejian, who opposes tax increases." Speaker Brown hoped for "a negotiated settlement with the governor."(10: April, 1983)

Hughes-Hart Education Reform Act of 1983 (SB 813)

By June, Honig and the legislative leaders were haggling over the educational reform package. Both the Assembly and Senate had passed bills which provide a $700 to $840 million in additional funds to schools. Even some Republicans were supportive and leaders in both parties were talking about a variety of ways to raise taxes. Deukmejian was willing to add another $100 million to the $350 million he had previously proposed and add $700 million the following year if the legislators would only "hold the line on spending" in 1983. He said that he would veto any bill that would raise taxes.

Operating independently from the Legislature, Honig was calling Deukmejian's offer "too little, too late," and proposed a quarter-cent sales tax increase. Deukmejian cried foul and said that Honig had not advocated tax increases during his campaign pledges. He had always said that additional money must be linked with reforms and since he was

never asked to make a commitment on tax increases, he never ruled them out.

Bill Honig was an independent outsider and apparently gave little thought to adhering to Sacramento's customs and protocols for coalition politics. Democratic legislators were determined to hold out for full funding, but Honig was impatient, went behind the legislator's backs and cut a deal with Deukmejian. In doing so, he lost the legislators' trust.

Although members felt betrayed by Honig, the legislative leaders decided to fight for full funding anyway. "It's still winnable," Hart said, adding that Honig's actions were "kind of a surprise and kind of diversionary tactic, but it's not going to stop us." The reform bill was already in a Senate/Assembly conference committee and the Democrats wanted to confront Deukmejian on this high profile educational issue. Democrats proposed a $2.7 billion omnibus reform despite the threat of a veto. Deukmejian was in a political corner and during the summer signed the Hughes-Hart Reform Act (SB 813) with its many provisions, but he "blue penciled" $1.9 billion that was intended to fund the second year of the reform.

Major Implications for Credentialing

Toward the end of the negotiations on the Hughes-Hart bill, Governor Deukmejian presented a small list of items that he included. Apparently, Assemblymember Bergeson has asked him to eliminate Life Credentials and impose the 150-hour renewal requirements and as a result, two major planks of the Commission's reform package were included. However, at the request of Assemblymember Hughes from Los Angeles, an alternative route to certification was provided that allowed school districts to create their own teacher preparation programs called the "Teacher Trainee Certification" program. This was a proposal of the Los Angeles Unified School District which suffered from a chronic shortage of teachers.

Dissatisfaction with the Commission

During the 1980s several legislators had become dissatisfied with the Commission's performance. The reasons for this dissatisfaction were vague, but most often, the Commission was told that it was not exerting leadership. The agency had spent several years carefully conducting

research, setting priorities and assembling a reform package. However, it had handled awkwardly its relations between Hart and Bergeson on its second reform bill. Commission representatives were often absent when credentialing measures were brought before legislative committees. Moreover, the Commission seemed to consume inordinate amounts of meeting time on trivial matters or blurt out disparaging remarks in public about the legislature or the State Board. These missteps drew substantial criticism.

As the dissatisfaction with the Commission grew deeper and Honig's desire to consolidate policy making increased, it was not a surprise when, in April 1984, Assemblymember Chuck Bader altered one of his bills to return credentialing to the State Board and a Bureau of Teacher Credentialing within State Department. Democratic Assemblymember Sam Farr later joined Bader as co-author of the measure. (11: May, 1984) When Bader presented his bill to the joint committees, he accused the Commission of failing to adopt competency standards mandated by the Ryan Act, of being irresponsible in budgeting and staffing, and of not knowing statistical information about credential holders. Bader pointed out the split in educational authority and responsibility. The State Board and Superintendent were responsible for professional development and curriculum development while the Commission was in charge of teacher preparation. Bader argued that, "curriculum development (what to teach) and teacher preparation (how to teach it) should be under the control of the Superintendent. Accountability would thereby be centralized."

Little came from these hearings. The Commons Commission was studying the issues and would eventually make recommendations. Until the results were known, it was decided that both Bader's and Bergeson's bills should not move forward. (12: July, 1983)

New Ideas for Reform

In the fall of 1983, the Assembly Education Committee held two interim hearings on teacher preparation and credentialing, concentrating on five areas of concern – program review, teacher supply and demand, teacher preparation, credentialing out-of-state teachers and governance. It set forth six legislative recommendations: develop an alternative to program review; develop an effective supply and demand data base; clarify the Commission's role in teacher trainee programs; develop new

policies to certify out-of-state teachers; conduct an in depth assessment of the governance of teacher preparation and licensing curriculum and professional development; and develop proposals to upgrade the teaching profession.

During 1984, the Education Round Table invited one hundred of California's educational leaders, researchers and other professionals to participate in an Asilomor symposium to address increasing the attractiveness of teaching. Several significant albeit familiar policy proposals came from this conference. The conferences proposed that a new Professional Standards Board be established and be composed of a majority of practicing teachers. It also called for beginning teacher support, a peer evaluation process, rigorous teacher training courses and a four-step career ladder, reduced distinctions between teachers and administrators and greater teacher responsibility for policing their own ranks. The group envisioned expanding the teacher's role, decentralizing decision making, changing the role of the principal and addressing problems beyond the school.

This symposium could not have occurred at a more opportune time. The work of a blue ribbon commission, the California Commission on the Teaching Profession (later known as the Commons Commission, after its chair, Dorman Commons) was just beginning.

Creation of the Commons Commission

In the fall of 1983, UC *ex-officio* Commissioner James Guthrie and Stanford Professor Michael Kirst had proposed that the Commission create a Blue Ribbon Commission, charged to find ways to enhance the teaching profession. If handled properly, this new center would gain credibility and prestige and legislators would find it difficult to ignore the Commission in formulating legislation. But for a variety of reasons, the Commission did not want to undertake this kind of leadership role. It wanted to concentrate on the issues and work plan that had been developed over several years. (13: September, 1983)

The proposal did not die with the Commission's reluctance. The idea of a "blue ribbon commission" had originated in a conversation between Guthrie and Ted Lobman, then Executive Director of the Hewlett Foundation. They had been impressed by the success of a bipartisan and objective Blue Ribbon Commission headed by former

Treasury Secretary Stuart Simon in recommending reforms for the Social Security System. Lobman wondered if the same concept could be used in reforming teacher credentialing. Guthrie thought they should try. They met with Bill Honig, who was initially reluctant, but after Lobman's persuasive arguments, warmed to the idea. Once persuaded, Honig wanted to be the single sponsor, but Guthrie and Lobman convinced him that the "blue ribbon commission" needed a broader base of support. In addition to Honig, they wanted the sponsorship of Governor Deukmejian, UC President Saxon, CSU Chancellor Ann Reynolds, Senator Gary Hart and Assemblymember Teresa Hughes. Gunthrie and Lobman were not as successful with Deukmejian, Saxon and Reynolds. The governor's education advisor, William Cunningham, like the idea, but he candidly admitted that he was unable to persuade the governor to co-sponsor this effort. Saxon and Reynolds declined because they did not want to potentially endanger their relationship with the Governor.

Ultimately, the California Commission on the Teaching Profession was formed under the chairmanship of Dorman Commons. Senate Education Consultant Linda Bond was hired as the Commission's Executive Director and Dr. Gary Sykes of Stanford University was asked to perform the duties of Research Director. Better known as the "Commons Commission" after its Commission focused on three principal areas: (1) restructuring the teaching career and establishing rigorous professional standards; (2) redesigning the school as a more productive workplace for teachers and students; and (3) accelerating the recruitment of capable men and women to teaching.

The Commons Commission, which consisted of "a cross section of California men and women representing different racial, cultural and professional backgrounds," deliberated for 15 months as commissioners listened to hundreds of hours of testimony from parents, teachers, education researchers and others from across the United States. The independent panel commissioned 17 research papers on aspects of the teaching profession such as compensation, career ladders, alternatives to collective bargaining and recruitment incentives.

With the help of a marketing research firm, the Commons Commission also conducted a focus study group to determine why former teachers had left the profession. The focus group study observed:

> *Most of the former teachers surveyed had entered into teaching as a career commitment to students and society. However, former teachers feel that the educational environment has changed dramatically in the last fifteen years. The teachers believe that erosion in the quality of public education in California during the last decades has resulted in a lack of public confidence. The areas of particular concern include: bureaucracy throughout, over-administration at the higher level, shortage of funds, overcrowded classrooms, elimination of special classes/programs, and lack of parental grades than learning and incompetent teachers. In conclusion, study results demonstrate the involvement/concern and more emphasis on gravity of the teaching situation in California today. These experienced teachers are unlikely to return to the teaching force unless policymakers substantially improve compensation, working conditions and community support for the profession of teaching.*

The Commons Commissioners resolved to address "a plethora of accumulated problems. Our school plants are in disrepair, with a $2 billion backlog required to bring them up to standards of safety and livability. Our class sizes are the largest in the nation, with the exception of Utah. We are facing an increase of at least 500,000 students by the end of this decade. We live in a society in which knowledge is growing exponentially, but the methods of training teachers and the structure of our school organizations have changed little in the past 85 years."

Who Will Teach Our Children? The Report of the Commons Commission

In November of 1985, the Commons Commission produced the report, *Who Will Teach Our Children? A Strategy for Improving California's Schools*. The report placed particular emphasis on teacher qualifications:

Perhaps the biggest changes the Commission proposes are in establishing and enforcing professional standards. Instead of basing credentials on the courses an individual sits through, entry into the profession should be based on thorough examinations and assessments,

and these exams and assessments should continue at each step of a teacher's career.

The Commons Commission believed that a clear credential should be based on what the teaching candidate knows and is able to do, not merely on the courses taken in college.

In another major departure, the Commons Commission recommended that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) be replaced with a California Teaching Standards Board comprised of a majority of teachers and charged with developing the required exams and assessments. The Board would include a separately appointed enforcement unit to administer and evaluate the exams and to take responsibility for sanctions against teachers involved in statutorily prohibited misconduct. The Commission believed that members of the profession should be held accountable for the qualifications and discipline of the profession.

The Commission also suggested that local school districts provide regular information to parents, maintaining that: "parents need to be informed of the conditions for learning at their neighborhood schools." The Commission recommended that all schools publish reports at least every two years on the condition that each school could affect the process of teaching and learning:

- If there is overcrowding, parents need to know.
- If teachers are teaching outside of their areas of competence, parents need to know.
- If the buildings are in disrepair or unsafe, parents need to know.

The Commons Commission also recommended that the management of schools be restructured:

- The principal's role must be more thoroughly defined by California's education community and new effort must be dedicated to developing training programs for principals.
- Principals must be team leaders, cooperating with teachers to run schools with greater autonomy at the site level.

According to the Commons Commission, the roles of teachers should be expanded both in breadth and scope. It advised, "teachers should have greater participation in crucial matters such as selection of

new teachers, teacher evaluation, schedules and curriculum and student discipline."

Finally, the Commons Commission declared that California must work actively to recruit capable people into teaching. To do so "teachers need to be afforded competitive salaries" they said. "At the college level, work study programs and service-paycheck fellowships for teaching students will not only help talented future teachers finish school, but will encourage many talented college students who might not otherwise consider teaching to select teaching as a career." (14: November, 1985)

The Commons Commission distributed over 40,000 copies of *Who Will Teach Our Children?* Briefings on the report were held with every major education and civic organization in California. Commissioners convened town meetings across California, in Fresno, Claremont, Los Angeles, Orange County, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco and San Jose. Prior to introducing legislation based upon the Commons Commission recommendations, Senator Gary Hart, Chair of the Senate Education Committee, scheduled two additional meetings for legislators and others – one in Santa Barbara and the other in Oxnard.

The Commons Commission embraced the medical licensure model for the teaching profession, including some of the parlance. Teachers would undergo "rigorous training," pass "state examinations," undergo a "residency" under the supervision of a "clinical" professor and have the opportunity to become a "specialist." This model would be the model legislative reformers pursued in their quest to make teaching more respectable and to improve public schools.

Bader and Honig Try Again

In 1985, Bader again introduced a bill to place the Commission in the State Department. Finally, in November, a special interim session was held by the Senate Education Committee on Commons Commission report and the Bader bill. Following a morning discussion of the Commons Commission's report, Bader restated his reasons for placing credentialing within the State Department and argued that the Superintendent was presently "shielded from the teacher preparation function." If the state was going to hold him accountable for educational quality, it was necessary to involve him from the first day that the

prospective teacher entered college. Without sufficient support, especially from the CTA, the Bader bill could not move through the legislature. The threat of abolishing or moving the Commission had subsided. At the same time, the just-released recommendation of the Commons Commission introduced a new set of dynamics for the credentialing agency. (15: November 1985)

Proposed Credential Reform Legislation 1986-1988

After the Commons Commission report was issued, Senators Hart and Bergeson introduced companion bills based on its recommendations. Hart's measure focused on the school site reform proposals. Bergeson's bill on credential reform proposed an eleven member California Teaching Standards Board and a nine-member Enforcement Board appointed by the Governor. Both new Boards would be fully independent of the State Board of Education. All teaching credentials would become two-staged, requiring a supervised internship prior to full certification. During the residency year, beginning teachers would teach an eighty-percent workload, be supervised by a mentor teacher and a "clinical" professor and be evaluated by several observers.

The details of Bergeson's legislation were negotiated over a two and a half-year period. Seven key issues were debated as the comprehensive Commons Commission package advanced through the Legislature.

The first issue was the composition of the Standards Board. Representatives of the CTC felt it would be politically difficult to exclude higher education from the voting seats. Moreover, one seat could not speak for all higher education and CSU Chancellor Reynolds was going to press for CSU's own seat. The Commons Commission had advocated a more limited size, giving teachers a majority, while including members of the public and others representing school board members, administrators and other educators. Honig was demanding a seat, but Bergeson hesitated to place an elected official on the policy board.

Second, at Honig's request, an amendment was added to eliminate CBEST and substitute an examination that included general knowledge and liberal education. The CTC approved of expanding the exam beyond basic skills, but some legislators had strong reservations about how that would impact minorities. Generally, minorities did well on subject matter

examinations – material they learned in college – but less well on general knowledge examinations which were more a reflection of background.

Third, the CTC was troubled by the notion of making teacher training exclusively a postgraduate program and asked for the rationale. The Commons Commission believed a postgraduate program was more appropriate under a professional model. In addition, it would give potential teachers more time to study subject matter during the undergraduate years. The Commons Commission felt that by giving teacher training graduate status, schools of education would have more prestige and credibility within their own institutions. Although the CTC agreed that schools of education needed more prestige and respect, they felt the use of postgraduate status was not a suitable approach. The Commons Commission felt that it was important to provide future teachers with strong subject matter skills, a good general education, and the ability to convey information. Moreover, they felt that something dramatic had to be done to force colleges to recognize the importance of teacher education.

Fourth, there were debates over "professional growth" requirements for credential renewal. The CTC felt that the Standards Board should have authority over the standards. Bergeson had fought hard to include this in the Hughes-Hart reform bill and wanted it in this bill as well. The Commons Commission felt that control had to be placed with teachers and wanted to move away from the top-down approach. The Commons Commission felt that if more responsibility and accountability were placed with teachers, the profession would attract a better quality of people and produce more positive results.

Fifth, there were debates about the proposed residency requirement. The CTC wanted the Standards Board to have authority over beginning teacher assessment, arguing that without uniform criteria for clear credentials, the requirements would be uneven throughout the state. Hart felt that a "framework" might be established but that a highly prescriptive check list would be acceptable.

Sixth, one of the most contentious issues in the bill was the proposal that the credentialing agency discontinue program review and, instead, the Standards Board would choose a national or regional body to accredit training programs, such as the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The CTC did not think the Standards

Board should be tied down to an accrediting body indefinitely, since California's new evaluation design and standards would be stronger than NCATE's, and NCATE did not include any standards on how well beginning teachers should perform.

Finally, there were debates regarding the role of internships as alternative routes into teaching. The CTC inquired about eliminating the Teacher Trainee Program, which was used almost exclusively in Los Angeles at the time. However, some legislators wanted to strengthen the program by integrating practice and theory, by making it more like an internship, and by involving higher education. The CTC mentioned that it was currently evaluating the program and could live with its continuation, at least until the results were known. The program subsequently was given a positive evaluation. Bergeson was examining the issue of replacing emergency credentials with an internship program leading to a preliminary credential. The CTC wanted the internship program to be viewed as an alternative that would include student teaching and support. To the Commons Commission, the internship was intended for "mature" people with "intensive" summer course work prior to and following the school year that would combine the fifth year and residency into one year. The internship envisioned would be designed for seasoned and mature people who were ready to undertake classroom work without much assistance. The CTC agreed that people ready for the rigors of teaching should not be held back; however, some individuals who had just completed their bachelor's degree and could not financially afford a fifth year of study would also want to take advantage of the program. These individuals would need as much support as an ordinary beginning teacher would. Bergeson felt that the opportunity to begin teaching early and earn a salary immediately should be one the primary incentives for an internship program. She also wanted interns in residency to carry a full teaching load. She and other members of the Republican caucus were finding it difficult to accept the residency with an eighty-percent workload and full salary. (16: August, 1986)

As proposed amendments emerged, it became apparent that the differences between the CTC and legislators could be the undoing of both bills. In the memo to his colleagues, Commission staff David Wright wrote:

> *Direct Communication with Bergeson should be pursued . . . but we should keep Senate staff informed of what we are telling both Senators. Some explanations will be most persuasive to Bergeson; others will appeal to Hart. Without working the two sides against each other, it may be possible for us to salvage much of what we have sought in SB 1605.*

Although the CTC's primary goal was to retain the "existence, composition, functions, staffing and funding" of the agency, it decided to work with Bergeson to seek amendments to the Standards Board provision in her bill. The Commission wanted the Board's composition expanded to fifteen: six teachers, two administrators, three faculty members, two board members, four public members and the five existing *ex officio* members. It sought authority for the Board to establish standards for accreditation and to establish "sound alternative patterns" to gain a credential and to mandate fewer restrictions on teacher education programs and for funding for beginning teacher assessments and a teacher information system. (17: February, 1986)

When Bergeson's bill came before the Senate Education Committee in April 1986, the bill analysis noted that the bill contained five of the twenty-seven Commons Commission recommendations and four major shifts in credentialing policy. Program approval would be discarded; a bachelor's degree would be required prior to entering teacher training; a one-year residency would be required for a permanent credential; and a second autonomous unit would enforce discipline standards. The bill passed on a 6 to 10 vote and went on to Senate Appropriations. (18: April, 1986)

The first resistance the bill met was fiscal. The Department of Finance opposed the bill primarily for fiscal reasons and, secondarily, for policy concerns. Its analysis revealed a $127 million per year cost for residency, which did not contain a "continuing revenue source." Further, it questioned whether it was essential to abolish the CTC to accomplish the reforms. It wondered how a second autonomous board would lead to an "efficient review" of "allegations of credentialed staff misconduct . . . It appears that the potential exists for an inconsistent application of policy standards with two separate groups. (19: May, 1986)

In an effort to seek accommodation, Bergeson addressed the Commission and appealed to the body to concentrate on areas other than the Board's membership. Regardless, several Commissioners stressed the importance of having a broad representation and making the disciplinary function the Board's responsibility rather than a function of a separate board. By the end of the meeting, Bergeson admitted that she was still considering changes in the membership categories, but in private, she intended to hold out as long as possible. Before going to the Senate Appropriations Committee, she inserted amendments to reduce the cost of residency, to delay the start of the beginning teacher support program and to eliminate the "clinical" professors' support and assessment functions.

Nevertheless, both Bergeson's and Hart's bills became "bottled up" in Senate Appropriations over CTA's objections to the peer review provisions in Hart's bill. CTA was not willing to accept the peer review provisions from his bill and persuaded his Democratic colleagues to keep Bergeson's bill alive on the merit of the issues. Similar to most Sacramento lobbying organizations, the CTA exaggerated when reporting the events to its membership.

> *In one of the most dramatic turnarounds in the history of California politics, lawmakers last month stripped Senate Bill 1604 of all the provisions CTA had objected to . . . revamping the evaluation system by giving authority to teachers' unions and superintendents to throw some teachers-including those with tenure--into a "peer review" system. Aside from creating still another layer of bureaucracy, assigning some teacher to evaluate others would have undermined both collegiality and faculty morale . . .*
>
> *"When legislators and the media talk about CTA as 'the powerhouse in education,' it's victories like SB 1604 that they have in mind," observed a jubilant CTA President Marilyn Russell Bittle.* (20: July, 1986)

During the Assembly Education Committee hearings in July 1986, the Commission was unwilling to go beyond its "neutral" position because college faculty members "would not be represented adequately on the Board." Apparently, the Committee was not impressed with the

Commission's position and passed the bill on a 9 to 2 vote. During the hearing, it became apparent that there was uncertainty regarding accreditation and program review. The Commission felt that it had been treated unfairly by the accusations that its review process was ineffective. With the uncertainty surrounding the issue, the Commission sought an opportunity to defend the process and sought compromises that would allow the agency to continue program reviews. In a letter to Bergeson two days after the hearing, Mastain proposed that the agency retain program review. He claimed that the process was being redesigned and would eventually be "the best system of teacher education program review in the nation." Getting to the heart of the issue, Mastain stated: "The Commission believes strongly that the Standards Board must have the authority to accredit programs on the basis of standards of quality and the judgments of qualified professionals." (21: July, 1986)

Regardless of Mastain's letter, amendments were adopted to replace program approval with accreditation. One amendment retained the Teacher Trainee Program while another required subject matter examinations before issuance of the permanent credential rather than before the Preliminary. This would allow out-of-state teachers to begin teaching immediately without having to pass a subject matter examination. In August, despite the large number of Commission amendments that had been accepted, the CTC still maintained its "neutral" position. It still wanted two additional seats for higher education and an *ex officio* seat for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). (21: January, 1986)

In the bill's hearing before the Assembly Education Committee, Senator Bergeson adopted amendments to mandate that subject matter examinations be appropriate for the grade level to be taught, and teacher assessments teams be trained and sensitive to language and cultures of major ethnic groups and possess strategies for teaching English to limited-English speakers, and the faculty member on the Standards Board be a "member of the CSU faculty . . . selected from a list of at least three candidates supplied by the CSU Academic Senate." The bill passed and went to the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, where Mastain again pressed for more faculty members on the Standards Board. Bergeson amended the bill to respond to the Commission's requests.

With little time remaining before legislative adjournment in August, Bergeson's bill began to encounter major obstacles. The Ways and Means bill analysis stated that teaching had not improved after several years of experimentation and the expenditure of and spending millions of dollars. Some legislators expressed concern about the effect proposed examinations would have on minorities. In the Assembly Education Committee, an amendment had been added to "double join" Bergeson's bill with one carried by Hughes to raise beginning teachers' salaries in those districts that had not taken advantage of the 1983 Hughes-Harmajor reform bill "double joining" stipulated that unless Hughes' bill was enacted into law, Bergeson's bill could not take effect. Hughes' bill was blocked in Senate Finance and her purpose probably was to force Bergeson to lobby on Hughes' behalf. Although Bergeson was not a member of the committee and had little influence with its members, she did talk to some members; nonetheless, Hughes' bill was voted down.

When her bill came to the Assembly floor, Bergeson had a floor amendment ready that would have deleted the "double joining" language, but Hughes opposed the amendment, and the Democrats voted it down. Hughes opposition may have stemmed from alarmist letters to Assembly Education Committee members from CSU Chancellor Reynolds. Reynolds had convinced Hughes and Maxine Waters that the bill's testing requirements were adverse to minorities, and the minority caucus, in turn, had convinced the Democratic Caucus to oppose the bill. However, CSU's motive may not have been that straightforward. There was widespread belief that the true reason for CSU's opposition was that the examination results, if published, would embarrass individual campuses. (23: June, 1989)

In January 1987, Senator Bergeson had introduced her reform bill again. It was very similar to the previous one; however, in a surprise move, the provision to replace the Commission with the Standards Board had been removed. Bergeson had settled on a fifteen-member composition with an educator majority and had decided not re-negotiate the issue. The CTA continued to push for a teacher majority and stated: "It is our firm conviction that giving teachers more responsibility for and authority over their profession would be the first major step needed to raise instructional standards in California" In March, after adding an amendment to increase the number of teachers, the Senate Education

Committee unanimously approved Bergeson's bill and passed it on to Senate Appropriations. (24: December, 1986)

During this period, Honig and Commons had joined forces and introduced another bill based upon the Commons Commission's recommendations, an action that later put Honig in direct conflict with Deukmejian. In addition, the Commission was able to successfully sponsor legislation on teacher misassignment.

During the fall of 1987, the CTC's relationship with the Governor's offices was strengthened. Petrossian and Mastain had dinner with the Governor education adviser, Peter Mehas and discussed the future of the credentialing agency. He expressed a desire to help pass the Bergeson bill and, in November, arranged for Petrossian to meet with Governor Deukmejian. The primary purpose of the meeting was to talk about the Commission's unfilled seats, but the agency's future came under discussion. The Governor expressed support for the autonomous agency and Petrossian convinced the Governor that beginning teacher support was necessary. An alliance was forged. Two days later, Petrossian met with Assembly Minority Leader Pat Nolan and Assemblymember Chuck Quackenbush. They discussed the Commission's accomplishments, the proposal to change its composition to an educator majority and her meeting with the Governor. (25: November 1987)

SB 148 (Bergeson)

Early in 1988, Alice Petrossian and Marian Bergeson met with Peter Mehas. They urged him to find the funds for the first-year cost for beginning teacher support and have the Governor's office testify on behalf of Bergeson's bill before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Governor Deukmejian's State-of-the-State speech reflected optimism. After announcing that it was his "mission to keep California on top in the world of growth and competition," the Governor stated that he was proposing a $1 billion increase in school funding and announced funds for "better training and testing of new teachers." When the budget was released the following day, $1.1 million was allocated for the Commission and $1.9 million for the State Department to study alternative support and assessment models. Soon after, the Governor adopted a "support" position on the Bergeson bill.

Alice Petrossian and Richard Mastain had fostered an important relationship with Mehas and Deukmejian. As a result, Petrossian was asked to represent the Governor and Mehas at the National Governors' Conference devoted to the creation on a National Teaching Standards Board. On her return, Petrossian wrote that she considered the National Standards Board a "very valuable concept" deserving consideration. Petrossian noted that California already had implemented many of the recommendations promoted by the National Standards Board. In Petrossian's view, the value of the National Standards Board was illustrated in the differences between minimum state level "licensing" standards and national "certification" standards for high levels of competence. She could not see how any state could object to the National Standards Board, "but as those who work with the board have stated, this is definitely a "stars and moon concept." There were many issues that had to be overcome.

Among these, the most prominent were establishing standards, equity issues, funding and the meaning of national certificates to local districts. It was estimated that at least five years would be required to resolve the major issues.

In January 1988, with the omnibus bills stopped by the Gann limit, Bergeson's bill (SB 148) had the inside track with the Governor's support. The bill passed out of Senate Appropriations on a 10 to 0 vote, and three days later, passed the Senate on a 38 to 0 vote. Governor Deukmejian thanked the Commission for its support on "our budget proposal, particularly our commitment to fund more teacher training and staff development. I am pleased with our plans for the upcoming year, which also include the highest level of pupil support for K- 12 schools in California history." (26: January, 1988)

Because of the Governor's support, interest groups began to take a serious interest in Bergeson's bill and staking out their positions. Some stakeholders seemed to be in a quandary, especially over the idea that training models might be explored that excluded higher education. A person from higher education and President of the CFT, Miles Myers, wrote that the Commission appeared to be abandoning the university approach to teacher education and the union would use collective bargaining tactics to gain control over standards used by districts engaging in teacher training. (27: February, 1988)

Even with the Governor's support, the financial requirements of beginning teacher support became an obstacle. Because of the Department of Finance's objections, the Governor's office asked Bergeson to remove funding for the support and assessment system. It was the intent of the Department of Finance to wait until the result of pilot studies was known before supporting legislation to implement the support and assessment program. However, Bergeson believed beginning support and assessment to be the heart of the reform and, if removed, would reduce the bill to little more than a plan to complete the pilot studies. Although Bergeson may have verbally acceded to the request, it is clear from subsequent events that the Senator did everything possible to resist the removal of the provision. (23: June, 1989)

To begin with, the Commission and Bergeson's staff met with major organizations to gain support and outline strategies. Richard Mastain, David Wright, Gary Jerome and Bergeson's staff representatives and others met with Governor's and Finance's staff to determine ways to make the bill more acceptable. A subsequent meeting was held with the major organizations, and with the exception of CSU, the representatives agreed that they wanted a more comprehensive bill. CSU expressed concerns about the possibility that a teacher training model could exclude higher education.

In spite of Finance's opposition, Bergeson and the Commission pushed further and drafted amendments to give the Commission exclusive authority to adopt and implement the support and assessment system without additional legislation. In a meeting, Gary Jerome told Peter Mehas that Bergeson was committed to genuine reform and could not settle for anything less than the full implementation of the residency program. In contrast, a few days later, Mehas told Alice Petrossian that the Governor's support for the bill had not changed.

Throughout the legislative saga, the Commission attempted to retain program review. Senator Hart called program approval a "disaster area," and expressed the view that although the process may have improved considerably, he believed the concept "flawed." He believed that the State should not be regulating and program assessment should be done in subject matter, basic skills, and "some type of performance assessment." He and Linda Bond believed that peer accreditation was essential if teacher education was to be raised in stature. They spoke positively of

Chancellor Reynolds' comparison of teacher education to the medical profession. (2: May, 1988)

Meanwhile, the University of California considered program review to be an infringement on its autonomy. CSU was less concerned and simply wanted the term "program accreditation" changed to "state program approval" with the stipulation that there be increased cooperation between the state program approval process and the national accrediting agency.

Prior to Bergeson bill's hearing before the Assembly Education Committee in May, Assemblyman Bader told Gary Jerome that he wanted all the program approval and accreditation provisions removed from the bill. He was only interested in the "outcomes" and believed that individual candidate assessment was sufficient. Bader claimed that both program review and accreditation were a "shuck," an exercise in "mutual back scratching," and did not reflect the quality of the programs or of their graduates. (23: June 1989)

The Commons Commission had recommended that program approval be discontinued and that accreditation be instituted by a non-governmental organization. Under this notion, the Commission could select and set standards, and based on these standards, the non-governmental organization would carry out the review and accrediting functions. Theoretically, a California accrediting body, similar to NCATE, could be created and be made up of school and higher education professionals. With wider participation, it was suggested that there would be a greater sense of ownership and responsibility. (2: June, 1988)

When Bergeson's bill was heard before the Assembly Education Committee, ACSA took an opposing position because of the loss of one of its two seats, and the State Board took an "oppose unless amended" stand because the bill eliminated its authority over the Commission's regulations and statutes. Essentially, the State Board would be removed from having any authority over credentialing. Several amendments were accepted, the most notable being the one that embodied Commons Commission proposal for accreditation. Bader took an opposing position because the bill allowed the Commission to continue program review indefinitely if "no entity had submitted a satisfactory proposal for program accreditation." Since Bader was Vice-Chairman of the

committee and carried influence with the Republican Caucus, this could be a problem. Even if the bill got to the Governor's desk, Deukmejian would have difficulty in signing it if the Republican Caucus recommended a veto. This caused the bill to be held up in the committee.

It was the University of California's long standing position that a state agency governing teacher education had nothing to do with its research mandate. The state constitution placed the university outside the legislatures and Governor's authority and it exercised considerable autonomy. Because of this stance, some university departments chose not to provide their teacher candidates with approved course work option, thus requiring teacher candidates from their departments to pass examinations. When it looked like Bergeson's bill might pass, UC proposed a number of amendments to limit the scope of accreditation standards, limit the participation of school people on accreditation councils and sunset the Commission's authority to conduct program review. (6: June, 1989)

In protracted negotiations, Senator Bergeson offered accommodation by proposing alternatives. For example, instead of having to pass an examination for the second stage credential, candidates for the Preliminary Credential either would have to pass an exam (or assessment) or complete an accredited program. In the end, the university was unable to persuade the Legislature to remove overseeing the state from accreditation reviews. Under the Bergeson proposal, however, UC could contract an organization such as NCATE to conduct accreditation reviews according to State standards. Moreover, UC gained provisions that would give teacher preparing institutions considerable input into fashioning the standards. By limiting accreditation to teacher preparation, it freed the University's undergraduate programs from being assessed or reviewed by the Commission. For a UC student desiring a credential, they would have to pass a subject matter examination prior to being issued a Preliminary Credential. However, it was felt that examinations should not be a problem for the graduates.

On the other hand, the CSU system tended to design their subject matter programs for teachers and was more willing to undergo the Commission's approval process. Candidates graduating from State approved CSU subject matter programs would be able to earn a preliminary credential without examinations; however, they would have

to pass a subject matter examination for permanent credential. CSU wanted a campus-based assessment as an alternative to examinations so that individual campuses would not be compared. CSU believed that a campus-based assessment would help students who had difficulty with examinations, such as minorities.

Los Angeles and San Diego School Districts and ACSA disliked the provisions for Emergency "Permits." The bill proposed that teachers have a Bachelor's Degree, 12-units in the subject to be taught for a Single Subject Credential, 40-units in subjects commonly taught in schools for multiple subjects and pass an examination. Their primary objection was the examination. They claimed that not enough candidates could pass the examinations to fulfill their needs. As a result, the bill was amended so that individuals could fulfill the examination requirements through course work. If "permit" teachers were needed, school boards would be required to declare a shortage, obtain written agreements from the local unions and documents that they had searched for qualified teachers. (28: June, 1988)

At its June meeting, the Commission reacted strongly against the amendments to limit accreditation and ease Emergency Permit requirements, and abruptly, changed its position from "Support" to "Disapprove Unless Amended," thereby threatening to drop its own bill. Some compromise amendments were placed in the bill, and Alice Petrossian persuaded the more militant Commissioners to soften their position.

One of the problems related to emergency permits is, conceivably, a teacher could renew the Permit an infinite number of times without having to undergo the tests and assessments. After a meeting with the interested stakeholders, amendments were proposed to allow the Commission to "establish standards for the issuance and renewal of Emergency Permits so that the number of times an Emergency Permit was issued could be controlled."

On the issue of UC, Peter Mehas "concurred" with the Commission's position, but felt that the University system's concerns had to be addressed. He also informed Petrossian that the Governor's office had recommended that the Assembly Education Committee vote for the bill, but because of Bader's objections, the bill had been held up for months.

Petrossian and the Commission's staff then lobbied the Committee members and emphasized Mehas' recommendation.

The Commission, wanting both program review and teacher assessment, produced a document entitled *"Candidate Assessment and Program Quality Accreditation in Teacher Certification: Why Both?"* It argued that standardized testing omitted many aspects of competence and evaluated only some skills required by teachers. Moreover, it claimed that program approval provides the assurance of quality and that training programs improve as a result of periodic evaluations. Ultimately, it argued, the State has the responsibility to ensure the knowledge and skills required to pass a teaching assessment are included in programs.

Finally in late June, the Assembly Education Committee passed Bergeson's bill on a 12-2 vote. With the exception of ACSA and the State Board, most major organizations spoke for the bill. In addition to the reasons stated before, the State Board this time argued that the reconstituted Commission would consist of a majority of "credential holders," and the regulations should continue to be approved by a "lay" board. ACSA expressed concern about whether a teacher's first year should be a part of the probationary period.

Assemblymembers Bader and Bill Leonard had voted against the bill. Bader wanted total deregulation of the teacher preparation programs and candidate assessment as the only screen for teachers. Leonard's view was even more extreme. He did not see the need for teacher licensing, felt that it should be abolished, and wanted teacher training programs to become optional. According to his view, a bachelor's degree should be the only statutory requirement for teaching. School districts should be allowed to hire anyone they chose and provide them with on-the-job training. This would broaden the pool from which teachers were to be drawn. More individuals could try teaching. If they were competent, they could have tenure. If they are incompetent, they could be dismissed. From Leonard's view, credentialing unduly discouraged people who would otherwise might contemplate teaching.

During July, the Department of Finance again notified the Governor's office that it was opposed to the bill because the state should not be committed to residency before the results of the pilot studies were known. To overcome the objection, the Commission staff met with the governor's staff on three occasions with Petrossian and Bergeson

attending one meeting. These meetings centered around four issues: (1) Finance's opposition, (2) Bader's desire to terminate program review, (3) the State Board's desire to have authority over regulations, and (4) the Commission's composition. In the end, the Governor's staff said that they would ask the Governor to make decisions about the first three issues; however, they did not think the Commission's composition worthy of his attention. Commission and Bergeson staff members continued to meet with Mehas to devise strategies to overcome Finance's opposition.

When Governor Deukmejian was presented with the three alternatives, he was unwilling to go against Finance's recommendation; however, he was willing to support a non-binding phrase to implement residency following the pilot studies. Because of Deukmejian's position, the commitment to residency was removed from the bill. (23: June, 1989) He had no opinion about program review, but he expressed hope that Bergeson and Bader could reach an agreement. Finally, the Governor felt that the Commission's regulations should not be subject to approval by the State Board.

When the bill was heard by the Assembly Ways and Means in August, both the Legislative Analyst and the Department of Finance were asked for its fiscal impact. The Legislative Analyst stated that costs ranged between $5 and $31 million while Finance estimated that the cost could be up to $72 million. Because of a crowded agenda, Bergeson was allowed only a brief hearing and the bill was put over until late August.

Bader still could persuade the Republican Caucus to vote against the bill on the Assembly floor and send a negative message to Deukmejian. However, eliminating the residency system placed the bill in a different perspective for him. Without the permanent system, the candidate-centered assessment system would not be implemented and without the assessment system, program review was the only mechanism for accountability. Residency would require subsequent legislation-another battle, perhaps several years away with a different set of circumstances. Because of this, Bader backed away from his opposition.

In late August, Bergeson's bill passed out of Ways and Means on a 22 to 1 vote and passed the full Assembly with a vote of 65 to 1. Governor Deukmejian signed SB 148 into law on September 26, 1988, to become effective January 1, 1989.

Summary

The scope of credential reform of the eighties was severely curtailed when the support and assessment provisions of Bergeson's bill were deleted. Nevertheless, during the 1980s, several reform measures were enacted, some of which had lingered in the policy arena for years.

1. Bergeson's two-step teaching credential with support for beginning teachers and a thorough assessment before issuing a permanent credential were again notions that evolved from need and reaction. With schools losing up to fifty percent of beginning teachers within five years from entering the classroom, something was lacking. However, there were really three major factors affecting attrition-remuneration, working conditions, and the lack of a mentor and support while learning the craft. While the first two factors are expensive and difficult, beginning teacher support is something that almost everyone can agree upon. To come to such a conclusion, policy makers finally had to bury the notion that virtually anyone can teach. There is some satisfaction in that thought. Nevertheless, support and assessment, probably the most substantive reform proposals of this century, failed to be implemented.
2. The Bergeson Act did increase the role of teachers on the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Although it is not a teacher majority as the unions or the Commons Commission desired, it is a certificated (school people) majority. This is very different from the public majority (seven public members and two school board members) of the former Commission. Having a teacher majority has been a long standing issue with advocates who feel that teachers must be in control if teaching is to become a true profession. This notion stems from the professional standards movement in the 1950s that started advocating that teaching should pattern itself after the full professions such as medicine, law, architecture, etc. In California, the reader may recall that the CTA proposed a commission during the legislative formation of the Fisher Act and was instrumental in its inclusion in the Ryan Act. Now, certificated employees have the majority, making the body more "professional," at least symbolically.
3. Enactment of the CBEST requirement restricted entry into the occupation for individuals who cannot demonstrate competence in

basic skills. California State University also tightened its entry requirements into teacher training programs, limiting entry to individuals from the top of their class and interviewing prospective candidates to assess their suitability for teaching.

4. Enacting requirements for continuing education.
5. Placing limitations on teacher mis-assignment.
6. Enacting program accreditation.
7. Enacting emergency permits.
8. Enacting study residency.

This chapter has examined much of the political dynamics and human frailties that have accompanied reforms in the 1980s. Drives towards greater professionalization, higher status and more centralization were all present. Like the previous reform periods since World War II, this one also had the specific purpose to "reduce and streamline the credentialing system." The system will only remain simpler if policy makers retain one system over a long period as teachers with the older credentials retire and if they resist pressures for increased specializations, each with their own training requirements.

With each subsequent credential reform period in California, the driving force has become increasingly diffused. The leading political figures during 1980s were Senators Hart and Bergeson who carried most of the Commission's and the Commons Commission legislative proposals. They were also influential in having several credential reforms included in the Hughes-Hart Reform Act. The Commission was influential in the reforms, especially after its performance improved under the leadership of Alice Petrossian and Richard Mastain. The turnaround of the Commission is a story in itself. Much credit can be given to Chair Petrossian and Executive Secretary Mastain.

Absent from the credentialing arena was the State Board of Education, which had been at the center twenty short years ago. Its arguments for a more cohesive educational policy failed to overcome the forces that want direct participation in the credentialing process. Further, the destructive poser of Deukmejian's and Honig's disagreements kept the State Board on the sidelines. Putting credentialing back in or near the State Department would have given Hong more influence and perhaps made him look more effective to the public. Moreover, Sacramento has

a history of taking functions away from State Superintendent it dislikes. The Republicans did not want to give him credentialing.

The trend toward achieving greater professional status has continued. In a society that increasingly equates materialism with status, this continues to be an elusive quality for teachers. Nevertheless, requirements for both academic and professional preparation courses have become more specific as well as substantive.

REFERENCES

1. Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing. *Minutes*. January, 1979 through December, 1982.
2. Commission on Credentialing. *Minutes*. January, 1983 through May, 1988.
3. Sidney Arthur Inglis, Jr. (November/December 1988), "*The Two-Tier Administrative Credential: What is it and How it Developed*," Thrust: 39-41.
4. LoPresti, Peter L. (May 1977), "*California: The Impact of the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing,*" Phi Delta Kappan: 674-677.
5. Anrig, Gregory R. (February 1986) "*Teacher Education and Teacher Testing: The Rush to Mandate,*" Phi Delta Kappan: 447-51.
6. Bond, Linda, Interview by author, 1989.
7. Fallon, Michael article, Sacramento Union, August 16, 1982.
8. San Francisco Examiner article, April 3, 1983.
9. Assembly Education Committee analysis, California Legislature, May, 1983.
10. Sacramento Bee article, April 22, 1983.
11. Assembly Bill 2486 (Bader) as amended May 1, 1984.
12. Los Angeles Times article, July 29, 1983.
13. Guthrie, James W., California's New Education Reform and Teacher Training: Creating a Buyer's Market, September 1983. Commission files.
14. Commons Commission; *Who Will Teach Our Children? A Strategy for Improving California Schools*, California Commission on the Teaching Professions, November, 1985.
15. California Legislature. Senate Education Committee, Interim Hearing (AB 1818), November 7, 1985.
16. Commission on Teacher Credentialing Analysis of Senate Bill 1605, August 1986.
17. Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Legislative Committee Minutes, February 6, 1986.
18. California Legislature. Senate Education Committee, Staff Analysis of SB 1605 (Bergeson) as amended April 7, 1986.

19. Department of Finance. Bill Analysis, SB 1605 (Bergeson) May 16, 1986.
20. Bittle, Marilyn, CTA Action, July, 1986.
21. Mastain, Richard K., Letter to the Honorable Marian Bergeson, Senate Education Committee, July 3, 1986.
22. Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Analysis of Senate Bill 1605, January 27, 1986
23. Jerome, Gary, Telephone interview by author, June 5, 1989,
24. Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Bill Analysis, Draft Legislation (Bergeson), December 19, 1986.
25. Petrossian, Alice, Memo to Commissioners, November, 1987.
26. Deukmejian, George. State of the State Address, January 6, 1988.
27. Myers, Miles, Letter to Alice Petrossian, February, 15, 1988.
28. Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Analysis of Proposed Amendments to Senate Bill 148, June 2, 1988.

Chapter 8
Fulfilling the California Promise (1988-1996)

Philip A. Fitch and Dennis S. Tierney

Introduction

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, California began to emerge from a time of economic depression brought about by a changing economy and government cutbacks in military spending. In addition, the severe tax changes brought about by Proposition 13 and other anti-property tax measures of the late-1970s had been at least partially addressed through greater state-level involvement in the funding for public education. Although California had traditionally had an activist Legislature with regard to educational issues, the beginnings of the last decade of the 20th Century brought an intensified interest in the performance of the public school system.

The shift from an industrial economy to a knowledge-based economy as exemplified by the decline in manufacturing and the rise in jobs generated by "Silicon Valley" was as wrenching and profound a shift as the one from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy that had occurred some one hundred years earlier. As a part of this shift in the economy, the number of union jobs in California decreased while the basic knowledge and skill requirements for most blue collar jobs were increasing. Additionally, as a significant portion of the Pacific Rim economy, California's employers and policy makers were aware of the increasing global-ness of the world's economy and fretted over the ability of American workers to compete with workers from other nations. Thus, with budget authority for public education coalescing in Sacramento, and a rising tide of worry over the competitiveness of California's public schools, the stage was set for both the Governor and the Legislature to make public education a centerpiece of their respective agendas. As the oldest independent teaching standards board in existence, the Commission was to find itself right at ground zero of a number of reform efforts. Using the public policy strands noted in the first chapter, varied reform efforts grew out of the intersection of these strands with the increasing awareness of the need for a high quality public school system.

The demographic engine in California was again in high gear. California experienced a major increase in population in this time period as immigration from Asia and Central and South America grew rapidly, and one-third of all immigrants to the United States came to California. Coupled with a relatively young population, California's school population began climbing faster than the national average to the point where, in the mid-1980s, California added over 600 new elementary students every day to its public school rosters. Meanwhile, enrollments in teacher education programs had fallen in the early 1980s in response to a brief period of teacher surplus and the fallout from Proposition 13 and other tax reform efforts. Thus, there were early signs that California was again heading into a time of inadequate supply of fully qualified teachers.

Policymakers were alarmed by a series of reports that suggested American schools were inferior to schools in the other industrial nations of the world and that American students were not being prepared for the coming world economy. California schools were judged as less adequate than other states' school systems and the limitations on school spending created by the tax reforms of the late 1970s revealed a steep drop in dollar support for public education in California. Moreover, critics of the public schools noted repeatedly that the individuals who were intending to teach came from the lower quartiles of college student ability, and also noted that the brightest of those who entered teaching left soonest.

Concerns were also mounting about the quality and effectiveness of the training of those who decided to teach in the public schools. Issues over whether professional preparation was needed, and, if needed, how much preparation and what form it should take were debated in a variety of settings. Critics of educator preparation still down-played the need for pedagogical training while championing the need for rigorous preparation in subject matter. Others argued as passionately for stronger standards of pedagogical preparation and decried the efforts to reduce education coursework. However, in the growing field of special education, the issue was one of increased professional training to meet the complex needs of children diagnosed with learning disorders and other handicapping conditions. Through a series of national court decisions, the obligations of the public schools and the state legislatures that paid for them had been dramatically increased in the previous

decade. Thus, the Commission faced a new set of challenges as policy makers increasingly turned to the Commission to address these intertwined issues of educator supply and demand with emphasis on alternative programs of preparation, increased standards for professional preparation, support for new teachers, enhanced accreditation practices and alignment of new student content standards and subject matter preparation standards for teachers. Happily for the Commission, both Governor Pete Wilson (in office from 1991-1998) and influential members of the Legislature were committed to identifying innovative policy solutions to these complex educational challenges.

This new visibility of the Commission as an active player in educational reform brought with it new scrutiny as well. Appointments to the Commission were held to close adherence to the Governor's views on proper education reform, and the Executive Director was increasingly expected to maintain clear congruence with the stated policies of the Governor's Office. During this same period, the State Superintendent monitored the Commission's activities closely. Although the Commission was not faced with elimination, there were ongoing sentiments in some quarters to return educator licensing to the State Department of Education. Observing the boundaries of authority between the Commission and the State Department was always complex and problematic. While both agencies espoused a desire for cooperation and collaboration and had done so over many years and on several recent major projects such as the California New Teacher Project and the subsequent Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program, the potential for conflict over proper roles and responsibilities was always present.

In those years of mission growth and increased duties, the Commission codified a practice that dated from its earliest years. Given the complexity of developing sound educational policy for the State of California, with over 1,000 school districts, encompassing many racial, linguistic, and cultural groups, the Commission early on relied heavily on volunteer panels of experts drawn from institutions of postsecondary education, school districts, and county offices of education. Through the efforts of these panels, the Commission was able to extend its expertise by tapping into the body of research knowledge and best practices within the state. During the years 1990-1996, the Commission developed

program standards for the preparation of professional educators in all credential areas and test specifications in those areas where there were tests as alternatives to programs. In doing so, the Commission continued its practice of appointing advisory panels consisting of experts from colleges, universities and public schools. These advisory panels typically worked with Commission staff to develop program standards and test specifications and then recommend them to the Commission for adoption.

The Commission also developed policies to ensure appropriate representation on its advisory panels. When an advisory panel was established to address issues that potentially affected diverse constituencies, its membership reflected the diversity of the affected constituencies. Appointments to advisory panels also reflected, to the extent feasible, the ethnic and cultural diversity of the California public schools. In addition, when a panel was appointed to examine a problem that was particularly technical or specialized, some of the panel members were appointed for their technical or specialized expertise without regard for other characteristics. The Commission's advisory panels have contributed significantly to the agency's policy-making achievements.

During his years as governor, Governor George Deukmejian had sponsored or supported few major initiatives. In fact, his support in 1988 for SB 148, Senator Bergeson's teacher preparation reform bill, was an exception to the rule. As a conservative Republican, Deukmejian believed in keeping government contained and encourage governmental entities to solve problems at the local level. Governor Wilson, a moderate Republican, had a different approach. He wanted to make government more responsive, to streamline state procedures and to bring about reforms in education systems. With budget authority for public education coalescing in Sacramento, the stage was set for both the Governor and the Legislature to make public education a centerpiece of their respective agendas, and the Commission was to find itself involved in a number of state education reform efforts. Governor Wilson and legislative policymakers made efforts to address the inter-twined issues of educator supply and demand, alternative programs of preparation, increased standards for professional preparation, and support for new teachers, enhanced accreditation practices, and alignment of new student content standards and subject matter preparation standards for teachers.

Governor Wilson and his Secretary of Education, former Senator Marion Bergeson, were supportive of the Commission's efforts to reform teacher education. They were particularly instrumental in expanding "alternative routes" into teaching. Intern programs flourished under Wilson, who welcomed an alternative to conventional university programs for mature professionals who were willing to change careers. Wilson even approached Commission Chair Jerilyn Harris and Executive Director Phil Fitch with a request that the CTC establish an Aerospace and Defense Workers Training Corps to respond to the "down-sizing" occurring in aerospace and the military. The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA) was fully funded under $67.8 million during Wilson's tenure, assuring that all beginning teachers could experience support, assistance and continued preparation during their first two years of teaching.

This chapter discusses a number of policy initiatives that typify the scope and direction of educator preparation reform in California in the early 1990s. The first was a general movement to a standards-based approach to defining what educators should know and be able to do. This replaced an earlier approach that focused on specific competencies and guidelines that did not include measures of how well the program met the competencies and guidelines expected of them. Standards were intended to be more broadly construed and were written to allow multiple means of meeting the standards. At the same time, these standards were to show more clearly what research on teacher education and best practice in teacher preparation had to say in describing the minimum knowledge and skill for each of the credentials issued by the Commission. This effort at writing standards-based credential requirements for the basic teaching credentials had begun in the mid-1980s and had been fully implemented across the state by the early 1990s. Now it was time for the Commission to begin a second-generation development effort at defining what teachers should know and be able to do. These new standards would be informed by the research work that had gone on in the California New Teacher Project, an enriched research base on teacher education and teaching largely funded by the national government, and shaped by the dramatic change in the student population of the state and the increased expectations of a post-industrial economy.

Fortunately for the Commission, a highly-regarded Republican legislator from Orange County, Marian Bergeson, carried the enabling legislation and supported a comprehensive, in-depth review of the requirements for preparing elementary and secondary classroom teachers in California.

A Comprehensive Review of the Requirements for Preparing Elementary and Secondary Teachers in California Statutory

Basis for the Review

In Senate Bill 1422 (Bergeson, 1992), the Commission was given the broad legal authority to:

> . . . review the requirements for earning and renewing multiple and single subject teaching credentials with special reference to the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the report on alternative routes to teacher certification . . . and of the pilot study of alternative methods of new teacher support and assessment . . . (Education Code Section 44259.2a).

With this direction, the Commission initiated the most comprehensive review of teacher credential requirements in California's history. The Commission invited thousands of California educators and other citizens to participate in the review. In doing so, the Commission indicated that all of the requirements for earning and renewing basic teacher credentials would be re-examined in relation to what the field had learned in the past decade about the learning-to-teach process. What set this particular work apart from earlier reform efforts was that it was a comprehensive, systemic look at the entire teacher certification structure, from pre-service preparation (graduate and undergraduate) into the induction or entry-period of teaching, and extending to ongoing professional development and renewal. Credential policies at every stage were examined, not in isolation, but in conjunction with each other and in relation to changes that were and are still occurring in student populations, school structures and concepts of teacher professionalism.

The SB 1422 Review was prompted by the completion of the California New Teacher Project (CNTP). The initial purpose of this

large-scale pilot project was to determine the most cost effective ways to support and assess all beginning teachers in induction programs. Upon completion of the pilot project (1992), policymakers drafted a statute (SB 1422) to add induction programs to the requirements for professional clear teaching credentials. In the course of drawing up this legislation, the participants were reminded that other requirements for teacher credentials had not been evaluated in several years. Indeed, the entire set of requirements had never been examined comprehensively. In this context, it seemed unwise to add another requirement - completion of support and assessment programs for new teachers - to the existing mix of requirements. Consequently, the Commissioners recommended that the author of SB 1422, Senator Marian Bergeson, include the statutory language that is quoted above. In taking this step, the Commissioners anticipated that completion of induction programs that met state standards would be included in a revised certification system when the SB 1422 Review reached its conclusion.

Purpose and Structure of the Review as Defined by the Commission

To initiate this comprehensive review, the Commission adopted a statement of purpose and a plan for the structure of the review. The Commission stated that the purpose of the review was to reexamine all teaching credential requirements in conjunction with each other, with the expectation that structural policy changes would lead to a teacher certification system that was more cohesive and more congruent with what the Commission and others had discovered about the learning-to-teach process. The structure of the review had six key components.

Component One: Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The roles of the Commission were to direct and oversee the comprehensive review and to consider all policy findings and recommendations that emerged from the review, particularly the findings and recommendations reported to the Commission by the Advisory Panel.

Component Two: Advisory Panel for Comprehensive Review. The primary functions of the Advisory Panel, as required by state law, were to review a considerable body of information and a wide range of alternative policy options pertaining to the education, induction and development of diverse, capable teachers for 21st century schools and to

recommend a comprehensive set of findings and conclusions to the Commission.

Component Three: Invitational Forum on Teacher Credential Issues. The purpose of the two-day forum was to develop and articulate (a) the kinds of information that the Advisory Panel should assemble, and (b) the full range of state policy issues that the panel should examine related to the preparation and development of excellent teachers.

Component Four: Intra-Organizational Discussions with Key Stakeholders. The function of these ongoing discussions was to provide multiple opportunities, over time, for organizations of teachers, teacher educators, administrators, postsecondary institution, school boards, county offices, parents and other citizens to (a) contribute key ideas and information to the review, (b) monitor the progress of the review, and (c) respond to policy options as they were discussed by the Advisory Panel and the Commission.

Component Five: Regional Networks of Mixed Groups of Stakeholders. To support the review, the commission established eight regional networks for the purpose of fostering intensive dialogues across the segments and levels of public education within each region. Each network had a direct link to the Advisory Panel, recommended specific options and policies to the panel, and was relied on to react thoughtfully to policies that were under consideration by the panel and the Commission.

Component Six: Specially-Commissioned Studies of Specific Issues. The purpose of these efforts was to give focused attention to particular areas of concern, such as the preparation of future classroom teachers for the full-inclusion of students with disabilities. A small task force of experts was formed in each area; each task force assembled information and ideas for consideration by the panel and the Commission.

The Commission adopted this six-part structure for the SB 1422 Review on June 2, 1995. At that time, Commissioners were aware that the plan would require 18 to 24 months to complete.

Eight Regional Networks

When the Commission adopted its initial plan for the comprehensive review, the Commission anticipated that each stakeholder organization would represent an important perspective about the restructuring of

teacher certification. In the Commission's view, it was equally important to foster dialogues among and across the boundaries that often appear to separate the stakeholder organizations. To accomplish this objective, the Commission decided to establish eight regional networks in order to engage the widest possible range of participants in ongoing discussions throughout the duration of the SB 1422 Review. The networks were organized to (1) generate ideas for discussion and (2) offer forums for evaluating ideas generated by the Advisory Panel.

Each network organized itself under the direction of a local steering committee. Within each region, the steering committee identified persons or organizations to involve in the regional dialogues. Progress reports to the Commission included information about the plans and activities of the eight regional networks. The reports also included informed discussions and presentations by several network participants.

On May 12, 1995, representatives from each Regional Network attended a one-day conference in Sacramento. During this conference, each network presented an overview of their discussions to date and the approaches they used to generate those discussions. The conference proceedings demonstrated that the eight networks had engaged in substantive examinations of significant policy issues pertaining to teacher education, induction and development.

In December 1995, and January 1996, the eight regional networks presented their findings and recommendations to the Advisory Panel. One full day during each of these monthly meetings was devoted to interactions between panelists and the network representatives. These Regional Network reports reflected broad consensus in the need for induction of new teachers, better integration of theory and practice in teacher preparation, more extensive collaboration between institutions and schools, and early field experiences for undergraduates who intend to teach.

Specially-Commissioned Studies of Specific Subject Areas

SB 1422 required the Commission and the Advisory Panel to conduct the review "with special reference to the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the report on alternative routes to teacher certification ... and of the pilot study of alternative methods of new teacher support and assessment." Other applicable state statutes required

teaching credential preparation in specific areas such as technology, health education, and mainstreaming of students with disabilities and these were folded into the SB 1422 review process. Also included in the SB 1422 Review were several new policy initiatives in critical thinking. To review these requirements, the Commission decided to invite selected experts to examine the current and future needs of the schools in each field.

Each study had a small-scope, limited-duration analysis of specific issues related to teacher education, induction and development. The Advisory Panel examined the key findings and recommendations of several special studies.

Pilot Study of New Teacher Support and Assessment

In 1992, the Commission had adopted the final report of the California New Teacher Project (CNTP), which the SB 1422 Advisory Panel examined and discussed in 1995. Additionally, an advisory task force had prepared a Framework of Knowledge, Skills and Abilities for Beginning Teachers in California. This Framework grew out of the CNTP, but had been extensively reviewed by several advisory panels in the three year period between the adoption of the CNTP final report and the creation of the SB 122 Advisory Panel. The directors of local Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Programs prepared Draft Standards of Quality and Intensity for Beginning Teacher Induction Programs during this same time period.

Review of District Intern Programs in California

This study examined the professional preparation and performance of District Interns in several districts throughout California. Survey data submitted by District Interns (including extensive commentary by hundreds of Interns) were compiled, analyzed and interpreted. Recommendations for policy changes relating to the selection and preparation of District Interns were provided to be SB 1422 Advisory Panel.

“Best Practices” Case Studies of Teacher Education Reform

This special study examined (1) the research literature on promising practices in pre-service teacher education in the United States, and (2)

recent credential reforms in other states. A number of states had initiated new structures, standards and criteria in teacher certification. Examples included improvements in the support and assessment of new teachers and verification of continued professional growth. The study included a comparison and analysis of "best practices" in teacher education institutions and "best policies" in other states.

Policy Issues Reviewed by the Advisory Panel

The SB 1422 Advisory Panel held 18 meetings from September 1995 through June 1997. While the array of informational reports was very broad, there were several key issues or questions around which the Panel's work was organized. The informational reports either provided a context for discussing these policy issues or they explicitly addressed on or more of the issues.

- *To what extent can or should the preparation, induction and ongoing professional development of individual teachers be developmentally connected or linked?*

  The then current credentialing system had evolved in a piecemeal fashion over time, resulting in a series of requirements that did not necessarily connect with one another. Examples of this disconnect were the clear credential requirements in health, mainstreaming and computers. These courses were offered to candidates in many cases as satellite courses that must be completed prior to earning a clear credential, but they were not offered as part of an integrated "program" of preparation. Health in particular was a requirement that had been modified through legislation several times over the previous 15 years, but had no particular tie to the rest of a candidate's preparation. A clear priority for the panel was to work toward creating a new system wherein the different phases of preparation (pre-service, induction, and professional development) were well articulated and developmentally linked.
- *Should all beginning teachers participate in an induction program in which they receive support and assessment during their first years as salaried teachers in the profession?*

  The SB 1422 review was born at the conclusion of the California New Teacher Project (CNTP), The CNTP, which evolved from a pilot project into the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment

Program, clearly demonstrated the value of an induction experience for new teachers. The pilot study showed that extension of preparation into the first two years of teaching results in teachers who are better prepared to meet the needs of all children and who stay in the teaching profession. Given the large numbers (30-50%) of teachers who were leaving the profession during their first five years, it was clear that a well-focused induction program of support and assessment was a significant intervention that increased teacher effectiveness and reduced teacher attrition. While the Panel strongly agreed with the need to provide an induction experience for all teachers, there were many issues that needed to be resolved with respect to how induction could be implemented statewide, and how it could be financed.

- *Should the panel recommend multiple routes to a teaching credential? If so, what should be their common elements (if any) and distinctive elements?*

  There was a clear consensus that emerged from the panel that a new credentialing system should be more responsive to candidates from a range of life experiences. Many on the panel believed that individuals who decided on a teaching career early in their undergraduate years should have access to a well-integrated, five-year preparation program. Individuals who decided on a teaching career later - upon completion of their undergraduate degrees - needed access to a more streamlined preparation program that met the same standards, but was offered in a different configuration. Still other routes needed to be developed to meet the needs of career-changers, who enter the teaching profession after years in other careers, as well as programs to meet the needs of individuals prepared partially or fully in other states.

- *To what extent can or should a new credentialing system facilitate collaboration between K-12 schools and postsecondary institutions in the preparation, induction and professional development of teachers?*

  While a certain level of collaboration existed between the institutions of higher education and local education agencies with respect to teacher preparation prior to the work of the SB 1422 Advisory Panel, there was growing interest in looking for ways to

strengthen the role of local schools in the preparation of teachers. Professional development schools offered one example of teacher preparation that occurred within the local context.

- *To what extent can or should a new credentialing system reduce the need for emergency permit or waivers?*

  A Commission staff report to the panel in March 1996, entitled, Indicators of Teacher Supply and Demand, heightened the panel's awareness of the need to address emergency permits and waivers during its review (10,000 emergency permits and waivers were issued in 1995-96). Various proposals emerged ranging from the elimination of emergency permits altogether to a conversion of emergency permits into internship programs. The large, and growing, number of less than fully qualified teachers in California's classrooms underscored the need for a system that could produce greater numbers of well prepared, fully qualified teachers from a variety of backgrounds.

- *What role should individual candidate-based assessment play in a new credentialing system?*

  It became clear during the panel's deliberations that there was growing support for the use of a candidate-based assessment in the new credentialing system. The panel reviewed and evaluated a variety of approaches to candidate assessment based, in part, on the funded research on candidate based assessments completed for the California New Teacher Project. One of the principal findings from that study was that no useable teacher assessment instrument existed that would address the content and performance concerns of the panel. Moreover, the cost of those assessments deemed most reliable and valid were extremely high. The panel determined that while the goal would be workable candidate-based assessment, care needed to be taken to allow for the budgetary and legal concerns that surfaced during the panel's deliberations.

Within these broad topics, the Advisory Panel focused on both the content of teacher preparation and the structure of teacher credentialing. Because of its early agreement that learning to teach requires more time than can be allotted in a pre-service teacher education and, therefore, must extend into the early years of teaching, the panel used the Draft

Framework of Expectations for Beginning Teachers which was developed to guide the development of Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs. In addition, the panel made significant use of the generic concepts of teaching embedded in the Draft Standards for the Teaching Profession.

In its preliminary findings, the Advisory Panel arrived at three principal policy positions that would form the corpus of its later, more detailed recommendations.

1. The credential system should facilitate multiple flexible routes to a teaching credential, which must be driven by standards. The same standards need to be met in all routes to a credential. At least three types of routes had strong support: (a) five-year integrated undergraduate/graduate preparation programs for "early deciders"; (b) one-to-two year post baccalaureate programs; and (c) internships for candidates who decide "later" to become teachers. However, the panel as a whole was not ready to limit itself to these three configurations for "routes" to the credential. The nature of IHE/LEA collaboration in the courses are offered at the public school site and public school classroom teachers serve as part of the instructional team for the credential program preparation of teachers was central to this discussion of routes.
2. All pre-service routes should lead into a BTSA-like induction experience for all candidates.
3. Candidate-based assessment should be employed at appropriate points in the preparation and credentialing process.

The Advisory Panel continued its work until the spring of 1997 when it began the process of winnowing down its findings and potential recommendations into an organized format that would embrace both a general overview as well as specific policy recommendations for Commission review and possible adoption. The Advisory Panel completed its work in June of 1997 and made its final report to the Commission in August of 1997. The Advisory Panel made sixteen recommendations shaped around four over-arching educational goals:

1. Improve Teacher Recruitment, Selection and Access to the Profession.
   a. Recruit greater numbers of talented individuals into teaching

who reflect greater diversity.

b. Select teachers carefully to ensure a qualified workforce.
c. Provide multiple, flexible routes to an initial credential.
d. Increase access to teacher preparation, so greater numbers of new teachers can learn to teach effectively.

2. Establish Clear Standards for New Teacher Preparation Programs.
   a. Adopt candidate standards that define professional practice.
   b. Establish a credential structure that recognizes the complexity of learning to teach.
   c. Require teacher preparation programs to address the learning needs of children and youth in California.
   d. Establish levels of standards that ensure the development of teaching competence over time.
   e. Establish accreditation standards that ensure opportunities to learn teaching.
   f. Give special attention to the preparation of teachers for early adolescents.
   g. Improve teacher accountability in credential renewal that involves career-long professional development.
   h. Establish and implement a professional services certificate.
3. Increase and Improve Professional Accountability.
   a. Require broader and more rigorous assessment of teacher candidates.
   b. Require more rigorous accreditation of programs for all routes into the teaching profession.
4. Increase and Improve Professional Collaboration and System Evaluation
   a. Require collaborative governance at all levels of the new teacher preparation and certification system.
   b. Institute new measures of accountability for the overall system of teacher certification.

The panel further developed a total of 110 specific recommendations within the sixteen general recommendations. Thus, the panel's final report contained both an overview of the context of reform in teacher preparation and a fairly detailed "blueprint" of a new architecture for teacher preparation. This new design for teacher preparation featured a

multi-tiered structure that reflected the panel's understanding of what it had learned about learning to teach. The plan argued that learning to teach in a state as diverse and complex as California could not be completed entirely in any pre-service program, but rightly needed to be extended into the early years of teaching. It also included multiple, standards-driven routes into teaching through which candidates from different backgrounds would complete preparation. The panel acknowledged strength the historical reality that a significant number of California's teachers would come from late deciders and career-changers. These individuals needed a teacher preparation program that built upon existing knowledge and work skills and was organized to fit their needs as adult learners.

In this model, preparation for a Preliminary teaching credential would provide basic, foundational knowledge and skills that candidates would need to begin teaching. Such knowledge would include general pedagogy, subject matter knowledge, and subject-specific pedagogy. In addition to rigorous, focused courses of professional preparation, substantial, supervised field experiences would support and enhance the classroom learning of the program. An initial candidate-based assessment conducted at the completion of this pre-service preparation would provide clear expectations for candidates and would verify directly that Preliminary Credentials would be awarded only to candidates ready for initial teaching responsibilities. The psychometric standards for such as assessment would be established by the Commission, and the necessary training for the implementation of this legally defensible, research-based performance assessment would be provided to each accredited teacher education program in the state to ensure that all candidates received a similar assessment. In this manner, the Commission could, for the first time, be assured that the initial teaching license was issued only to those individuals who demonstrated sufficient initial skill in teaching at a common level established by the Commission.

Preparation for a Professional Clear Credential would consist of an individual induction program with intensive support, formative assessment, and an advanced curriculum to extend and develop the teacher's initial preparation. Preliminary and Professional Clear Credentials would be earned in multiple, standards driven routes that

would uniformly include support and assessment activities developed in conjunction with state-developed standards. The second level credential was intended to prepare individuals to meet later licensure standards as set by national certification organizations and for future service as mentor teachers and support providers in beginning teacher support programs. Thus, the SB 1422 Advisory Panel proposed a new architecture for credentialing and envisioned an integrated "learning to teach" continuum that would provide standards-driven, research-based, varied programs of professional preparation that would meet the needs of California's public schools.

Accreditation Reform Initiative

From its earliest days, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing had engaged in review and approval of the preparation programs offered by colleges and universities. Indeed, the whole approach to the issuance of credentials was based on an approved-program model. That is, the Commission certification officers, when granting credentials to first-time applicants, granted them to applicants who had completed programs at colleges or universities with approved programs. The Commission made no individual assessment of the qualifications of the candidate except where passage of a specific examination was required by law (e.g., the California Basic Skills Test was imposed in the mid-1980s to counter the belief that teachers were incapable of demonstrating basic skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic). Thus, the assessment of the quality and effectiveness of the individual programs operated by the more than seventy-five colleges and universities in California was a critical element to ensuring that only those individuals who demonstrated sufficient competence would receive a California educator credential. The history of the Commission's efforts to maintain quality in credential programs would be a book in of itself, but it can be summarized as having three phases. The initial phase was a period of experimentation in discrepancy model evaluation. The Commission developed a series of guidelines for its credential programs that included both input and content statements and then required the programs to write program documents explaining how the program met each of the guidelines. These Program Approval Review Documents (PARDS) and the subsequent Program Approval Documents (PADS) were used by visiting teams of educators to examine

whether the program was, in fact, doing all the things it said it would do in the Program Approval Document. The size and training of the team that did these visits varied in the early years of the Commission. The dominant perception by higher education faculty and administrators was that the teams were too large and too poorly trained to be effective or helpful.

The second phase consisted of the Commission's movement to a standards-based program approval system. The guidelines were replaced in each credential area with standards developed by teams of practitioners, university faculty and other specialists adopted by the Commission after extensive public hearings. The size of visiting teams was reduced and the training of team members increased from one day to three days. Handbooks were prepared based on evaluation data collected in the early 1990s and the Commission developed pro-active materials and programs to help institutions prepare more effectively for program approval visits. While these efforts assisted to some degree, the lingering problems of phase one seemed to be resistant to modification.

At this same time, policymakers in postsecondary education were interested in streamlining activities and obtaining more efficient results from the varying accreditation requirements imposed on them. Of particular concern to the California State University system was the preference for national accreditation for their schools and colleges of education. This system-wide preference created difficulties in that the national accreditation agency and the Commission did not have strong mechanisms for conducting joint visits. There was also the persistent belief that the Commission's adoption of standards, even though they had been done through extensive public hearings, were limiting to the creativity of postsecondary education institutions. Out of this varied mix of interests and perceptions came reform legislation.

Accreditation Advisory Council

The interest in reforming the Commission's program review process was embedded in SB 148, a larger education reform bill carried by Senator Marian Bergeson during the 1988 legislative session. SB 148 had links to the Commons Commission report, "Who Will Teach Our Children" that had been developed by a blue-ribbon commission chaired by Dorman Commons and staffed by Linda Bond, former staff to State

Senator Gary Hart. One of the recommendations of the Commons Commission was to alter the process of program approval. While this aspect of the Commons Commission report did not get full approval, some of the ideas appeared in SB 148. The portion of SB 148 that dealt with program approval called for the creation of an Accreditation Advisory Council that would undertake a systematic review of the current procedures, review national accreditation procedures and practices and propose a new model for ensuring that credential programs were of high quality and effective. As was the Commission's practice, an advisory council of twenty California educators was chosen to engage in the process of reviewing existing practices, both within the state and nation, and recommending a new approach to the Commission. That Advisory Council took a total of almost five years to reach a final set of recommendations that comprised the Accreditation Framework. These recommendations were adopted by the Commission in May of 1993 and codified into law through the support of Senator Marian Bergeson who carried SB 655.

Committee on Accreditation

The key elements of the Accreditation Framework included the creation of a standing committee of six K-12 individuals and six postsecondary education individuals, elected by the Commission, who would make the legal determination regarding the accreditation status of each college or university in California that offered at least one credential program. This standing committee would review the visiting team reports, hear from a representative of the institution being visited and then make an accreditation decision about the institution and all of its credential programs. This requirement for a single accreditation decision was in keeping with the practice of national accrediting bodies, but was a signal change for the Commission. Previously, individual credential programs were approved. Thus, one institution could have some programs with full approval while others were placed on probation. The thrust of the Accreditation Framework was to force the whole institution to take responsibility for the quality and effectiveness of its credential programs rather than permitting good and bad programs to co-exist. The Framework also encouraged the use of national standards, once it was determined by the Committee on Accreditation that these

national standards were comparable to California standards. The Framework even permitted national accrediting bodies to act on behalf of the Commission in the accrediting of specialized credentials provided that the national body met certain performance requirements as established by the Committee on Accreditation.

The Framework also called for a major improvement in the training of those individuals selected to do the actual site review. The Commission staff was charged with the responsibility of reviewing the training programs of other national and state accrediting bodies and developing a training program that would ensure that all evaluators were well trained. Finally, the Framework encouraged experimental and alternative standards programs in an effort to foster an atmosphere of serious research into new, innovative models of teacher education.

The inaugural Committee on Accreditation was selected by the Commission in November, 1994 and met for the first time in April, 1995. That Committee determined that its initial efforts should be with establishing clear procedures, preparing a Handbook for institutions preparing for accreditation, and approving the new training called for in the Framework. Accordingly, the Committee determined that it would not begin hearing and deciding accreditation cases until fall, 1997. This was intended to give institutions adequate time to prepare for this new style of accreditation. Since it takes most institutions between 12 and 24 months to prepare for an accreditation visit, delaying the onset of the Committee on Accreditation's legal authority for more than a year was deemed the fastest possible implementation schedule. The Committee then spent the next eighteen months ensuring that it had clear procedures for every aspect of the Framework. The Committee developed and implemented the process for determining whether national accrediting body standards were comparable to California standards. The Committee sought and signed a new partnership agreement with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education that permitted institutions in California to prepare for one visit for both national and state accreditation. The Committee sought nominations for a new Board of Institutional Reviewers, approved a new four day training program and then trained over 300 educators around the state in a series of five training programs. The Committee developed and issued a new Accreditation Handbook. The Committee developed and implemented its

own procedures manual that governed it own agendas, record-keeping, parliamentary procedures and other internal processes. The Committee developed and implemented procedures for approving both experimental programs and those programs seeking to use alternative standards to either comparable national standards or extant state standards. The Committee made its first annual report to the Commission, as required by the Bergeson Act, in August 1995 and makes its annual report in August each year.

The Committee officially began making accreditation decisions for the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in the fall, 1997. The first Annual Report with actual accreditation decisions made was published in August, 1998.

District Intern and Other Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification

District Intern

The District Intern Program was created by statue in 1983. The same statute that created the District Intern Program required the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to study the effectiveness of the program. In 1987, the Commission produced an initial report on the first two cohorts of district interns (who were then called teacher trainees). A 1995 study (A Longitudinal Study of the Effectiveness of District Intern Programs of Alternative Certification in California. Report to the Legislature October, 1995) drew on the 1987 report and compared the initial findings with data collected in 1994.

Since its inception, the District Intern Program has had three goals: (1) to allow districts to develop high quality teacher preparation programs in credential areas in which local universities cannot meet the districts' demands for qualified teachers; (2) to allow districts to develop programs that directly address the needs of their students, such as preparing teachers for schools in low-income urban districts; and (3) to provide an additional path into the teaching profession for persons whose economic circumstances prevent them from entering through a traditional program, or whose life experiences and maturity make them particularly suited for alternative preparation in a program that closely ties theory to practice and is committed to on-the-job training. The 1995 study

examined a decade of data to determine if these three goals had been achieved partially or fully.

The demographic data indicated that district intern programs provided a method to diversify the teaching workforce. Those under-represented in the teaching force and individuals who were coming into teaching from a second careers were well represented in district intern programs. These programs tied a preparation program and full-time employment together and were particularly well suited for work-seasoned, mature individuals. Many district interns stated that they would have been unable to pursue a career in teaching without the support provided by the District Intern Program.

Interns and graduates of district intern programs reported that the strengths of their programs far outweighed the weaknesses. There was high praise for the practicality, immediacy, and relevance of the coursework. Interns appreciated that experienced classroom teachers were teaching most of the courses in the program. Opportunities to interact with peers who were experiencing the same challenges and encountering the same frustrations were listed as important parts of learning to teach.

School districts that sponsored district intern programs reported that they were able to retain those who successfully completed the two-year internship. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the respondents to the graduate questionnaire were still in the districts where they began and most remained in the same hard-to staff schools. Most of the graduates of district intern programs reported that they had assumed significant leadership positions in the schools where they worked. Since most of the interns had taught fewer than seven years, their move into leadership positions was surprising and remarkable for teachers in their early years of service.

To implement this internship statute, the Commission, in 1988, adopted and disseminated Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for District Intern Programs. The standards were largely the same as those used to evaluate University Intern Programs. The main differences were that the District Intern Standards did not include student teaching standards and the support persons (mentors) did not participate in evaluating the interns.

Other Alternative Certification Programs

In June 1992, the Commission produced Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification in California: A Report to the Legislature. This report was the Commission's response to AB 2985, (Quackenbush, Chapter 1464 of the 1990 Statutes). This legislation required the Commission to review alternative avenues, for persons to become certificated to teach in California (including District Intern Programs) and to report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature. The report presented the array of options from a variety of perspectives, examined alternative certification in other states, described and illustrated the options, discussed the public policy implications of the available options, and recommended several ways to improve alternative certification. Included were the following recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor:

1. Encourage careful expansion of the responsible alternatives in teacher preparation and certification, which could be beneficial to the schools and the teaching profession.
2. Make state funds available to provide grants so school districts and universities could incorporate needed innovations in alternative certification programs, such as summer coursework, support systems, and performance assessments; and so state and local agencies could exchange information about the most effective practices in alternative certification programs.
3. Make special funds available, for grants to facilitate the success of alternative certification programs in small school districts in rural regions.
4. Make special assistance available for large numbers of individuals from nontraditional sources to become teachers in California's hard-to-staff schools.
5. Establish a resource center to disseminate information and coordinate efforts to recruit talented individuals from nontraditional sources into teaching profession in California.
6. Require new District Intern Programs to meet State standards prior to commencing operations in the future, as a protection to the interns and the students they teach.

In addition to internships, the Commission, in the early 1990s, also encouraged colleges and universities to initiate experimental and other alternative programs. Education Code 44273 (1978) authorized the Commission to approve programs at institution of higher education that propose to test novel hypotheses about the preparation of teachers or to try out innovative curriculum or techniques of teacher preparation. Most of the statutory restrictions on "conventional" teacher preparation could be waived in these pilot or experimental programs. To be approved as an experimental and pilot program, the proposing institution must show the program has "merit and the potential of improving the quality and service authorized by the credential." At that time, 21 approved experimental programs were operating at 11 universities. The Commission had adopted this provision in order to encourage experimentation in educator preparation and to avoid the accusation that state oversight of educator preparation led to narrowly prescribed programs that discouraged innovation in educator preparation. Most of the experimental programs were proposed by research universities that were historically opposed to close state supervision of educator preparation. The provision for experimental programs provided a useful outlet for such institutions and gave the Commission an opportunity to promote new ideas.

Assembly Bill 1161 (Quackenbush, Chapter 1147 of the Statutes of 1993) required the Commission to solicit and review proposals to establish, expand, or enhance programs of alternative certification. As a result of this statute, Education Code Section 44382 specified that alternative certification programs should address geographic and subject matter shortage areas, and be targeted toward people with work experience, such as those from business, industry, and the military services, and others who already had a Bachelor's Degree in the field in which they planned to teach. The 1993-94 and 1994-95 State Budget Act included $2 million from the General Fund to support alternative to traditional programs for teaching credential candidates. The Commission administered the $2 million annual fund by providing grants to school districts and county offices of education that proposed to create, expand or improve teacher internship programs. A school district or county office of education could request funds for the creation or expansion of a District Intern Program (operated pursuant to Education Code Section

44325 and following) or a University Intern Program (operated pursuant to Education Code Section 44450 and following). Only school districts and county offices of education were permitted to submit funding proposals for internship programs; however, these agencies could have worked collaboratively with colleges, universities, teacher association, private businesses, defense-related industries, military services, or others to develop and implement internships.

The California Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program

The Commission initiated the California Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, established by Senate Bill 1636 (Roberti, Chapter 1444, and Statutes of 1990) and SB 862 (Roberti, Chapter 1220, and Statutes of 1991). The primary purpose of this program was to create new career ladders that enabled school paraprofessionals to become certificated classroom teachers. The program initially provided grants, through a competitive process, to 13 projects involving more than 30 school districts and county offices of education in collaboration with California Community Colleges and California State Universities. Nearly 600 paraprofessionals were being supported by the $1.5 million allocated to this program from the General Fund in 1995-96.

Development of Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development and Bi-lingual Cross-Cultural Language and Academic Development System (CLAD/BCLAD)

As a result of the enactment of the Chacon-Moscone Bilingual-Bicultural Education Act in 1976, the Commission developed the Bilingual Certificate of Competence (BCC) pursuant to California Education Code Sections 44253.5 and 44253.6. The BCC authorized instruction for English language development (ELD), specially designed academic instruction in English (SDAIE), instruction for primary-language development, and content instruction in the primary language. An examination for the BCC was available for Spanish only and included bilingual and bicultural teaching methodology, culture, and language components.

In 1987, the Commission appointed an 18-member panel to advise the Commission on all matters related to the preparation and

credentialing of teachers and other educational professionals who provided services to LEP students. Members of this Bilingual Cross-cultural Advisory Panel (BCAP) were selected from nominations submitted by school districts, county offices of education, institutions of higher education, relevant professional organizations, the California Department of Education and the California Legislature. From the nominations, members were picked so that the Panel would be representative of the various constituents involved in the education of LEP students. Criteria for member selection also included expertise in one or more of the following areas:

- Current issues in the education of LEP students, bilingual/cross-cultural education, and language development;
- Culture, cultural diversity, and multicultural education;
- First-and second-language development;
- Instructional methodologies for LEP students; and
- Tests and measurement in the area of bilingual education and language development.

Conceptualization of the CLAD/BCLAD System

Initially, the BCAP worked to convert existing compliance guidelines for the Bilingual Cross-cultural Emphasis Credential Program into program standards. At that time, the Commission was converting all of its program guidelines into program standards, focusing more on the quality of programs than on compliance with specified requirements. By 1990, however, the limitations of the existing procedures, for the preparation and credentialing of teachers for LEP students became clear to the BCAP. It then began the difficult task of designing a new system to meet adequately the needs of an increasing portion of the California public school student population.

The BCAP members did not initially agree on a number of issues. The political context surrounding the education of LEP students required careful negotiations among advocates of English as a Second Language (ESL) only and the different cultural and linguistic groups that supported bilingual education. The participants recognized early the importance of addressing the needs of the ESL community as well as the needs of all the language groups who had been poorly served by the system in place at that time.

The BCAP identified a number of goals that a new system of preparation and credentialing should address. These goals are listed below:

- The new system should equally serve the needs of students from all language groups.
- The new system should be demographically responsive; that is, it should be able to react quickly and efficiently when changing demographics require modifications.
- The new system should alleviate rather than exacerbate the shortage of teachers trained and certified to teach LEP students.
- The new system should be clear, equitable, and internally consistent, allowing candidate's access to credentials and certificates through a variety of comparable routes, and providing school personnel with clear information about the authorizations associated with each credential and certificate.
- The new system should recognize and incorporate the common core of knowledge and skills needed by all teachers of LEP students.
- The new system should incorporate knowledge and skills in various instructional methodologies used with LEP students (i.e., ELD, SDAIE, and primary-language instruction) and a general understanding of culture and cultural diversity.

Keeping these goals in mind, the BCAP conceptualized a new system for the preparation and credentialing of teachers for LEP students. By the spring of 1991, the Panel was ready to present a general design for the new system to the Commission for its review and adoption. The Commission adopted the design in May 1991, and directed the Panel and staff to develop the system in greater detail by:

1. Developing standards for professional preparation programs leading to Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teaching Credentials with a CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (which would replace the existing bilingual Cross-cultural Emphasis programs). Institutions could develop CLAD Emphasis programs or CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis programs.
2. Developing specifications for and overseeing the development of examinations whose content would parallel the content of the

CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Programs (which would replace the existing Bi-lingual Cross Cultural [BCC] and Language Development Specialist [LDS] Examinations).

3. Developing standards for professional preparation programs leading to CLAD/BCLAD Specialist Credentials (which would replace the existing Bilingual Cross-cultural Specialist Credential Programs).

Standards for the CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Credential Program

In February 1992, the Commission adopted the new Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs for Multiple Subject and Single Subject Teaching Credentials with a (Bilingual) Cross-cultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Emphasis. The Commission also adopted timelines for phasing in CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Credential Programs and phasing out existing Bilingual Cross-cultural Emphasis Credential Programs. Adoption of these standards was the first stage in the implementation of the new CLAD/BCLAD system. Although standards for the CLAD/BCLAD Specialist Programs were developed by the BCAP, the Commission never implemented them.

CLAD/BCLAD Certificates and Examinations

While working on the standards for the CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Credential Programs, the BCAP also began to identify the specific content that would be included in the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations. The new exams, which would replace the existing BCC and LDS Examinations, would provide an opportunity for already credentialed teachers to become licensed to teach LEP students by earning CLAD and BCLAD Certificates. The program standard and exam content were developed concurrently because the Panel recognized the importance of congruence between the alternative routes to CLAD/BCLAD certification.

Impact of the Revised System

The new CLAD/BCLAD system for the preparation and credentialing of teachers for LEP students impacted the field in the following ways.

Large numbers of prospective teachers took advantage of the new entry-level route (i.e., the CLAD Emphasis Credential). Many school districts indicated to potential teachers and teacher training institutions that they would give priority in hiring to teachers who had CLAD or BCLAD Emphasis Credentials. In response, a number of postsecondary institutions replaced their basic teaching credential program with a CLAD Emphasis Credential Program.

The recognition and utilization of a common core of knowledge and skills in the CLAD/BCLAD system facilitated the professional development of English Language development teachers who wished to become bilingual teachers. Teachers could earn a CLAD Emphasis Credential or Certificate and add the bilingual components when they had mastered the additional competencies.

The new competencies in generic culture provided CLAD and BCLAD teachers with the knowledge and skills needed to function in culturally diverse classrooms. With the new training in generic culture and basic social science skills, the teachers were prepared for future demographic changes.

The new system provided for efficient and economic professional preparation programs at institutions of higher education. It provided the flexibility for institutions to share resources, such as language and culture courses, with each other by forming regional consortiums. For example, six institutions in the Los Angeles are developed a consortium to share courses and faculty for a number of Asian languages.

The new system facilitated the development at teacher training institutions of programs for multiple languages. For the first time in the state, professional preparation programs for Cantonese, Hmong, Khmer, Lao, and Vietnamese bilingual teachers were developed, approved and implemented.

In the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations, culture, and language exams for nine language groups were available statewide and all at the same cost by the end of 1995. This increased opportunities for native speakers of these languages to become certificated with bilingual credentials by earning a BCLAD Certificate. Similarly, the range of languages, for which teachers could earn bilingual teaching credentials was increased. This increased attention to multiple languages had a significant potential for diversifying the teaching force. In addition, CLAD Emphasis

Credential Programs were developed that dealt with issues of dialect in English. One institution offered a Commission approved CLAD Emphasis Program with a concentration on African-American English.

Administrator Preparation Study

Enabling legislation (SB 306) and the 1990 Budget Act directed the Commission to consult a wide variety of persons and organizations in the conduct of the administrator preparation study. The Commission began this consultative process by convening a two-day forum devoted to a discussion of the major policy issues to be examined.

Following this forum, the Commission solicited nominations from a wide variety of constituent groups in order to establish a School Administration Advisory Panel to advise the Commission on the study. Over 100 nominations were received. The panel of 25 members was appointed by the Commission in December, 1990 and included representatives from school districts, higher education institutions, the legislature, and the business community and credential holders.

Effective May 1, 1994, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing began implementing revised policies related to the Administrative Services Credential. These policies grew out of a multi-year study of administrator preparation needs which were presented in a report entitled An Examination of the Preparation, Induction, and Professional Growth of School Administrators for California (March, 1993). This study was conducted by Commission staff, under the guidance of the School Administration Advisory Panel. The final report of the Advisory Panel included policy recommendations, which were subsequently adopted by the Commission. The recommendations adopted by the Commission included a proposal to retain the two-level structure for the Administrative Services Credential that had been established in the early 1980's, but to modify the structure to eliminate identified weaknesses and respond more effectively to the professional development needs of potential and practicing administrators. In addition to structural changes, the Advisory Panel recommended that the content of preparation in both levels be shaped by newly developed program standards. The recommendation indicated that program standards should "include both a knowledge and practice component and should be designed to prepare

effective managers and leaders who are able to operate successfully in a changing environment."

The legal framework for the structural changes in administrative preparation was put into place through legislation sponsored by the Commission and authored by Senator Rebecca Morgan (SB 322). This legislation was passed in 1993 and signed by the Governor, effective January 1, 1994. The Commission then asked the advisory panel to assist in the development of new program standards consistent with the legislation and the policy recommendations. *The Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credential Programs* were adopted by the Commission in March 1995.

Special Education

Changing National Policies and Practices in Special Education

Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, was established to ensure that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate public education which includes special education and related services to meet their unique needs. The intent of the law was that the educational environment should be adapted to fit the needs of students. That is, the individual with disabilities should be the focus of discussions regarding options for educational placement. Students with disabilities may receive special education services in regular classrooms, resource rooms, special day classrooms, special schools, home/hospital settings, correctional facilities, nonpublic, nonsectarian schools and agencies, and alternative instructional settings other than classrooms. In California, Part 30 of the Education Code relative to special education programs was rewritten in 1980 to implement the Master Plan for Special Education statewide. Further, other legislative measures have modified California statutes since 1980 relative to special education services.

The Ryan Act of 1970 established a structure with four Specialist Instruction Credentials in Special Education: *Learning Handicapped, Severely Handicapped, Communicatively Handicapped,* and *Physically Handicapped* (including orthopedically handicapped and visually handicapped). All of these credentials required a basic teaching credential as a pre-requisite. Special education credential programs were

initially approved by the Commission in 1972-73. In 1974, under the term "individuals with exceptional needs", the same four sub-classifications identified by the Ryan Act were also identified in the California Master Plan for Special Education.

Later, other additions included the *Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential* with authorizations in *Language, Speech and Hearing; Special Class Authorization; Audiology;* and *Orientation and Mobility*, which were implemented in 1976. Statutes were also passed in 1978 requiring persons employed to teach blind or partially seeing students to hold Special Education Specialist Credentials. The Commission adopted guidelines for approving programs and established a separate *Visually Handicapped Credential. Adapted Physical Education (APE)* authorizations also went into effect in 1985.

Assembly Bill 2304 (Chapter 388, Statutes of 1989) amended Sections 44265 and 44265.5 of the Education Code by expanding the authority of the Commission to determine the standards and requirements for all specialist credentials, including whether the basic teaching credential should be required for every specialist credential. This statutory change was made because practitioners, parents, and faculty involved in special education teacher preparation pointed out the need for change in program guidelines and credential authorizations to better serve an increasingly diverse student population in California schools.

Revised Structure for Special Education Credentials

The Commission adopted new policies in 1993 that eventually led to the adoption of new *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Education Specialist Credentials and Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credentials* in and changing the structure of the credentials in 1997. The standards responded to the evolving nature of special education service delivery and integrated regular and special education professional preparation. The "core" standards addressed the need for special educators to be prepared to work with a variety of disabilities, to gain greater knowledge and understanding of the diversity of individual differences and needs of students, and instructional techniques that are effective with many types of learners.

New Education Specialist Credentials were adopted in Mild/Moderate Disabilities and Moderate/Severe Disabilities that

authorized the provision of services to individuals in grades K through 12, including adults. New credentials in the low incidence areas of Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, and Visual Impairments authorized the provision of services to individual's birth to age 22. An Early Childhood Special Education Credential authorized services from birth to pre-K.

Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credentials were developed authorizing the provision of services to individual's birth to age 22. These credentials are awarded with specific authorizations in (1) Language, Speech and Hearing, which may include the Special Class Authorization, (2) Audiology; and (3) Orientation and Mobility.

Two Level Structure for Education Specialist Credentials

The Commission adopted a two-level credential structure because fundamental changes were occurring in how and where students with disabilities were being served, and because general educators needed extended preparation to meet a broader range of students needs. Two phases or levels of training were important because special education professionals are increasingly expected to act as consultants and collaborators with general education teachers and other practitioners in mainstream settings. The two level structures were designed to meet the changing, growing needs of schools and children.

In adopting the two-stage structure for these credentials, the Commission also dropped the requirement that special education teachers previously earn Multiple or Single Teaching Credentials. To prepare special education practitioners for collaboration with general education teachers, the Commission's new standards required special education candidates to complete coursework and fieldwork in general education as well as special education. The standards also recognized that preparation experiences needed to occur earlier in the post-secondary education of teachers, including special education teachers. The Multiple/Single Subject Credential requirement continued to apply to candidates who were prepared under pre-1996 guidelines, but would not apply to candidates whose preparation met the new standards for education Specialist Credentials.

In developing new credential structures and standards, the Special Education Advisory Panel and the Commission considered thoroughly

the widespread shortage of qualified teachers for special education assignments. Elimination of the prerequisite teaching credential requirement was intended to reduce these shortages. Additionally, new standards for Professional Level II Credential Programs included support and mentoring expectations that were likely to increase the retention of new special education teachers, according to evaluation studies in the California New Teacher Project, which were co-sponsored by the Commission and the State Department of Education. Completion of Professional Level II preparation was required for Specialist Teaching Credentials only. Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credentials required Level II preparation because Speech and Language, Audiology, and Orientation and Mobility programs already required a Master's degree to meet their respective national accreditation standards.

Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Credentials

In the Commission's restructured system of special education credentials, the major purpose of the Preliminary Level I program was to prepare individuals to perform the responsibilities of entry level special education teaching positions in a variety of settings. Preliminary Level I programs included coursework and field experience in both special education and general education. Individual colleges determined program length and universities whose programs were based on the Preliminary Level I Standards in this Handbook. Subject Matter requirements for Level I Education Specialist Credentials were the same as for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials: completion of approved subject matter preparation or passage of adopted subject matter assessments. Education Specialist Credential candidates were given the option of satisfying the subject matter requirement in the subject of greatest interest to them.

Professional Level II Education Specialist Credentials

In the Commission's new special education credential structure, Professional Level II preparation was intended to enable new teachers to apply their Preliminary Level I preparation to the demands of professional positions while also fostering advanced skills and knowledge. In adopting new certification policies in 1993, the Commission expected that Professional Level II would include academic

requirements, an individualized induction plan with a support component and an option to allow some requirements to be met with non-university activities.

Standards for Subject Matter Preparation Programs

When the Ryan Act was passed in 1970, it continued the emphasis upon the subject matter preparation of teachers begun under the 1961 Fisher Act (see Chapter Three). Each candidate was required not only to complete an approved program of professional pedagogical preparation, but also demonstrate a grasp of the subject or subjects to be taught. The law required the candidate to pass an appropriate subject matter examination for the credential or complete an approved college or university program of subject matter preparation to waive the subject matter examination. Thus, the approval subject matter programs became known as "waiver" programs.

Prior to that time (under the Fisher Bill, which eliminated the "major" in education), each candidate was required to complete a degree with an acceptable academic major or an acceptable combination of major and minor. A transcript review by a certification officer in the California Department of Education was used to determine that the correct number of units, the proper balance of upper and lower division courses and, in some cases, that the appropriate distribution of courses were completed.

Under the Ryan Act there was significantly greater attention to the content of subject matter preparation programs. A primary determinant in the approval of subject matter preparation programs was how appropriate the content of the programs was to the subject(s) that the teachers were expected to teach to students with these credentials. Since 1970, the Commission had been gradually requiring a higher level of scrutiny prior to the approval of subject matter preparation programs and had called for a closer alignment between the preparation programs and the curriculum of California's public schools. This culminated in the development of *Standards of Subject Matter Program Quality and Effectiveness* for the *Multiple Subject (Liberal Studies) Program and the several Single Subject Credential Programs.* These programs were intended to provide appropriate academic subject matter preparation for teachers working in self- contained classrooms where the same teacher was responsible for

instruction in eight or more subjects. The subject matter preparation programs for the various Single Subject Credentials focused on these subjects as typically taught in the public schools.

Subject Matter Preparation for Multiple Subject Credentials

The conclusions of this work led the Commission to advocate significant changes in the academic content requirements. In 1987, the Commission sponsored AB 1759 (Clute) which called for revision of the academic preparation of elementary teachers. The required subjects were expanded to more adequately represent the content of an elementary school curriculum and programs were to be approved based upon standards of program quality. The legislation was passed and signed by the Governor. It required that subject matter preparation programs for the Multiple Subject Credential be a minimum of 84 semester-units and would include coursework in language studies, literature, mathematics, science, social science, history, humanities, the arts, physical education and human development. Further, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing was required to establish standards of program quality for these programs and to review the programs according to the standards. *The Elementary Subject Matter Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness implementation* plan was adopted by the Commission in March 1988, after nearly two years of development and consultation.

The *Standards of Program Quality* approved by the Commission in 1988, sought to address the overall quality of subject matter preparation. Standards were developed to address candidate advisement and the coordination of approved programs. Opportunities for field experiences early in a student's undergraduate years were part of the standards. Appreciation for diversity and understanding the unique needs of persons with disabilities were built into the standards. The candidate's ability to use technology was an expectation included in the standards. Content knowledge was expanded to reflect the California Curriculum Frameworks and to provide the foundation which practicing teachers and other experts said was necessary for an elementary teacher to succeed.

Subject Matter Preparation for Single Subject Credentials

In 1982, the Commission adopted new regulations establishing a new review and approval process for subject matter preparation programs for

Single Subject Credentials. Effective June 1984, institutions of higher education were required to develop programs that were directly related to those subjects "commonly taught" in California public schools.

Each program was required to consist of a core of 30 semester-units that address or are directly related to the subjects commonly taught in public schools. In addition, each program required breadth and perspective courses (15 semester-units) to supplement the basic core. (The two exceptions were that mathematics requires "closely related" courses, rather than breadth and perspective courses for the 15 units and foreign language required only a core of 30 upper division units.)

In 1989, the Commission began the process of establishing standards for the subject matter preparation of secondary teachers in all single subject areas. Expert subjects matter advisory panels were appointed to develop standards for the subject matter preparation in English, mathematics, science, and social science. The panels consisted of teachers of the subjects, public school curriculum specialists, university professors of the subjects and other subject matter experts in California. Following extensive consultation with colleges, universities, professional organizations, local and state education agencies, the Commission adopted the standards in 1992. In a similar manner in 1991, the Commission established expert panels to develop subject matter standards in music, art, physical education, and languages other than English. These standards were adopted by the Commission in 1994. In 1995, the Commission appointed advisory panels to develop program standards in agriculture, business education, health education, home economics, and industrial and technology education. These standards were adopted by the Commission in 1996.

In 1994, the Commission adopted *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Subject Matter Programs* in Art, Languages other than English, Music and Physical Education. Review panels were selected for these subject areas. They followed the same pattern as the panels for the first four subjects. They met twice per academic year to review programs, once in the fall and once in the spring. Finally, in 1996, the Commission adopted Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the remaining subject areas: agriculture, business education, health education, home economics, and industrial and technology education. Because of staffing difficulties, action on these new standards was

delayed until 1998-99. The typical common pattern of allowing post-secondary institutions two years to submit new programs when standards change delayed full completion of Commission standards in all of the single subject matter areas until 2001.

Teacher Fitness

As a member of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) since 1987, the Commission has participated in the establishment and maintenance of a national teacher identification clearinghouse to exchange information on disciplinary action among participating states. The purpose of the clearinghouse has been to minimize the chances that persons whose certificates were revoked or suspended in one state could evade the system by receiving credentials in other states.

The Commission is mandated by California law to maintain a disciplinary review committee called the Committee of Credentials. The Committee is an investigatory body comprised of seven members appointed by the Commission for two-year terms. By law, the Committee is comprised of one elementary teacher, one secondary teacher, one school board member, one school administrator, and three public representatives. The Committee is required to review allegations of misconduct against a credential holder or applicant and make a recommendation to the Commission as to whether probable cause exists for adverse action against a credential holder or applicant. In certain situations where a holder or applicant has been convicted of a serious crime, such as a serious and violent felony or sex crimes involving children, the Committee has no discretion; the law requires that the credential be revoked or denied based on the nature of the crime committed.

Computer Competency and Teacher Preparation

While provision for educational technology in teacher preparation was not specifically mandated by law, its inclusion as a “fifth-year-of-study” requirement prompted Commission staff to organize such a review by an expert committee (The Committee to Review Computer Education Requirements of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing).

The work of the Committee was completed in January, 1986 and resulted in the recommendations summarized below.

Minimum requirements for the professional Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential included, by law, the completion of study of computer-based technology, including the uses of technology in educational settings. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing, through its regulatory authority, established those requirements in March of 1988. Those requirements focused upon providing elementary and secondary teachers with a minimum level of computer skills and knowledge necessary to utilize educational technology in the instruction of pupils as follows:

1. access to, use, and control of computer-based technologies;
2. demonstrate knowledge of basic operations;
3. understand and use representative programs appropriate to the teaching subject area and grade level;
4. use computer-based technology as a tool to enhance problem solving; and
5. to integrate a computer-based application into instruction in his or her selected subject area and/or grade level.

Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program

In 1988, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the State Department of Education sought legislative approval and funding to investigate a growing problem in California, that of new teacher retention. Because of substantial student population increases in California, there was growing interest in the public policy arena over the future staffing of the public schools. As a part of the research program, policy makers realized that a significant number of newly prepared teachers left the classroom within the first five years of teaching. Those data had come from national studies, but staff members at both the Department and the Commission were concerned that California suffered from similar problems of teachers, often the best teachers, leaving the profession. The Legislature concurred with this concern and funded a four-year study of the lives of beginning teachers in California. The California New Teacher Project (1988 - 1992) not only looked at possible programs of new teacher support through funded experiments in supporting and mentoring beginning teachers, but also investigated

emerging tools for assessing the quality and effectiveness of beginning teachers. The CNTP produced a final report that called for the establishment of a state-funded program of support for all teachers in their first and second years of teaching. The minimum cost of such support was calculated at $4,000 per teacher per year. The state proposed to support about half the cost of the mentoring and support program while the employing district supplied the remainder of the funds from their existing staff development and mentor teacher funds. The CNTP report also challenged the teacher education profession to improve its assessment practices and called for the state to take a more active role in defining what knowledge and skill all teachers should possess at the time of initial licensure and for the state to develop a more rigorous and legally defensible means of assessing beginning teacher knowledge and skill.

In 1992, the California Legislature passed and the Governor signed legislation that created a new program and a new entity in California public education. The Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program was created to provide two years of high quality induction for beginning teachers in the state. The program was designed on the best practices learned through the four-year California New Teacher Project. This new program, because it traversed the early years of teaching but had clear implications for pre-service teacher education, was to be jointly administered by the State Department of Education and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The program was designed around a model of assigning an experienced, trained mentor teacher to each beginning teacher. This mentor teacher would be trained in principles of support and assessment, using a coaching model and an adopted framework of beginning teacher knowledge and skills. In addition to the assigned mentor, the beginning teacher would participate in a series of group activities designed to assist these neophyte teachers in making the transition from student teachers to regular, full-time classroom teachers. These programs of support and assessment of beginning teachers would be funded through competitive applications based on their fulfillment of established standards of program design and effectiveness. The whole state-wide program was to be managed by a joint task force of staff members from the two state agencies. The initial

program was funded at about $5 million dollars which supported about a dozen such programs around the state.

From 1992 to 1995, the program operated at a relatively modest level as the competition for available funds was quite keen during this time. Happily, the two agencies learned a great deal about operating such programs and were able to improve the quality of mentor teacher training, improve the other support and assessment activities, test out and improve the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and obtain wide-spread "buy-in" for these pedagogical standards and make other improvements in the internal workings of the support programs. With increased state funds, early evaluation data that suggested BTSA teachers stayed in the profession at extremely high rates (over 95% retention rates were reported) and strong professional and political support, the funding level for BTSA programs jumped tremendously. By 1998, BTSA funds had increased to a total of $75 million dollars and the number of programs in the state had been expanded dramatically such that almost every beginning teacher in the state could be accommodated in an approved BTSA program. By 2000, the BTSA program was a truly state-wide program and did provide services to almost every beginning teacher in the state.

The BTSA program had grown each year since its inception in 1992, dramatically since 1995. In 1999-2000, Governor Wilson included funds in the state budget sufficient to enable 23,500 first and second year teachers to participate in the program, 90 percent of the eligible new teachers in California. (Governor Davis later continued the expansion of BTSA, including enough funding to allow 26,500 new teachers to participate in the program.)

Expansion was coupled with the development of a model formative assessment system. Beginning in 1998-99, the Commission and the Department of Education offered the California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST) to local education agencies participating in BTSA. In this model, used in most local beginning teacher induction programs, mentors learn how to manage an integrated process of areas of what beginning teachers are expected to know and be able to do.

The extraordinary success of the BTSA programs can be attributed to a number of sensible public policy decisions made early in its inception.

First, the central state oversight was deliberately kept small. Additionally, BTSA made extensive use of the "trainer of trainers" model that quickly moved expertise to the local level so that programs could and did make extensive use of local capacities. Also, the state task force concentrated on standards development and encouraged local variations in delivery and focus within the standards. In this manner, local educational agencies had significant input into their own programs and made them fit the local needs. The final goal was a BTSA program in every one of the 1,000 school districts in the state. Each new program was assigned a program mentor, generally an administrator of an experienced and well-run BTSA program so that the learning curve for new programs would not be as steep as it had been for some of the pioneer programs.

The BTSA program maintained a strong evaluation component from its earliest beginnings. Outside researchers were provided grants to conduct high quality evaluation activities that gave the BTSA task force useful information about program retention data, participant satisfaction data, and overall perceptions of the program. As a result, BTSA was able to justify its expansion as a program and garnered significant legislative, gubernatorial and general public support. Not only did the BTSA program reduce teacher turnover in the public schools, but also the program gave teachers highly useful feedback on their teaching that resulted in improved practices that, in turn, supported increased student learning. Although its $100 million dollar price tag made it among the most expensive programs for teachers in California, its impact justified the price. As schools were able to retain more teachers for more years and provide them with high quality in-service training that improved daily instructional skills and increased the teachers' sense of efficacy, fewer new teachers were needed, and more students were likely to be taught by a fully prepared and motivated teacher than before. While much remains to be done in the realm of teacher induction and support, BTSA programs are providing cost-effective means of achieving major gains in the twin areas of new teacher support and new teacher assessment.

California Basic Educational Skills Test and Lawsuit

In the early 1980s, Gary Hart, a member of the California Legislature from Santa Barbara and a former high school social studies teacher, made headlines in California over stories of classroom teachers and other credentialed school personnel who were seemingly incapable of using basic English grammar. Coming as these stories did at a time when public concerns over the state of the public schools was rising, the media seized upon the story and it soon achieved national prominence. Anecdotal evidence was displayed that showed notes written to parents by classroom teachers that were filled with egregious errors. Hearings were held in Sacramento and several school superintendents decried the quality of teachers being prepared by approved credential programs at California colleges and universities. It was the swift and certain judgment of the Legislature that such a state of affairs was unacceptable and the legislative remedy was to require that all candidates for any educator license must take and pass a basic skills test. No longer would the possession of a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution of postsecondary education confer basic educational skills. While that might still be true for admission to and graduation from other professional schools, those seeking to enter the education profession (at least in the public sector of K-12 education) must take and pass a test of basic skills.

The Commission was charged with the duty of developing and administering such an examination. A proposal was developed by Commission staff and a testing contractor was sought who had the necessary expertise to create such an examination. The Educational Testing Service of Princeton New Jersey, the largest testing company in the United States won the contract to develop, administer, score and monitor the test. After the typical period of test development, item bias review, field testing, and validation of the applicability to test specifications to the basic work of the all educators, the California Basic Skills Test was first administered in California in 1983. There was intense public interest in the initial test results that were published in the media. Interestingly, the test results were published by the name of the institution where the candidate did her or his undergraduate degree. Yet, the resulting publicity focused on the teacher education programs that had the lowest pass rates on CBEST. This negative publicity seemed

oblivious to the fact that the teacher education programs were not responsible for the general education of the students they had admitted. High pass rates were assumed to confer some semblance of quality on the teacher education program while those programs that had low pass rates were deemed of poor quality. Almost no one raised the question of how a candidate could fail the CBEST and yet have earned a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution.

It was also the case that those teacher education programs that enrolled the largest number of under-represented students tended to have lower CBEST pass rates than programs that enrolled relatively few under-represented students. This fairly persistent disparity in pass rates across racial and ethnic groups led several public interest law groups to begin tracking the CBEST.

Finally, in the late 1980s, a federal lawsuit was filed by a Bay Area public interest law firm with long-standing interests in issues related to testing discrimination, charging that the CBEST was biased and unfairly discriminated against racial and ethnic minorities. While a complete analysis of this case requires an entire book unto itself, the issues joined in the lawsuit touched upon a number of key policy issues in education.

There was the whole issue of using an examination as a single point screening mechanisms for licensure. Prior to the development of the CBEST, all examinations for licensure had been optional. Candidates could either complete approved programs of professional preparation or take the examination. Testing difficulties, test phobias, or other problems could be worked around through the completion of coursework. The CBEST, however, because it focused on basic skills of reading, writing, and mathematics and because it has been developed to screen out those candidates who had unacceptably low levels of skill in these three critical areas, had no other option open to those who could not earn a passing score on the examination.

The CBEST examination opened up questions of the desire for a diverse teaching force over against the desire to have all teachers clearly demonstrate a minimal ability to read, write, and compute. Yet, the accumulative data were clear that certain racial and ethnic groups had lower pass rates than other groups. These same groups had low representation in California's teaching force while they had rising representation among California's schoolchildren. Moreover, all the

CBEST takers had already entered or completed college so that the test was denying entrance to the education profession to a group of individuals who were already under-represented among college students and graduates.

The CBEST lawsuit touched on what general knowledge all educators were expected to have in order to carry out the work expected of all of them. Earlier attempts to set minimum standards for entrance to certain professions had been challenged on the basis that the test was not aligned to the work requirements of the employee. The courts had ruled that any examination had to be clearly aligned with the minimum work expectations of the job. Thus, if one were hiring cooks, knowledge of proper food-handling techniques could be argued to be an essential task required of all cooks while knowledge of French, although possible helpful, could not be considered essential. Since the CBEST was not about teaching, nor did the examination contain any specifications focused on pedagogical or particular academic content knowledge, some people argued that the test was not aligned to what all teachers and other educators did on the job.

The lawsuit also raised the question of how well the test was developed, given the cultural, linguistic, and racial diversity of California. Questions were raised by the plaintiffs in the lawsuit about the process used to develop test specifications, the process used to eliminate any items that might have bias in their language or cultural assumptions, the process used to develop and field test new items for the test, and the process used to evaluate and score the writing samples required within the CBEST examinations. While these were, for the most, part, highly technical questions that turned on best practices and proper test development techniques, they also reflected the challenge of developing fair and equitable instruments for assessing any type of knowledge or skill across a diverse group of individuals.

The lawsuit was tried in the 13th District Federal courts. This district had a reputation in legal circles for a high degree of social activism and a commitment to matters of social justice. However, the outcome of the first trial was a full and complete vindication for the Commission and the CBEST. The court ruled that the test was fair, was based upon reasonable expectations that all educators, regardless of what they taught or where they taught should possess the level of knowledge and skill in reading,

writing, and mathematics that was assessed by the CBEST. While the court acknowledged that there was a disparate impact of the test on certain groups of people, the nature of the work of educators, and the expectations of the public in sending its children to the public schools was such that requiring all licensed educators to meet these minimal standards was acceptable public policy and not an impermissible violation of civil rights.

The plaintiffs immediately appealed this decision to the appropriate federal appeals court. The panel of three judges assigned to hear the appeal also ruled in favor of the Commission and the CBEST, but did so for reasons not connected to the analysis and reasoning of the original trial court judge. The three judge appeals court focused on the question of whether the Commission, acting on behalf of the Legislature and people of California, is the employer of the individuals seeking to take and pass the CBEST. In the original court case, the trial judge had ruled that the Commission needed to meet the standard for essentialness of the test items that an employer would need to meet rather than the lower standard of essentialness and alignment expected of a licensing agency. The original court judge had argued that, since it was impossible to teach in the public schools of California without a license and since earning license required passage of the CBEST, the Commission was, in effect, an employer of public school credential holders. The appeals court dismissed that argument as inappropriate and also argued that the state was immune to lawsuits of this sort.

The plaintiffs then asked for an “en banc” review. This required all of the judges in the federal appeals court district (some thirteen federal judges in all) to review both the original trial case and the first appeals case. The “en banc” review resulted in the upholding of both the original trial judges’ decision and the first appeal judges’ decision. There were some dissenting views and the Commission was denied any financial relief from the plaintiffs, but the basic policy and psychometric decisions of the Commission were upheld by the federal courts.

In all, the case lasted about seven years and cost the Commission over $3 million dollars in legal fees. Ironically, since the Commission is a special fund agency and takes no money from the State's general fund, it was teacher licensing fees that paid for the defense of CBEST.

In the long run, the expensive and sometimes bitter lessons learned by the Commission and its staff through the CBEST lawsuit informed any future assessment work to be undertaken by the Commission. Hiring highly competent test development firms, doing the careful work of aligning test specifications with accepted and validated work expectations, field testing the test specifications with a diverse population of respondents with particular attention to underrepresented groups, employing bias reviews throughout the test development process, and ensuring that the on-going item analyses and test item pool development all adhere to and support the highest standards of the testing profession and are continuously aligned to the California context will help in assuring that any new assessments, especially those where there is no alternative to the assessment itself, will meet the legal tests that are almost inevitable in contemporary society. And perhaps more importantly, the Commission can go about meeting the increasing expectations for accountability in education confident that its programs rightly and fairly address and assess the knowledge and skills that all teachers must possess if our schools are to achieve their adopted goals.

Political Context – 1988-1996

During the mid 1980s, the very existence of the Commission was in jeopardy. Alice Petrossian, an administrator in the Glendale Unified School District was elected as Commission Chair in 1985 and Richard Mastain was appointed as Executive Secretary (which changed to Executive Director in 1990) later that year. Petrossian and Mastain had fostered important relationships with members of the legislature, particularly Senators Hart and Bergeson, and with Governor Deukmejian and his education adviser, Peter Mehas. The passage of Bergeson's Senate Bill 148, the governor's support for funding the California New Teacher Project in 1988 and movement towards a "new accreditation model" are examples of real leadership and collaboration from Petrossian and Mastain. It set the stage for several major reforms and initiatives that are highlighted in this chapter for the period 1988 - 1996.

The increased stature of the Commission, engendered by the combined efforts of Chair Alice Petrossian and Executive Secretary Mastain during the early part of the 1980s decade, and the leadership of the Commission from 1989 through the early 1990's had brought about

increased scrutiny of the Commission's role in education reform by the Governor's Office. Additionally, education had become a state-level issue in California as the basic funding for public schools shifted as a result of court decisions about adequate school funding and through propositions that removed local property tax as the primary vehicle for funding public education. By 1990, the state was directly responsible for the majority of school costs. This made public education the largest single segment of the state budget, thus capturing the attention of both the legislative and executive branches of government. In such a climate, gubernatorial candidates boosted their level of attention to public education issues and found that such topics were powerful ones to use in getting elected. As California experienced its transition from an industrial economy to a post-industrial economy and as the federal government began its defense "down-sizing" in the aftermath of the Cold War, the perceived quality and performance of its public schools was closely viewed. The general public perception was increasingly unfavorable. California entered into another period of concern for public education and an increasingly desire for major reform not seen since the Sputnik scare of the late 1950s. This time the fear was not Soviet aggression through military or economic domination, or even the economic competition from Japan, but a more generalized fear that the United States would lag behind the world in technology, basic and applied research and economic productivity. And this fear became crystallized in the perceived poor performance of American public schools relative to the performance of students in public schools in other industrialized countries. It did not take too many editorials and blue ribbon reports to arrive at the conclusion that the quality of the classroom teachers in our public schools was a critical variable in the over-all quality of our public schools. Thus, matters of educator preparation policy were soon seen to have a direct and measurable impact on the success or failure of the school reform agenda.

Pete Wilson (1990 - 1998) had run for the Governor's Office on a campaign that included much attention to education issues. His initial plans for substantial school reform ran into two obstacles. One, leadership in public education is split in California. The Superintendent of Public Instruction is a constitutional office and the candidates for this office run a non-partisan state-wide race. The State Board of Education is

appointed by the Governor. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing is also appointed by the Governor, but the State Superintendent has a permanent voting seat on the Commission. The Legislature largely controls the budget for the public schools, but several propositions initiated by the major teacher union in the state created significant structural provisions regarding fund allocations to the public schools. In general, constitutional changes like Proposition 98 guaranteed a base level of funds to the public schools regardless of the overall budgetary needs of the state. Thus, the ability of any Governor to make significant changes in state educational policy was blunted by both the intentional and unintentional balance of powers within state government.

The second problem faced by the new Governor was the perilous state of economic affairs in California when he took office in 1990. Even though Wilson was replacing an eight-year Republican Governor, George Deukmejian, the state faced large shortfalls in income projections. In addition, there were long-standing infrastructure problems that had gone unaddressed during the inflationary years, and these problems required immediate and expensive attention. Finally, the federal government was in the midst of its defense expenditure "draw-down" and had targeted California for a significant number of base closures that further exacerbated the state's economic problems. California was adversely impacted with the decline of aerospace and defense industries in the aftermath of the ending of the "Cold War."

A number of factors delayed the Governor's agenda for school reform. However, the Governor's staff remained insistent that all his appointees and directors of state agencies remain loyal and adhere to the Wilson legislative program. In this era of possible school reform, loyalty to Governor Wilson was strongly enforced by the Governor's office.

Since its creation in 1970, the Commission consisted of fourteen voting members appointed by the Governor. The fifteenth voting member was the elected state Superintendent for Public Instruction (or designee). The Commission was responsible to select its chief administrative officer, who served at the pleasure of the Commission and who could be removed from the position by the majority vote of Commissioners. With the selection of Philip Fitch in 1989, the Commission had selected five Executive Secretaries (Directors) since 1970. All resigned from the position for different reasons. Fitch, who

replaced Dick Mastain in 1989, resigned July 1, 1995 after a time of increasing pressure from members of Governor Wilson's office. Fitch had been a member of the professional staff at the Commission prior to his selection as Executive Secretary (Director), and, prior to his Commission service, had been on the education faculty and served as an administrator for a private college in California. Although he studiously avoided any partisan positions during his tenure as Executive Director, the view from the Governor's office was that he was not sufficiently loyal.

On July 1, 1995, Dr. Ruben Ingram, a recently retired superintendent from Fountain Valley School District, began his duties as Interim Executive Director of the Commission. Ingram had been a public school educator for more than forty years in California, serving as classroom teacher, principal, superintendent, university professor, and educational consultant. Dr. Ingram had been involved with the Commission for a number of years, having served on several accreditation teams and as a member of two Commission advisory panels. During his term in office, Ingram and the Commission continued the pace of innovation established by earlier Commissions.

As stated earlier, SB 148 called for a change in terms and membership for the Commission. In July 1989, Mary Jane Pearson was elected to serve as the Commission Chair. Dr. Pearson had been a professor in special education for a number of years at CSU, Sacramento and was very interested in the extensive study regarding the requirements for special education teachers being undertaken by the Commission. She was instrumental in shaping the study and bringing the new special education standards and requirements into being.

In December 1992, Jerilyn Harris, a high school science teacher from Ukiah was elected chair of the Commission for 1993. Being a classroom teacher added to her credibility as chair of the Commission as she provided leadership to the implementation of SB 1422. Her question to the Commission and to organizations in the state was, "if you could prepare teachers for California classrooms in the best way possible, what would you do?" She encouraged commissioners and staff to think "outside the box" in creating and implementing new standards and requirements for teacher preparation directed by SB 1422. In December

1993, the Commission adopted a policy that chairs and vice chairs could only serve in those positions for two consecutive year terms.

At the December 1994 meeting, the commissioner's elected Dr. Verna B. Dauterive as chair. Dr. Dauterive served the Commission as chair with unusual leadership skills and distinction during her two years as chair. She had direct access to the Governor's Office which benefited the work of the Commission in a number of ways. The new accreditation system was initiated with the Commission adoption of the Accreditation Framework and the appointment of the Committee on Accreditation during her term as chair. As chair, Dr. Dauterive developed a positive relationship with the State Board of Education. The commission and the State Board agreed to have a liaison member designated to attend meetings of the two agencies and provide information on issues of common interest. Commissioner Dauterive continued to serve as chair through December, 1996.

Much of the positive momentum that was created in the late 1980s continued into the early 1990s. Listed below are some of the achievements of the Commission during this period.

- Elimination of a credential backlog and establishment of the credential automation system.
- Full development and enhancement to both staff and resources for the Professional Standards Division, which investigates misconduct.
- Development of a prudent fiscal planning and accountability system and a well-managed budget and reserve.
- Completion of a new system for issuing credential waivers and handling appeals.
- Enhancement to fully developed technology with the use of microcomputers and other technologies in the agency.
- Re-configuring of all special education credentials for California.
- Establishment of new standards for the two-tier administrative credential.
- Creation of CLAD/BCLAD Credentials to replace LDS, BCC and Bilingual Emphasis Credentials.
- Establishment of standards for preparation of adult educators and vocational education teachers.
- Implementation of the California New Teacher Project as the

Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program.

- Expansion of major programs of alternative routes for teacher certification.
- Establishment of new standards for subject matter programs and exams.
- Completion of over twenty-seven special reports for the Legislature, Governor's Office and professional organizations in the state dealing with the preparation of educators.
- Initiation of a comprehensive study of basic teaching requirements for the multiple and single subject credentials - SB 1422.
- Establishment of the Committee on Accreditation resulting from three years of work with the Accreditation Advisory Council.

Chapter 9
The Critical Role of Teacher Preparation in the School Accountability Movement of the 1990's (1996-2003)

Linda Bond

Class Size Reduction

The most sweeping initiative enacted by Governor Pete Wilson, and the one that would have the most far-reaching implications for education in California, was the class-size reduction program established in 1996. The California Teachers Association had waged a full-scale media campaign, airing television commercials showing California public school children in large, over-crowded classrooms and challenging Governor Wilson to lower class sizes. The dismal scores of many California children on reading assessments had cast teachers in a bad light and research was beginning to emerge showing that lower class sizes could have an impact on student achievement. Research indicated that lowering the student-teacher ratio to below 17 to 1 was most effective, especially for the lowest achieving students.

The Governor was interested in providing increased funding to all school districts while keeping extra funding "off the table"—not subject to local collective bargaining negotiations. The budget was showing a surplus. Late in the 1996 legislative session, Governor Wilson's administration proposed to earmark "surplus" funds for reduced class sizes. In a marathon of just a few weeks the Governor pushed through an initiative that would allow local districts to reduce class size in the early elementary grades.

Wilson's class size reduction program would become arguably the most popular education initiative in California's history. Parents in suburban areas, deeply concerned about their children's ability to learn to read, welcomed class-size reduction as a way to provide all children with more personal instruction. Advocates for the poor held out the hope that reduced class sizes in urban schools would provide poor children with the extra help they needed to become successful readers. Despite its promise, however, the rush to fully implement class size reduction, virtually overnight, created an instant shortage of fully credentialed

teachers. While nearly all K-3 classrooms were kept to a 20-1 size, the disparities between the underserved poor schools and their counterparts grew significantly as they were disproportionally served by underprepared teachers. This disparity would be an unintended consequence. This disparity exists, to some extent, even today.

Dramatic Increase in the Issuance of Emergency Permits

Pursuant to law, the Commission had issued emergency teaching documents for over twenty-five years. However, the 1996-97 *Annual Report on Emergency Permits and Credential Waivers* showed a dramatic increase in the issuance of both emergency permits and credential waivers. Emergency permits increased from 6,000 in 1995-96 to 30,029 in 1999, a four-fold increase. The unprecedented increase was due, for the most part, to California's effort to reduce class size in the primary grades. Approximately 11% of certificated staff in California's schools were employed on the basis of an emergency permit or a waiver as Class Size Reduction created an immediate need for over 18,000 new teachers to staff elementary classrooms. Other areas of teaching, such as middle schools and high schools, were impacted as teachers transferred to serve in the newly available smaller elementary classrooms. However, the most dramatic impact was seen in special education, as thousands of special education teachers "self-revoked" their credentials to take advantage of the opportunity to move into smaller regular education classrooms. A peripheral, but substantial, effect of class-size reduction was the drastic increase in the need for 30-Day Substitute Permit holders, as many substitutes were offered full-time employment. In most cases, these substitutes – turned teachers did not have full credentials.

Teacher Fitness

Class size reduction had a largely unanticipated impact on ongoing efforts to protect California public school students from individuals who did not meet statutory requirements for teacher fitness. In the push to fill classrooms, many individuals who had been dismissed from school employment due to convictions for crimes of moral turpitude attempted to return to employment in the public schools. Commission workload increased in relation to the number of teachers needed. In particular, the work of the Division of Professional Practices-responsible for teacher

fitness reviews--increased dramatically.

It is fortunate that California was one of the first states to require fingerprinting for credential applicants and one of the first participants in the NASDTEC clearinghouse. The Commission experienced a substantial increase in disciplinary caseloads after fiscal year 1994. In the seven-year fiscal period of 1995-2002, following the enactment of the Class Size Reduction Program, the Commission revoked 1,159 credentials, suspended 357 credentials and issued 84 private admonitions. In the same seven-year period, applicants were denied credentials in 492 cases. Complex case resolution increased 212 percent in four years--rising from 2,574 cases in 1995 to 5,460 in 1999—with no increase in legal staff during this time period. The law requires that these cases be investigated within a strict time period. Probation monitoring workload increased dramatically, from 35 cases in 1997 to nearly 130 in 2000-01.

Margett and Scott Measures Strengthen Fitness Mandates

The Commission's mandates with respect to educator misconduct were revised and strengthened by several measures, including AB 1067 (Margett, 1999), AB 457 (Scott, 1999) and SB 299 (Scott, 2001). At the request of the Commission, Assemblyman Margett carried AB 1067 to bring into conformity two sections of the Education Code dealing with "lewd and lascivious behavior." AB 1067 also required the Commission to immediately revoke the credential of, or deny an application from, any individual who engaged in specified offenses, including assault against a child in his or her custody who is under the age of eight. Mr. Scott's AB 457 added to the list of sex offenses leading to mandatory credential revocation crimes involving the sale, distribution or publication via the internet of obscene and pornographic material. This Scott measure also required the Commission to revoke the credential of any person convicted of a violent or serious felony or a specified sex or drug offense. Finally, AB 457 prohibited a county board of education from issuing a temporary certificate to any applicant whose teaching credential had been revoked or suspended. SB 299 sponsored by Senator Scott ensured that credential holders convicted of a federal sex offense are immediately removed from the classroom.

The Michelle Montoya Act

The most sweeping employee discipline measure was enacted in response to tragedy at a high school in Sacramento. In 1997, a classified school employee savagely murdered student Michelle Montoya at her school. School district administrators, who had only recently hired the employee, were unaware of the man's history of violence. Following a highly emotional set of legislative hearings, the Michelle Montoya Act (AB 1612, Alby, 1997) was signed into law, banning any individual convicted of a violent or serious felony from working in a California public school. The ban applies to both credentialed and classified school employee positions; the only exemption allowing a convicted felon to pursue employment when he or she obtains a certificate of rehabilitation from the courts and a pardon from the Governor.

In follow-up to the Michelle Montoya Act, Assembly Members Alby and Ortiz co-authored a measure requiring all candidates for school employment and others who may come in contact with students to undergo a background check prior to employment. AB 2102 (1998) added to credential candidate screening already underway by the Commission local, an employment fingerprint screening that included certificated and classified employees as well as outside employees who work on a school campus. Commission staff actively assisted Ms. Alby and Ms. Ortiz to craft the proposal and testified repeatedly in favor of the measure. As a result of Michelle Montoya's tragic death, California public school students and their parents are now assured that school employees meet a high standard of fitness.

Changing Leadership

Executive Director

On April 1, 1996, Commission Chair Verna Dauterive announced the appointment of Dr. Sam Swofford as Executive Director of the Commission. Dr. Swofford had been a public school teacher, administrator, and superintendent in California with over twenty years of experience in curriculum, personnel and labor relations. Dr. Swofford was familiar with the work of the Commission through his service on the Committee on Credentials, the standing committee of the Commission

that deals with educator discipline and the moral fitness and professional conduct of credential holders. His familiarity with California educational issues and with the work of the Commission made it possible for him to take charge quickly following his appointment. One of his first initiatives was to engage the Commission in a strategic planning exercise that produced a set of goals for the Commission based on its legal mandates and mission. Through the assistance of an outside management consulting firm, the Commission engaged in a series of discussions, review of key documents, and legislative mandates to arrive at a set of goals that captured the essential work of the Commission.

The six goals were:

Goal One: Promote educational excellence in California schools.

Goal Two: Improve coordination between Commissioners and staff in carrying out the Commission's duties, roles, and responsibilities.

Goal Three: Improve customer service provided by the Commission.

Goal Four: Increase legislative involvement of the Commission on key issues relating to educators in California.

Goal Five: Improve the Commission's communication with its stakeholders.

Goal Six: Work with schools of education, the Department of Education, and school districts to assure quality teachers.

One of the shifts that his appointment suggested was the increased visibility of the K-12 sector in the work of the Commission. Of the five previous chief administrators of the Commission, two of them had ties to the postsecondary world of educator preparation and none had recent experience as administrators of California school districts. The appointment of Ruben Ingram as Interim Director and the selection of Sam Swofford as Director were indices that the consumers of educator preparation, the school districts of the state, were increasingly interested in the quality and quantity of the educators produced by the accredited colleges and universities.

Given the increased interest in policy issues related to the goals established by the Commission, Swofford made internal personnel changes intended to increase the Commission's effectiveness and

visibility as a policy-making agency. He increased institutional resources toward making the Commission's legislative efforts more effective. In February 1998, he also created a new position for Policy and Programs within the agency. This small office was intended to provide the Commission greater capacity to anticipate issues that would impact the work of the Commission and to provide the Commission with a long-range planning function in the area of state and national educational policy concerns. Swofford re-organized the support functions of the Commission to increase the technological support element and to provide more rapid and detailed budgetary and income information. Swofford also worked with the Commissioners to improve and streamline their own meeting structure.

The Commission had outgrown its office building earlier in the 1990s and had moved its Division of Professional Practices to a separate building in 1994. By 1997, it was clear that the Commission needed a larger facility if it was to carry out the increased workload generated by the increase in number of credentials granted, increased attention to teacher discipline, and increased programmatic work caused by the creation of teacher recruitment programs and other policy innovations. In late 1998, the Commission moved to a newly renovated office building on Capitol Avenue in Sacramento.

Commission Chairpersons

Carolyn Ellner was elected to serve as chair for 1997. She had served as the Associate Dean and Director of Teacher Education at Claremont Graduate School for a number of years and had established a national reputation as an educational scholar with expertise in the field of teacher education. Later, Dr. Ellner was selected to serve as the Dean of Education at California State University, Northridge. She served as chair with good will and had a positive relationship with the various constituent groups of the Commission. She also gave support and leadership to the initial work on formation and language for SB 2042 that was passed in 1998.

Commissioner Torrie Norton was elected chair of the Commission for 1999 and re-elected for 2000. Chair Norton served during the transition between the Wilson and Davis administrations and paved the way for continued good relations with Governor Davis and his Secretary

for Education. Governor Wilson had appointed Norton, a special education teacher from San Diego, and she had garnered the support of Commissioners while developing a solid, productive relationship with Commission staff. Her natural warmth, her commitment to students, and her intellect all stood her in good stead as the Commission assumed a larger role in education policy. Chair Norton led the Commission as it engaged in intensive efforts to develop new teacher preparation standards and recruit and retain teachers. Norton focused particular attention on efforts to provide improved customer service to classroom teachers, school districts, universities and others who depended on the Commission for information and assistance.

Alan Bersin, Superintendent of the San Diego City Schools, was appointed to the Commission by Governor Davis who cited his leadership in reorganizing the San Diego system to focus on instruction, with emphasis on extra reading and math help as early as possible for struggling students. Bersin was later elected Chair of the Commission for 2001 and re-elected for 2002. Bersin had the confidence of Governor Davis and his first Secretary of Education, former State Senator Gary Hart. He was able to connect directly with the Governor and the Governor's Chief of Staff. In Sacramento, he reached out to legislators, education constituency groups and state policymakers. During that time, the Commission would enhance its standing with key education constituency groups, implement a major teacher education reform, initiate improvements in technology, and redesign the content, structure and standards for the administrative services credential.

Carol Katzman, a school administrator in the Beverly Hills School District who had been on the Commission since 1995, was elected chair for 2003. She was well known and respected in California education circles and had a major interest in reading instruction and the implementation of the implementation of SB 2042. Three months after she was elected as chair of the Commission, she was appointed by the Governor to the California State Board of Education. Lawrence Madkins, who had served as vice-chair of the Commission under Alan Bersin and who had been elected as vice chair for 2003, served as acting chair for one meeting. Margaret Fortune was selected to be chair for the remainder of 2003. She was very involved in education in California, especially in the Sacramento area. This included being superintendent of

St. HOPE Public Schools, a K-12 charter school district, and serving in the Office of the Secretary for Education. She later served as an advisor to Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, after leaving the Commission. Lawrence Madkins was elected chair of the Commission for 2004, after serving as vice-chair for three previous chairs. He was an eighth grade teacher in the Poway Unified School District and gained a reputation for encouraging thoughtful consultation with all interested stakeholders.

New Governor Elected

In 1998 Gray Davis was elected Governor of California. Vowing to make education his first, second and third priority, Governor Davis called on the Legislature to convene a Special Session on Education. Davis appointed former Senator Gary Hart as Education Secretary and former Senate Education staff member Sue Burr as Undersecretary. Hart and Burr worked long hours to craft and negotiate proposals for the new governor. Four measures, focusing on student achievement, teacher quality, and school accountability, were proposed:

- California Peer Assistance and Review Program (PAR), peer review, staff development and assessment designed for veteran teachers. Results of the peer review program were to be used in annual teacher evaluations conducted by school principals and reported to local school boards.
- Elementary School Intensive Reading Program, an after-school, Saturday and summer session intensive reading program for students in grades K-4 who needed to strengthen and develop their reading skills.
- Public School Performance and Accountability, to rank schools by academic achievement, establish a system for rewarding schools that met performance goals and provide assistance for the lowest performing schools.
- A High School Exit Exam to determine whether secondary students had mastered specified skills in reading, writing and mathematics.

All four of Governor Davis' education measures became law.

Two provisions embedded in Governor Davis's first set of reforms would have a significant impact on successful state programs. The first,

enacted as part of the new peer review program, repealed the Mentor Teacher Program created under SB 813 (Hart, 1983). The Mentor Program had provided crucial support to novice teachers participating in the beginning teacher support and assessment program. Mentors were instrumental in offering assistance and continued preparation to participating first and second year teachers. The second provision sanctioned local collective bargaining regarding the peer assistance program. Governor Davis proposed that teachers receiving assistance in peer review "shall have permanent status and either volunteer to participate or be referred as a result of their biennial performance review." Thus, the Governor's measure made the new program subject to local collective bargaining. As *Sacramento Bee* reporter Janie DeFao explained in a March 15, 1999 article:

> Davis' proposal departs significantly from the popular BTSA program. For one, it is aimed not at fledgling teachers but at struggling veterans. In addition, the advice and evaluation of the mentor teachers would not be confidential, as it is in BTSA, but would become part of teachers' files and could be used by school boards in deciding whether to fire teachers.

Since the intent of the peer review program was to focus on tenured teachers who were having difficulty assisting students to meet learning goals, Davis agreed that teacher associations should have a say in program implementation. However, following direction from the largest state teachers' association, local bargaining units campaigned to target beginning teachers for peer review, rather than those with tenure. As a result, California had two separately funded programs to provide preparation and support for new teachers—the Beginning Support and Assessment Program and the Peer Review Program. One (PAR) required local collective bargaining, and one (BTSA) did not.

The statutory mandate to bargain PAR led to entanglements with other issues that were locally bargained. In an attempt to ensure implementation of peer review, Governor Davis had placed a "hammer" in his legislation to deny state staff development resources to any district failing to implement peer review by a date certain. The California Teachers Association (CTA) then made major efforts to subsume continued implementation of BTSA under bargaining over PAR. This

had particular implications for the selection of mentor teachers to serve as consultants to beginning teachers.

Governor Davis and the Legislature built on the foundation they had created during Davis' first year in office. The second wave of educational reforms and resources focused on recruiting talented candidates to the teaching profession, retaining capable and dedicated educators, and renewing teachers' knowledge and skills in the classroom through professional development tied to statewide standards and goals. California was still reeling from the effects of class size reduction and growth in enrollment creating a demand for fully credentialed teachers. The Governor's key teacher recruitment measure, SB 1666 (Alcaron, Chapter 70, Statues of 2000) was approved by the Legislature with bipartisan support. Davis' Education Secretary, Kerry Mazzoni, said the Governor's initiative offered "unprecedented incentives to attract teachers." She called attention to "regional recruitment centers; an acceleration of the credentialing process for teachers already teaching in the classroom under emergency permits; improvements in teacher salaries and working conditions; and a campaign to raise the profile of teaching as a valued profession." Following is a list of the major initiatives that were enacted to recruit and prepare new teachers for California's schools.

- Increased beginning teacher salaries.
- Reduced Emergency Permits by requiring more specific documentation from school districts to ensure that a diligent search had been conducted.
- Provision of California credentials to out-of-state teachers based on equivalent experience or requirements.
- Established teacher recruitment centers in six regions of the state where there was a demonstrated need.
- Provided grant awards to low-performing schools for discretionary teacher recruitment and retention incentives.
- Provided $20,000 fellowship awards for 1,000 teacher candidates who earn credentials and agree to teach in low-performing schools for four years.
- Expanded the grant amounts to school districts for teacher interns.
- Added an option within the Intern program for eligible candidates

to test out of credential requirements.

- Expanded funding ten-fold to increase the number of participants in the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program.
- Funded state-supported summer session teacher preparation programs at the California State University.
- Increased loan forgiveness awards for teachers who served four years in subject shortage areas, or low income schools.
- Created the Governor's Teacher Scholars, a 15 month credential and masters program at the University of California that would provide prospective teachers with full scholarships in exchange for teaching in schools which are the most difficult to staff.
- Provided below market mortgages for qualifying new teachers who agree to teach in low performing schools.

Reforms in the Teaching of Reading

The dominant topics of consideration for the Commission in the 1990s in terms of pedagogy and subject matter knowledge and alignment with changing student content and performance standards included increased attention to teacher knowledge, the use of technology, and, most importantly, the ferocious battles related to reading instruction in California. The question of how best to teach students to read has a long and politically bloody history in American education. In California, the period of the 1980s was a time when the whole language school of thought held sway in the state. Both in university training and in curriculum materials prepared by the Department of Education, the focus of teaching children to read gave greater emphasis to reading for meaning than to the mechanics of reading. While the complexities, claims and counter-claims around the issue of how best to teach children to read are too great for this publication, suffice it to say that during the 1990s, the pendulum shifted dramatically back in favor of the primacy of phonics instruction. Fueled by abysmal reading scores on national assessments, both the State Board of Education, then largely composed of more conservative Wilson appointees, and activist members of the Legislature proposed and passed new regulations designed to correct the reading problem in California. The Commission developed new standards to govern the teaching of reading courses in teacher

preparation programs as a part of a larger state-wide initiative called the California Reading Initiative.

The effort called for a total effort to ensure that every K-3 student encountered a balanced curriculum of explicit skills instruction in phonics along with classroom activities that fostered enjoyment, motivation, and meaningful reading, writing and other language uses. Assembly Bill 3075 (Baldwin) and Assembly Bill 1178 (Cuneen) required the Commission not only to develop and implement new standards for the teaching of reading in teacher preparation programs, but also to develop a Reading Instruction Competence Assessment that all elementary candidates prepared in California would be required to pass before they could be licensed to teach in California. Both of these measures represented new levels of involvement by the Legislature in the preparation of classroom teachers in that they specified the content that must be included in the new reading course, and the content of the new examination.

The Commission developed a process to examine the syllabus for every reading course in every elementary credential program in the state and verify that the actual course content complied with the requirements as set out in the law and the Commission adopted standard. Interestingly, the traditional aversion of postsecondary education to governmental intrusion into academic curriculum was muted. It may have been that the public outcry over dismal reading performance silenced the usual champions of academic freedom or it may have been that this intrusion was seen as peripheral to the central mission of colleges and universities and, therefore, not worth an expenditure of political capital to fight it.

The Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) also represented the first true 'high stakes' assessment used in California since failure to pass the examination regardless of how well one did in the professional preparation program meant that no credential could be awarded. Although the Commission engaged in a careful job analysis to ensure that the test specifications were clearly linked to the required knowledge and skills of teaching reading, the movement into a new area of assessment with such high stakes attached placed the Commission at risk for more litigation over possible disparate impacts of its adopted assessments. Ironically, the early high pass rates for RICA prompted

some critics of teacher education to claim that the RICA test was too easy. A more probable explanation is that the negative exposure an institution would receive if it had a low pass rate may well have goaded the involved faculty to teach to the test specifications so that their students would have the best chance to pass the examination.

Expansion of the Paraprofessional Teacher Program

In January 1999, Governor Davis identified the paraprofessional Teacher Training Program as an important element of his education initiative, Enhancing Professional Quality. Governor Davis authorized an additional $10 million in the 1999-2000 State Budget for program expansion. Career ladder programs provide funding to support individuals while they work in the classroom and complete their teacher preparation. The primary purpose of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program is to create local career ladders that enable school paraprofessional to become certificated classroom teachers. In most instances participants have served in a classroom environment for more than eight years. Therefore, program graduates do not experience the culture shock that might be experienced by individuals with little or no classroom experience. In return, each participant must make a commitment to complete one school year of classroom instruction in the district or county office of education for each year that he or she receives assistance for tuition, fees, books, and other costs received under the program. Additionally, the program was created to respond to teacher shortages, improve the instructional services that are provided by school paraprofessionals, diversity the teaching profession, and establish innovative models for teacher education. Initially established by legislation authored by Senator David Roberti (SB 1636) in 1990, the Paraprofessional Program was funded for the first time in 1994-95. The 1994-95 budgets contained $1.478 million in local assistance funds for implementation of 13 local programs. Legislation signed by Governor Deukmejian (Chapter 1220, Statutes of 1991) required the program to focus on the recruitment of paraprofessionals who are specializing in working with English language learners and special education students. Governor Davis responded to requests to expand the program after repeated

efforts by school employee unions and legislators to increase participation were rebuffed during the Wilson administration.

Assessment Issues

Perhaps the most dramatic change in the 1990s for the Commission was in the area of assessment. For most of its history, the Commission's involvement in psychometrically sophisticated assessments had been low. While the reforms of the 1970s had pointed toward the wide-spread adoption of testing in lieu of various preparation programs as a means of opening up the field of education to a wider array of applicants, the necessary funds to develop California-specific examinations had not been available. When the Commission did adopt examinations, it was forced to select from commercially available examinations. Thus, the subject matter examinations (testing of content knowledge) adopted by the Commission were taken from examinations originally developed by the Educational Testing Service for the state of New York. These tests were psychometrically sound examinations, but the content was never completely aligned with the subject matter preparation requirements as established for California classroom teachers and never aligned with the California public school curricula. The Commission was to use these examinations for more than a decade before it was able to develop subject matter examinations that were based upon California public school curricula.

In the early 1980s, in response to perceptions of school teacher inadequacies, California had mandated that all applicants for credentials, including substitute teaching credentials pass a test of basic skills that would determine if such applicants for credentials possessed minimal levels of performance in reading, writing, and mathematics. This examination, the California Basic Skills Test (CBEST) represented a new use of an assessment by the state of California as there was no alternative available to passing this one examination. In all other cases where formal assessments were used in credentialing, candidates had a course-work option. In the case of the CBEST, however, the candidates had to pass this examination in order to earn a credential. Within a few years, a lawsuit was filed in federal court challenging this examination on the basis of alleged disparate impact on racial and ethnic minorities (discussed in the previous chapter).

The Commission prevailed and the CBEST was ruled an acceptable screening examination. The case was appealed to federal appeals court and when the original verdict was upheld, the case was appealed to an "en banc" level of the federal appeals court. At that level, the original court's decision was upheld. However, the enormous expense of this one case (over $3.5 million dollars in direct legal fees) provided the Commission with a clear understanding of the dangers of assessments in the field of educator preparation. Nonetheless, the public was demanding increasing measures of accountability in public education during the 1990s and the press for the adoption of individual candidate assessment was growing. At the same time, the demand for teachers was also growing.

In response to this press for better measures of what teachers actually know and can do, the Commission initiated a multi-phased approach to addressing the need for better assessment practices in educator preparation programs. In conjunction with its growing Beginning Teacher Assessment Program, the Commission had commissioned a detailed study of assessment practices in current California teacher education programs and reviewed existing teacher assessments in use in other parts of the United States. Based on these findings, the Commission first worked to identify and adopt a set of standards for initial classroom teaching and then worked to promulgate their adoption and use in pre-service teacher education programs and teacher in-service programs around the state. The California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) went through several years of pilot use and review before being adopted by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and endorsed by the State Board of Education in 1997. The document provided both pre-service and in-service teacher education programs with a "lingua franca" or a common language with which to discuss teaching. It enabled all parties interested in improving teaching with a common technical language to use and communicated a coherent view of teaching to all parties involved. With its increasing use in pre-service teacher education programs and its adoption in the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment programs around the state, the CSTP became the foundation for additional work in the area of assessment.

The next assessment phase for the Commission required additional financial support and the federal government just happened to be

increasing its interest in teacher education in the late 1990s. The federal government created a program to provide states with significant financial support to create programs that would lead to enhanced teacher standards. Under the leadership of the newly elected Governor Davis, California put together an inter-agency task force to write a proposal to obtain the necessary funds to increase its teacher recruitment and support efforts, and to provide the needed funds to build a "high stakes" pre-service teacher assessment that would be legally defensible, financially affordable, and professionally and educationally appropriate for California. In 1999, the state learned that it had won of the largest grants from the federal government, an award in excess of $10 million dollars, which permitted the state, through the Commission, to begin the process of building a pre-service teacher assessment that would meet the goals established by the state for improving the teaching profession.

The Commission began the process by engaging in the complex and detailed psychometric work of identifying a set of teacher performance expectations for initial licensure regardless of grade level or subject matter taught. These generic pedagogical skills were seen as the foundational knowledge that all teachers must possess in order to be successful with all students. These Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) were not about the subjects to be taught. That knowledge was already being tested elsewhere or was demonstrated through the completion of approved undergraduate academic programs aligned with the public school curriculum. This assessment was intended to be about the pedagogical knowledge and skills that teachers needed to be successful with their students.

The Commission enlisted expert advice by releasing proposals to outside testing companies to provide assistance. The work commenced in late 1999. Once the TPEs were developed, reviewed by outside panels of teachers, administrators, school board members, public members, and other experts and interested parties and finally adopted by the Commission, the process of actually developing the means of assessing individual knowledge and skill in these adopted performance areas could begin. At the same time, the Commission began the process of ensuring that all accredited teacher education programs would be able to provide the necessary instruction for their students so that said students could pass the developed assessment. Ultimately, since the Commission had

envisioned this state-developed assessment as being part of an accredited pre-service teacher education program, the state also began developing the necessary training to ensure that all accredited teacher education programs could administer such an assessment correctly or were using a local assessment that met the Commission's standards.

Management Study of the Commission

The Commission's efforts to address the crisis of teacher shortages resulting from class size reduction took considerable time and effort. The process adopted by the Commission in bringing the SB 2042 recommendations to fruition allowed for extensive involvement by representatives of educators and teacher educators, however, this process took years to complete—many more years than anticipated by the Legislature. Legislative staff began questioning whether the Commission had lost sight of its primary mission. Complaints mounted from the California Teachers Association and others about credential processing time. The Commission's workload had increased exponentially with the advent of class size reduction. Emergency permits increased from 6,000 in 1995-96 to 30,029 in 1999, a four-fold increase. Unlike teaching credentials, which are renewed on a five-year cycle, emergency permits needed to be renewed each year, creating substantial new workload. Meanwhile, permission to implement much-needed improvements in credential processing technology was stalled in executive control agencies.

Legislators believed increased requests for credentials and permits following the enactment of the Class Size Reduction Program would be short-lived. This assumption proved to be incorrect. Prodded by the California Teachers Association and others, the Legislature ordered a management study of the Commission's operations. The 1999 State Budget required the transfer of $250,000 from the Teacher Credentials Fund (supported by credential fees) to the Legislative Analyst's Office to contract for a study of the Commission's organizational structure and credential processing protocols. The study was, at a minimum, to review:

- Identification of regulations and statutes related to teacher credentialing that may be modified to improve the efficient processing of credentials;
- Evaluation of the extent to which the CCTC's information technology plans achieve improvements in efficiency and timeliness

in credential processing and other service areas and recommendations for further improvement in this area;

- Recommendations regarding the appropriate level of staff to process credentials in an efficient and timely manner;
- Recommendations for any customer service improvements, including, but not limited to, accessibility;
- Recommendations for an appropriate credential fee structure to support the CCTC's average cost to process a credential, including the costs of potential discipline review, professional standards development, institutional accreditation, and agency administration; and
- Recommendations for further topics of study.

On March 1, 2000 the Legislative Analyst released the independent management study to the Legislature and the Governor. During the April Commission meeting, staff explained the management study revealed no major structural issues. The report offered recommendations that could generally be divided into three categories: 1) those that the Commission can implement given sufficient resources (18 recommendations); 2) those that require the coordination and cooperation of other agencies (6 recommendations); and 3) those where costs may outweigh the benefits (8 recommendations).

The primary recommendations proposed by the independent management study were as follows: reduce application turn-around time, expand web-site capabilities, improve readability of Commission publications and forms, and maintain the current standard of customer service. The independent reviewer noted that the Commission had implemented numerous technological and procedural changes in the past several years that had enabled the Commission to cope with the unprecedented workload demands imposed by the Class Size Reduction Program during a time when resource levels remained relatively stable. In addition, the study found that the Commission had improved customer satisfaction and continued Commission's current credential application fee level appeared reasonable and appropriate.

In 2001-2002, Commission staff processed 130,597 new applications and 116,822 renewals. In addition, the Commission provided credential-

related services to the public by answering 258,642 phone calls, 37,921 email questions and 7,301 letters. Meanwhile, with the assistance of Secretary of Education Sue Burr, funding was secured for improved database management affording school districts and the public electronic access to information on credential status, on-line submission and electronic payment of renewal applications, and data analysis necessary for state policy makers. This funding was essential since the existing technology hardware was outdated and long-term support of such equipment was impossible to acquire. Commission implementation of the first phase of new technology meant teachers would receive a credential renewal in fewer than nine days. The second phase of implementation would enable web-based credential application.

After considerable discussion and debate in the legislative fiscal subcommittees on education, Senate Budget Subcommittee Chairman Jack O'Connell proposed additions to the Commission budget sufficient for staff to process credentials within 10 days. His colleagues on the Joint Legislature Budget Committee agreed and included this provision in the 2000 Budget Bill. Upon the advice of the Department of Finance, who argued that the statutory 75-day processing time was reasonable, the positions to cut processing to 10 days were vetoed by Governor Davis. Nevertheless, eleven staff positions shown by the management study to be warranted were included in the Budget, allowing the Commission to process credential renewals within less than a week and initial credentials within 50 days--until the budget cuts of 2002-03.

Recruitment and Retention Initiatives Begin to Take Hold

The Commission announced that fiscal year 2000-01 marked the first time in over ten years that the total number of emergency permits decreased from the previous year. The overall reduction in emergency permits was 5% -- from 34,309 in 1999-2000 to 32,573 in 2000-01. While emergency permits decreased, teacher supply increased. The supply of credentialed teachers in California increased by 8% in 2001, from 22,122 to 23,926. Meanwhile, Senator Scott's 1998 "reciprocity" legislation (AB 1620) and his 2000 equivalence measure (SB 877), both sponsored by the Commission, had paved the way for teachers from other states to move to California. Twenty percent of California's

newly credentialed teachers – 4,724 – came from other states. The Scott measures were intended to remove unnecessary barriers and recognize comparable state credential standards and equivalent teacher experience.

Again in spring of 2002, the number of credentials granted increased and the number of emergency permits declined. In what Commission officials hoped would mark the beginning of a trend in increasing teacher supply, the number of credential waivers decreased by 17% and the number of emergency permits decreased by 5%. Meanwhile, data from fiscal years 1997-98 to 2000-01 showed that the career ladder programs put in place under Governor Wilson and expanded under Governor Davis were working. The example, the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program increased in number from 580 in 1998-99 to 2,268 in 2000-01, with major funding provided by the Davis administration. Teaching Internship programs were showing growth. More people were considering a teaching career.

BTSA Contributes to Teacher Retention

Retention of BTSA Induction participants in teaching can be largely attributed to the effectiveness of the BTSA Induction model. California was one of only sixteen states providing mentoring, and it was becoming clear that the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program was impacting teacher retention. Throughout the 1990's educators contended that about 50% of beginning teachers left the profession within three years. However, a detailed 2002 study undertaken by the Commission and the California Employment Development Department (EDD) revealed quite the contrary--that California schools retain their teachers at a significantly higher rate than the national average. After four years, 84% of California teachers remained in the classroom as compared to 67% of U.S. teachers. The study findings were based on a data comparison between the Commission and the Employment Development Department, which matched teachers' credential information with wage employment data over a four-year period. An analysis of the data showed that California surpassed the national average in teacher retention (employed in public education) by 17%. Of the 14,643 individuals earning new California teaching credentials during 1995-96, over 13,000 became employed in the California public school system in their first year. Of these first year teachers, 94% were still employed in public education

after their first year on the job, compared to 89% nationally. The data showed that 84% of the 1995-96 new teachers were still active in education after four years, compared to 67% nationally.

BTSA-Induction Retention Data 1998-2002

	One Year*	Two Years	Three Years	Four Years	Five Years
1998	95.6%	90.3%	86.0%	82.8%	83.6%
1999	91.9%	93.6%	85.2%	85.0%	
2000	87.5%	89.0%	88.3%		
2001	91.1%	91.4%			
2002	90.3%				

*Years of teaching

Another apparent outcome of BTSA was improved teaching. In 1998 twenty-one of the thirty local evaluation reports included data about the quality of teaching by BTSA teachers and BTSA graduates, based upon results from the state formative assessment. Several of these reports were based on general performance assessments of BTSA teachers and graduates. Others were based on more focused analyses of particular skill areas such as classroom management and student discipline. Some of the local evaluation reports compared BTSA teachers/graduates with other new teachers who were not (or had not been) in BTSA. All of the 21 reports showed greater-than-expected performance or skill levels on the part of the BTSA teachers/graduates. These findings coincided with the results of the California New Teacher Project Evaluation study, in which an external contractor showed that pilot study participants used effective teaching methods significantly more often than new teachers who were not in the pilot study did.

Major Teacher Preparation Reform

SB 2042 Alpert, Mazzoni (Chapter 48, Statutes 1998)

From 1994-1997, the Commission sponsored a comprehensive review of the requirements for earning and renewing multiple and single subject teaching credentials, pursuant to SB 1422 (Bergeson, Chap. 1245, Stats, 1992). The SB 1422 Advisory Panel appointed by the Commission examined all facets of the then-current credentialing system and developed a series of recommendations aimed at improving the recruitment, preparation, induction and ongoing development of teachers (the Learning to Teach Continuum).. The Commission received the SB 1422 Advisory Panel report in August 1997. Many of these recommendations were included in the omnibus legislation SB 2042 (Alpert, Mazzoni, Chap. 548, Stats. 1998) that was signed into law in September 1998.

SB 2042 provided a new architecture for California's credentialing system that included:

- New program standards to govern all aspects of teacher development, including subject matter knowledge, professional preparation, and induction that was aligned with the State-adopted academic content standards for students in California's schools;
- Developing new program standards for the preliminary credential that gave additional emphasis to collaboration between the preparation program and school districts and that included preparation for all teachers to instruct English learners in mainstream classrooms;
- Embedding a standards-based teaching performance assessment in teacher preparation programs leading to a preliminary teaching credential; and
- Providing an induction program for every beginning teacher in California as a requirement for the professional clear teaching credential.

In January 1998, the Commission adopted a plan to develop and implement new *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs*. A new Advisory Panel for the

Development of Teacher Preparation Standards began in the fall of 1998 to implement the Commission-adopted plan. In June 1998, the Commission adopted a set of Assessment Policy Principles to guide the development of the Commission's teaching performance assessment. The Advisory Panel met the first time on September 24-25, 1998. Consistent with the plan adopted by the Commission, the Advisory Panel worked for two years to develop or oversee the development of the inter-related products for Commission consideration and possible adoption. These are described in the following statements:

1. The development of a comprehensive set of program standards to govern all types of teacher preparation programs for preliminary teaching credentials, including post-baccalaureate preparation programs, internship programs, and undergraduate blended programs. In addition to professional preparation standards, the Advisory Panel oversaw the review and revision of the Elementary Subject Matter Standards.
2. Assessment Quality Standards that would guide the development of teaching performance assessments that are developed by professional preparation programs in response to SB 2042.
3. Teaching performance expectations and a teaching performance assessment that are valid and legally defensible. SB 2042 required that a teaching performance assessment be included in each professional preparation program leading to preliminary multiple and/or single subject teaching credentials. Also, the Advisory Panel had a prominent role in advising the Commission about the teaching performance expectations that describe (a) the domains of pedagogical knowledge, skills, and abilities eligible for assessment in teaching performance assessments and (b) the levels of proficiency in those domains expected of preliminary teaching credential candidates.
4. New standards for induction programs leading to professional clear teaching credentials. These standards were developed in collaboration with the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Inter-agency Task Force for adoption by the Commission, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the California Board of Education.

The Commission's budget for 1998-99 included $1.35 million for the development of its teaching performance assessment. When approved by the Commission, the plan would (a) allow staff to initiate the development process as soon as possible, (b) result in valid and legally defensible teaching performance expectations, and (c) allow the Commission to learn of any extant assessments that could be used, in whole or in part, in the Commission's assessment. The plan included three separate but inter-related efforts that must be undertaken prior to developing the actual teaching performance assessment. The products of each of these efforts would be used by the Advisory Panel to ensure alignment between the *program* quality standards, the *assessment* quality standards, and the Commission-developed assessment.

The Commission authorized an extensive field review of the draft credential program standards to begin in January 2001, and in July a summary and analysis of field review findings were presented to the Commission. During July and August 2001, the standards were amended, based on field review findings and direction from the Commission and finalized for presentation to the Commission in September 2001. The Commission adopted the amended *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs* along with the *Standards for Elementary Subject Matter Programs* at the September 2001 meeting. The *Professional Induction Program Standards* were adopted in October 2001 and the *Assessment Quality Standards* in September 2001.

In order to assist the field in implementing the SB 2042 Program Standards, the Induction Standards and the Teaching Performance Assessment within the time frame specified by law, Commission staff planned a series of statewide Technical Assistance Workshops. Program sponsors were engaged in extensive program planning and modification to implement the new structure. In 2003, the Commission took action to delay the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment requirement due to budget constraints faced by colleges and universities. However, over 40 programs volunteered to pilot test the assessment at their own expense.

Review of the Administrative Services Credential

For over a year, from 2000 through 2001, the Commission reviewed the issues and options related to the preparation and licensure of California school administrators. The Commission convened a task force on administrator preparation that studied both state and national preparation standards. Forums were sponsored across the state and public testimony was taken at numerous Commission meetings. Representatives of administrator preparation programs, administrators, teachers, and school districts, county offices of education and professional organizations offered their comments and suggestions.

The task force produced a series of recommendations that some believed relied too much on the "status quo." Administrators had significant criticisms of "Tier 2," which they reported to be time-consuming, expensive, burdensome and redundant of preliminary administrator credential preparation. The forums and public testimony showed a distinct split between representatives of K-12 and those of higher education. Seven key themes emerged from the forums and public testimony:

- The level and intensity of field experience at the preliminary level does not present an adequate picture of the responsibilities of an administrator.
- The professional credential level structure and content should be drastically redesigned or eliminated.
- Alternative delivery systems should be developed to facilitate the recruitment and training of administrators.
- A structure should be developed to give all new administrators the benefit of support, mentoring and assistance during the early years of employment as an administrator.
- Collaboration between institutions of post-secondary education and employing school districts should be improved.
- Programs should provide a better blend between theory and practice.
- The complexity of the job of the administrator, the demands of the responsibilities and the level of compensation perceived as reasons individuals do not choose to seek administrator positions.

Following the extensive review of the administrative credential the Commission introduced legislation that would modify the statutory mandates on administrator training enacted in the 1990's. Once again, Senator Jack Scott carried a Commission-sponsored measure. Senate Bill 1655 created expedited routes to both the preliminary and professional clear administrative services credentials that included an examination-based option for completing the preliminary credential. The bill also created new options for the professional administrative credential. The essence of SB 1655 was to move from "seat-time" to demonstrated competency under a standards-based system, allowing potential administrators to meet standards at a pace consistent with their knowledge, experience and training. The Commission-sponsored measure completed the Legislative process and was signed by Governor Davis in 2002. A design team was appointed to develop revised standards and guidelines for Commission consideration. These were adopted by the Commission in 2003.

Inter-state Credential Comparability

The Commission developed a partnership for reform with Assemblyman Jack Scott. The relationship with Assemblyman Scott began in 1997 and continued through his ensuing years in the Senate. Spurred on by concerns expressed by his daughter, an out-of-state prepared teacher, Scott carried legislation to attract and retain much-needed teachers from other states to California schools. Thus, AB 1620 (Scott, 1998) required the Commission determine whether credential "reciprocity" could be established with other states.

AB 1620 required the Commission to review teacher preparation programs and standards in other states and establish reciprocity with states that had comparable standards and requirements, if possible. However, the study required by the Scott bill showed that in the nationwide push for high standards following publication of *A Nation at Risk*, numerous other states upgraded their teacher preparation requirements. When the work required by the Scott bill was completed, over 37 states were shown to have teacher preparation requirements that were comparable to California's. In a welcome move for teachers credentialed and experienced in other states, Scott's urgency measure

also exempted from specified California requirements teachers prepared in other states that successfully completed at least three years of full-time classroom experience, as demonstrated by written performance reviews.
In 2000, Scott authored AB 877 that called for a contractor to review and analyze the subject matter requirements for the other states regarding the preparation of multiple subject and single subject teachers. The contract also called for a review of credential emphasis or equivalent programs in other states pursuant to AB 877 and included the development of a database of out-of-state teacher credential requirements. One of the additional purposes of AB 877 was to study those areas that were lacking in comparability in the initial comparability studies conducted pursuant to AB 1620 and to further streamline and facilitate the entry of qualified out-of-state teachers into the teaching profession in California.

AB 877 built on the reviews conducted under AB 1620, and allowed the Commission to decouple the previous reviews of comparability to provide greater flexibility in the credentialing process for out-of-state teachers. In November 2000, the Commission approved further findings from the Reciprocity Task Force related to reading instruction, and the professional clear credential requirements in health education, computer education, and special education. In addition, the Commission approved additional findings of subject matter comparability in other states in January 2001. AB 877 (Scott, 2000) streamlined the credentialing system by requiring that all out-of-state prepared teachers receive a five-year preliminary teaching credential.

AB 877 allowed the Commission to eliminate redundant California credential requirements if an individual had completed equivalent work out-of-state. Under the previous and new systems, all out-of-state teachers must submit fingerprint cards and meet the California requirements for teacher fitness.

Note–much of the work of AB 1620 and AB 877 was superseded by SB 1209 that was passed in 2006 and effective in 2007 (see next chapter).

Chapter 10
The Survival and Revitalization of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (2004-2010)

Philip A. Fitch & Lawrence W. Birch

Accreditation Reform

Prior to the Ryan Act of 1970, state oversight of educator licensing resided with the Bureau of Teacher Certification in the California Department of Education (CDE). Licensure requirements were defined through coursework and field experience expectations. Candidates submitted applications and transcripts to the Bureau for review and determination of eligibility for the credential. They were awarded a license if all established requirements were met. The Bureau conducted site visits to colleges and universities with two to three member teams of postsecondary educators to determine whether or not the institution should be recognized as eligible to offer educator preparation. During the late 1960s the concept of approved programs was introduced whereby institutions would be approved to offer specific preparation programs.

In 1970, the Ryan Act created the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensure (CTPL), later to be renamed the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC), and shifted the licensure of educators and the monitoring of teacher preparation programs to this new entity. The approved programs concept was refined over time and fully implemented by the Commission. Since the beginning of the Commission in 1970, the process of program review or accreditation has been an ever changing, dynamic and effective process. Over the years, many individuals, groups or entities have advocated major changes for the existing process of that time and the Commission was responsive to the criticism. The Commission moved from a discrepancy model in the early and mid 1970s, to the use of detailed guidelines and an extensive focus on quantitative data in the late 1970s and early 1980s, to the development of qualitative standards requiring professional judgments by educators in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The program evaluation system remained in place until the mid-1990s when the results of an extensive teacher preparation and accountability reform effort came to fruition. Senate Bill 148 by Senator

Marian Bergeson had been enacted in 1988 which led to the Commission adoption of an *Accreditation Framework* in May 1993, thus taking the first step in replacing its individual program approval system with a unit wide professional accreditation system. With this action, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) was charged with the implementation of the accreditation system based on the policies that were adopted by the Commission. One of the provisions of the *Framework* was for an external evaluation of the accreditation system. The Commission contracted with the American Institute for Research (AIR) to conduct this independent evaluation of the Commission's accreditation process and the implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*.

In the meantime, the Commission took action in December 2002 to suspend required accreditation site visits (with the exception of institutions scheduled for NCATE visits) while institutions were devoting significant resources to the implementation of the SB 2042 teaching credential reforms and while the evaluation of the accreditation system was taking place. In 2003, the AIR submitted a final report on its three-year independent evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*, thereby, launching the Commission's review of its accreditation system. In general, AIR concluded that the COA process for review of education preparation programs:

> *Effectively serves the goals and objectives of accreditation as identified by the process and procedures in the Accreditation Framework and Handbook. Even though the process of preparing for accreditation is long and arduous, it provides IHEs an invaluable opportunity to self-examine their programs and practices and to allow them to identify weaknesses and improve their programs through a self-reflective process. The process allows the accreditation team of peers to make an informed assessment of the educator preparation programs from the self study documentation and on-site review, and to produce a report and recommendations for the COA's consideration.*

Although there were some shortcomings in the Commission's system identified in the AIR report it is important to note that the design of the AIR study had limited usefulness in the revision of the accreditation

system. First, it was limited in that it examined the implementation of the existing structure only. In addition, AIR was not charged to consider alternative policies or procedures to the Commission's *Accreditation Framework*.

The Commission continued the process of reviewing the current accreditation system in January 2004. At that meeting, the Commission directed the Committee on Accreditation to meet with stakeholders to identify options for establishing a process for the review of the Commission's *Accreditation Framework* that would be open, inclusive of key stakeholders and consultative. The COA proposed and the Commission then approved the formation of an Accreditation Study Work Group at its May 2004 meeting.

One other major factor that led to the Commission's current examination of its accreditation policies and procedures was the changing policy context at both the state and national levels. In the 1990s, since the adoption of the *Accreditation Framework*, California, like most states across the nation, was undergoing a significant transformation towards greater accountability in education. Numerous reforms were being enacted requiring increased demonstration of educational effectiveness. Central to these reforms was the adoption of academic content standards for K-12 schools, as well as new teacher preparation and subject matter preparation standards aligned to those standards. In addition, there was a greater focus on the need for establishing valid and reliable measures of effectiveness for policy and programmatic decision-making as well as the increased requirements for public disclosure and notification.

Two reports from external state agencies added some urgency to the Commission's efforts to reform its accreditation system.

In 2004, Governor Schwarzenegger's California Performance Review report included the following recommendation:

> *The Governor, through the Secretary for Education or his or her successor, should direct CTC to resume accreditation visits in FY 2004-05. The Governor should direct the Department of Finance or its successor to authorize CTC, as necessary to charge institutions for the costs of accreditation. The accreditation function plays a critical role in establishing the basis for the issuance of credentials and monitoring the*

> *quality of educator preparation for the state. Suspension of this activity undermines the system in a manner that is serious, making the need for a fiscal remedy critical.*

Additionally, the Bureau of State Audits, in its report on the Commission issued in November 2004, recommended that the Commission resume its continuing accreditation reviews and take steps to complete the evaluation and revision of its accreditation policy promptly.

The Accreditation Study Work Group (Work Group) began working in June 2004 to review and suggest possible revisions to the Commission's accreditation system. The Work Group communicated frequently with the COA during the review process. At the October 2005 Commission meeting, the Work Group and the COA presented a draft of their recommendations for revisions of the accreditation system to the Commission. After an additional stakeholder feedback period, on August 1, 2006, the Commission took action to resume accreditation site visits in 2007-2008, endorsed priorities for the scheduling of accreditation site visits and acted on the first six recommendations of the Work Group and the COA as follows:

1. To revise the *Accreditation Framework* to define the purposes of the accreditation system. The purposes were to ensure accountability; to ensure high quality and effective preparation programs; to ensure adherence to credential standards; and to encourage and support ongoing program improvement.
2. To maintain the current roles and responsibilities of the Commission and the COA as defined in California Education Code Sections 44372 and 44373 (c) but improve the communication between the COA and the Commission.
3. To modify the system so that accreditation becomes an ongoing activity instead of a once every six year event. The ongoing cycle would be focused on accountability, meeting standards, and data-driven decision making. Each institution's prior accreditation report and continuing data reports will be considered in the accreditation system.
4. To adopt an accreditation cycle and activities as follows:

(a) Revise the accreditation cycle from a single site visit once every 6 years to a series of accreditation activities over the course of 7 years;
(b) Revise the cycle from a 3-4 day comprehensive site visit conducted every six years to a system that includes annual data collection by the institution or program sponsor;
(c) Require program sponsors to submit biennial reports to the COA;
(d) Retain and revise the review of documents submitted by all credential programs in the 4th year of the 7 year cycle;
(e) Retain and revise a site visit in the 6th year of the cycle focusing on Common Standards and where needed, Program Standards; and
(f) Use the 7th year in the cycle for required follow up.

5. To revise the system so that it addresses unit accreditation and enhances program review.
6. To establish consistency in the system by including all credential and certificate programs in the accreditation process. The Commission credential areas for which this recommendation applies are Designated Subjects Programs, Guidelines-based Professional Administrative Services Credential Programs, Fifth Year Programs, Induction Programs, and Subject Matter Programs.

At its September and November meetings in 2006, the Commission adopted a number of recommendations that were essential and central to a revised accreditation system that would greatly assist in implementing site visits in 2007-2008. An example of the Commission action was to modify the accreditation system to more clearly report individual program findings.

A revised *Accreditation Framework* (the Commission's document outlining its policies related to accreditation of educator preparation in California) was subsequently developed to reflect the policy changes approved by the Commission. The draft *Accreditation Framework* was presented as an information item to the Commission in June 2007. At that meeting, the Commission directed staff to seek stakeholder comment and return at a future meeting with any proposed changes, for Commission adoption. At the December 5-6, 2007 Commission meeting,

the Commission voted unanimously to approve the revised *Accreditation Framework.*

The revised accreditation system places a large emphasis on on-going data-driven decision making while maintaining the importance of standards that define a quality program. Biennial reporting was developed that would be entirely related to candidate outcomes and program effectiveness data. The implementation of the biennial report has served as a major component in the accreditation decision process. Candidate test scores, retention data, employer and candidate survey data are common types of data reported. Standard program findings are reported for each program an institution offers in addition to the institution, or unit decision. The revised system is based on multiple measures including a site visit and adherence to all program standards.

Changing Political and Leadership Context

In a historic election, Governor Gray Davis was recalled from office in November 2003, one year after his re-election to a second term. Upon his election, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger was faced with a number of decisions as he took office. He called for a California Performance Review. A group of 275 individuals worked for five months to prepare a report released in August 2004 with approximately 1200 recommendations to reform and revitalize California's state government. Although the review called for some changes in the governance structure that might have an effect upon the Commission, none of those particular changes were implemented.

Another aspect of the changing political context is the ongoing appointment of Commissioners by the Governor. Fourteen of the fifteen voting Commissioners are appointed by the Governor. Since the establishment of the office of the Secretary of Education by Governor Pete Wilson, most appointments have been influenced, if not directed, by the Governor-appointed Secretary of Education.

One of Governor Schwarzenegger's early decisions after his election was to appoint Richard Riordan as his Secretary of Education to advise him on educational issues. The following October, there were only seven voting members of the Commission and three of them (who had been appointed by the previous Governor) were to be termed out in November, leaving only four voting members. In October, 2004, action

was taken to postpone the election of Commission officers until additional appointments were made. Thus, the first tangible effect of Governor Schwarzenegger on the Commission was the first wave of new appointments to the Commission in December 2004. The five new Commissioners came with backgrounds or interests in reading and language arts and were strongly interested in subject matter preparation programs and their intersection with state student content standards. In March of 2005, three additional new Commissioners were appointed. This gave a majority of 8 members appointed by Governor Schwarzenegger that were necessary to elect a new chair. The election of chair had been postponed until March, when all of the new members would be seated. At the March meeting, an election was held and Leslie Peterson Schwarze, a school board member from Novato was elected as chair, and Jon Stordahl, a teacher from Mission Viejo was elected as vice chair. This was unprecedented, in that they both were attending their first Commission meeting.

In June 2005, Secretary Riordan resigned and in July, Alan Bersin, who had previously served as a Commissioner and as Chair of the Commission was appointed Secretary of Education by Governor Schwarzenegger. Mr. Bersin had expressed a very strong interest in the ongoing work of the Commission. In October of 2005, the Commission was in a similar position as the previous year, with four existing vacancies on the Commission and four Commissioners with expiring terms, there would not be a quorum of voting members. The Administration requested the Commission to postpone the election of Chair and Vice-Chair until new appointments were made and seated. Chair Schwarze remained as chair during 2006. Over the next few months new appointments were made so that by December 2006, the Commission was at full strength. At the November 30 - December 1, 2006, Commission meeting, Dr. David Pearson, Dean of Education at the University of California, Berkeley, was elected as the new Commission Chair for 2007. He was re-elected for 2008. Caleb Cheung, a teacher representative from the Oakland Unified School District, who had served as vice-chair for the previous two years, was elected to be the Commission Chair for 2009. In December 2009, Dr. Ting Sun, a public representative who is the co-founder and Educational Programs Director at the Natomas Charter School in Sacramento was elected chair.

In another significant leadership change, on June 1, 2006, Sam Swofford, the Commission's Executive Director for the previous ten years, announced his retirement because of his failing health. For two months, Mary Armstrong, Director of Professional Practices (DPP) and Dale Janssen, Director of the Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division (CAW), co-directed the work of the agency. In July 2006, the Commission held a one-day meeting in executive session to interview three candidates for the position of Interim Executive Director. Then at the July 31-August 1 meeting, Commission Chair Leslie Peterson Schwarze announced that Dale Janssen had been selected to serve as the Interim Executive Director.

Dale Janssen had served as the Director of CAW for 5 years. Before moving to that position, Mr. Janssen, who came to the Commission in 1991, had served as Certification Officer, Waiver coordinator, and manager of Certification in the Division and had been entrusted with various leadership roles in CAW. He knew the issues of certification, assignments and waivers "from the ground up" as one of his fellow administrators stated. One of his most significant contributions was his commitment and leadership in addressing the certification backlog – an issue that had caused the very existence of the Commission to be questioned. He was not only a popular and unanimous selection by the Commissioners, his appointment was also applauded by the Commission staff and by Commission constituent groups. Mr. Janssen was known to be an individual who was thoughtful and willing to make changes. He could be pragmatic when the situation called for it and still be professional in his deliberations. He was perhaps best known as knowledgeable, friendly and as a good communicator. At the February 7-8, 2007, Commission meeting, Dr. Pearson announced that the Commission was appointing Dale Janssen Executive Director, effective immediately.

Chair Pearson noted that, Mr. Janssen had served as the Interim Director since August 2006, and during that time, he had performed in an outstanding manner. Some of his accomplishments were:

- Improving communications with members of the Commission, by introducing a unique web page for Commissioners and revamping the way the Commissioners are oriented;
- Improving communications with the Department of Finance on the

Commission's budget and with the legislative staff to mitigate the damage from the Legislative Analyst's Office report on the Commission and working with his own staff to develop a new image for the Commission;

- Meeting with the leadership of stakeholder groups such as the Association of California, School Administrators, California School Boards Association, State Board of Education and Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities as well as with the acting Secretary of Education and Margaret Fortune, Senior Advisor to Governor Schwarzenegger; and
- Making an important effort to reach out to members of the legislature by meetings with many of them and speaking at numerous statewide conferences.

At the time of his appointment as Interim Executive Director in August 2006, Mr. Janssen was faced with a number of challenges. On one hand, the Legislative Analyst Office prepared a report that was highly critical of the Commission and expressed a sentiment that the functions of the Commission should be handled in other ways and questioned the need for the Commission. On the other hand, there was an omnibus bill (SB 1209) going through the Legislature asking the Commission to undertake a number of tasks and expand its responsibilities. There was a significant backlog in the processing of credential applications and questions were being raised about the management of the organization. Mr. Janssen reorganized the administrative structure of the Commission and provided direction and support for staff work on a number of initiatives in the agency, which are detailed later in this chapter. In addition, he initiated the development of a new Strategic Plan.

Development of a New Strategic Plan

At the November-December, 2006 Commission meeting, Dale Janssen, then Interim Executive Director, presented the Commission with a proposal to develop a new Strategic Plan. The Commission's Strategic Plan had been last updated in 2001. Director Janssen pointed out that, a new Strategic Plan would help the current Commission articulate its goals and objectives and proposed that the Commission approve the

development of a new five-year Strategic Plan that would become effective in January 2008.

The Commission developed its first Strategic Plan in 1997 prior to the State mandate that all agencies develop a Strategic Plan. The plan was updated in 2001, involving Commission members, staff and stakeholders in the preparation of the plan. In 2004, although the Bureau of State Audits report recommended that the Commission update its Strategic Plan, the process was delayed due to a change in Governors. December, 2006 was an appropriate time to update the Commission's Strategic Plan given the advent of a new Commission and the fact that a number of years had elapsed since the last plan's inception. The development of a five-year plan was to help the Commission be more proactive in anticipating critical state needs, establish performance measures and to be better prepared to address other critical issues in the coming years. These issues were to include educator supply and demand, educator preparation, and credentialing. The Strategic Plan was to serve as a guide to direct an organization to successfully identify and achieve its goals with measurable results. The Commission's strategic planning effort was to focus on taking control of its future and becoming a proactive rather than a reactive agency. Additionally, it was pointed out that the creation of performance measures with consistent accountabilities would support the work required to meet the Commission's goals.

In developing the Strategic Plan in 2006, the Commission solicited input from all of its stakeholders, Commission staff, and Commissioners. The Strategic Plan was developed based on input from all of these groups. Input was gathered by surveying five separate sources:

- Commission Staff Survey (paper-based and selected interviews)
- Stakeholder Survey (web-based)
- Commissioner Survey (paper-based)
- Northern California Stakeholder Input Session
- Southern California Stakeholder Input Session

The data gathered from the surveys and input sessions was reviewed by a planning team consisting of Commission staff and a Commissioner to identify key strategic business issues. These key issues were presented to the Commission to help formulate the Commission's Vision. Next,

the planning team considered the Commission's Mission, Goals and Objectives and developed a set of updated goals and objectives for the Commission's consideration. As a group, stakeholders had a positive view of the Commission and its work. Stakeholders were uniformly complimentary about the willingness of the CTC and its staff to seek stakeholder input in its planning. The planning team then drafted the Commission's mission, goals and objectives statement and proposed a set of updated goals and objectives for consideration by the Commission. At its June 2007 meeting, the Commission conducted an extended discussion regarding the draft mission and goals statement and took action to modify the language in several areas. The following vision, mission and goals statements were adopted by the Commission at its August, 2007 meeting.

Vision

Ensuring high quality educators for California's diverse students, schools and communities

Mission

The purpose of the Commission is to ensure integrity and high quality in the preparation, conduct and professional growth of the educators who serve California's public schools. Its work shall reflect both statutory mandates that govern the Commission and research on professional practices.

Goals

Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators.

- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation and performance of professional educators and for the accreditation of credential programs.
- Grant credentials, certificates and permits as set out in regulation and statute.
- Evaluate and monitor the moral fitness of credential applicants and holders and take appropriate action.
- Conduct, monitor and evaluate the programs and systems it operates to maintain quality and assure their alignment with each other and with other state systems.

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.
- Provide and report information to the legislature, stakeholders and other state agencies.
- Propose new legislation.
- Collaborate with and advise appropriate agencies.
- Maintain and explore high quality routes for educator preparation

Goal 3: Provide quality customer service.

- Provide services tailored to specifically defined customer needs and groups.
- Provide current and consistent information.
- Provide timely, accurate and responsive processing of credential applications, disciplinary cases and professional program reviews.
- Use technological innovation to improve customer access to information and service.

Goal 4: Enhance working relationship with stakeholders.

- Maintain contacts with and respond respectfully to a diverse customer base.
- Collaborate with stakeholders to develop and implement Commission policies.
- Publicize the Commission's purposes, activities and accomplishments.

Goal 5: Engage in evaluation, assessment and research studies that inform the Commission's work.

- Track current trends and research in educator preparation and certification.
- Utilize measurement studies to facilitate its work.
- Regularly evaluate the effectiveness of Commission programs and policies.
- Engage in, promote and participate in research activities related to the Commission's mission.
- Use data collection and analysis to report on and improve the Commission's work.

Goal 6: Maximize the effectiveness of the agency and its staff through the optimal use of technology, ongoing staff development and maintenance of a positive work environment.

- Use technologies to support both ongoing operations and innovations designed to increase efficiency.
- Communicate effectively to share information and increase productivity.
- Conduct periodic review of the efficiency of the day-to-day operation and financial accountability of the Commission.
- Implement, monitor and report on the outcomes of new program initiatives.
- Offer staff opportunities for training and growth to maximize professional quality, and job satisfaction.

Action Plans

Staff was then engaged in the preparation of division-based action plans, meeting both within and across divisions. Division directors met as a group several times to review and modify work in progress, as did managers. As a result, they decided to base their action plans on a fiscal year format, rather than the calendar year. This matched more closely with state expectations and reporting requirements. To make this adjustment, initial one year plans actually covered 18 months, from January 2008 to June 2009. Five year action plans continue through 2013. The completed action plan was presented to the Commission in December 2007. The major priorities for the first 18 months (January 2008 – July 2009) were:

- Implementation of the TPA;
- Implementation of the revised Accreditation System;
- Implementation of the CALTIDES data system;
- Implementation of Phase One of the Paperless Office; and
- Implementation of computerized system that tracks discipline cases.

Legislative Analyst Report, *"Modernizing the Functions of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing"* and the Commission's Response

The Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) is a semi-autonomous state agency that reports directly to the state legislature. The LAO may generate reports or studies on its own initiative or at the request of a member or committee of the legislature. Over the 40 year history of the Commission, there have been at least five major LAO Reports on selected aspects of the work of the Commission but none as far reaching as the April 27, 2006 report. At the time, it was not clear as to the genesis or catalyst for undertaking this particular study but it could have been at the behest of a member of the legislature or a key staff member. Although certain members of the CTC staff were contacted by the author of the report for information, no staff member or member of a constituent group of the Commission was able to review draft or make comments before publication of the report.

In the Executive Summary of the report, the author of the report stated that, "state law establishes the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and entrusts it with three specific teacher quality processes: (1) accrediting teacher preparation programs; (2) credentialing teachers; and (3) monitoring teacher conduct. Following are the major points from the Executive Summary:

Existing State Accreditation and Credentialing Systems Have Significant Shortcomings

During the last several years, concerns have been raised with almost every aspect of CTC's operations, including its ability to perform its core functions effectively and efficiently. In this report, we identify several shortcomings with the state's existing accreditation and credentialing systems. Most importantly, the existing accreditation process is too subjective and input-oriented and occurs too infrequently. In addition, the existing credentialing process is overly complex, inefficient, and riddled with redundancies. Most teachers, for example, have their initial credential application material reviewed three times (by their teacher preparation institution, county office of education (COE), and CTC) and

are initially fingerprinted three times (by CTC, COE, and a school district).

Establish Performance-Based Accreditation System

Given the significant shortcomings with the state's existing accreditation system, we recommend the Legislature establish a new performance-based accreditation system. This new state system would continue to supplement the required regional accreditation process and the optional national accreditation process. Under the new state system, teacher preparation programs in California would report annual summary data on various outcomes, including their average scores on state-required teacher assessments, graduation rates, employment rates, three-year retention rates, and employer satisfaction rates. Programs meeting minimum performance expectations would have their accreditation renewed. Programs not meeting one or more performance expectations would be placed under review and potentially provided support services. If they failed to improve within a few years, accreditation would be revoked. The California Department of Education (CDE) and State Board of Education (SBE) would work collaboratively to define minimum performance expectations, review and maintain data, and provide related support services.

Streamline and Devolve Credentialing Responsibilities

Given the significant shortcomings with the state's existing credentialing system, we recommend the Legislature undertake major credentialing reform. Specifically, we recommend the Legislature simplify the requirements for, and types of, initial teaching credentials and then devolve credentialing responsibility to universities and COEs. We also recommend the Legislature retain county-level fingerprinting activities but eliminate CTC and districts' fingerprinting activities. As a result of these reforms, teachers would have their credential application material reviewed only once rather than three times and would be initially fingerprinted only once rather than three times. While each existing safeguard would be retained, the associated administrative process would be streamlined and CTC would be removed from the process.

Replace Commission With Advisory Committee

In addition to concerns with CTC's accreditation and credentialing systems, many groups have expressed concern with the governance structure of the commission. The existing commission is a statutorily authorized body consisting of 15 voting and 4 nonvoting members. The executive director of the commission is accountable only to the commission and does not report directly to the Governor. Moreover, the commission is not directly related to any of the other state education agencies. This existing governance structure has led to excessive regulation, blurred lines of accountability, and a lack of policy coherence. To overcome these problems, we recommend the Legislature replace the commission with an advisory committee that would make teacher-related recommendations to SBE. This would be the final step required to dissolve the entire existing structure of CTC.

The LAO report served as the impetus for the inclusion of language in the Supplemental Report of the 2006 Budget Act, 2006-2007 Fiscal Year, to require the Assembly Education Committee and the Senate Education Committee to convene a working group to undertake the study of major teacher credential and accreditation reform. By January 1, 2007, the group was required to develop a report with recommendations.

One underlying theme of the LAO report was to, "greatly simplify the existing system and reduce redundancies." In the conclusion of the report, the author stated that, "taken together, the reforms would eliminate the role of CTC. They also would greatly simplify the existing system, reduce redundancies and strengthen accountability." However, the question was not answered as to what extent complex statewide policy issues related to teacher preparation, credentialing, accreditation, teacher assessment or disciplinary reviews and actions and other professional issues could or should be simplified.

At its September 2006 meeting, the Commission adopted a report entitled *The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: Moving Forward* as a background for its response to the LAO report. In the report, the point was made that the Commission is the oldest of the autonomous state standards boards in the nation and is considered a national leader. At the time there were forty-six states that had some type of professional standards board. Fifteen states had *autonomous* boards; six states had *semi-autonomous* boards; and 25 states had

advisory boards. In a report titled *"What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future,"* the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF) discussed the need for states to establish professional standards boards in every state. The report stated:

Developing coherent standards for teacher education, licensing, professional development and practice requires a governing partnership between the public and the profession that is not vulnerable to constantly changing politics and priorities. Such boards are the conscience of each profession; they develop and enforce ethical codes as well as technical standards of practice. How would a standards board help solve current problems? First, it would bring great expertise to bear on the process of setting teaching standards and would do so in a more focused and steady fashion, as standards must be continually updated and reevaluated in light of growing professional knowledge. Second, it would allow the creation of a more coherent set of standards across teacher education, licensing and ongoing professional development, since they would all be considered by the same process, allowing higher standards that are more connected to the professional knowledge base to be set and maintained. States with standards boards have shown that they enact and maintain more rigorous, professionally current standards than they had been able to do before the standards board was in place.

The Commission's report indicated that as an autonomous state standards board, the Commission is statutorily responsible for the design, development and implementation of standards that govern educator preparation for the public schools of California, for the licensing and credentialing of professional educators in California, for the enforcement of professional practices of educators and for the review and discipline of applicants and credential holders in the State of California. The Commission works to ensure that those who educate the children of California are academically and professionally prepared. The Commission carries out its statutory mandates by:

- Conducting regulatory and certification activities;
- Developing preparation and performance standards in alignment with state-adopted academic content standards;
- Proposing policies in credential-related areas;
- Conducting research and program evaluation;

- Monitoring fitness-related conduct and imposing credential discipline; and
- Communicating its efforts and activities to the public.

The Commission's report then discussed the major issues raised by the LAO report. The redesigned accreditation system already incorporated changes that addressed concerns of the LAO report, although not in exactly the way recommended by the report. Many of the issues defined about the complexity of the credentialing system were a result of statutory direction. The Commission was taking strong action to eliminate the processing backlog and to utilize technological tools to move to a processing system that was largely online. The changes recommended in fingerprinting would compromise student safety and jeopardize teacher due process.

The Commission closed its report as follows:

As the Commission moves forward it will continue to reflect on its current practices and seek to make thoughtful, effective changes when needed. The Commission is currently in the process of reviewing its strategic plan. This process will include reviewing and discussing the following:

- Developing a five-year strategic plan;
- Resolving budget and staffing issues;
- Refining world class professional preparation standards;
- Continuing to look for efficiencies and best practices across the agency; and
- Fully utilizing technology throughout the agency.

Further, as the Commission considers its strategic plan and best business practices, it will continue to maintain its focus on the safety of California's public school children by ensuring that applicants and educators licensed in California have passed stringent fitness reviews. The Commission remains committed to making any changes and any improvements that will help the Commission move forward in assuring that those who educate the children of this state are academically and professionally prepared to help all students achieve.

The legislative working group completed its task in early 2007. No changes in legislation were proposed as a result of its review.

SB 1209 (Scott) The Omnibus Bill

On September 28, 2006, the Governor signed SB 1209 (Chapter 517, Statutes of 2006), an omnibus education bill, with impact on thirty different provisions of the Education Code. The bill took effect January 1, 2007, but many of the activities directed by the legislation were not effective until later in 2007 or 2008.

SB 1209 implemented recommendations from The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning report *The Status of the Teaching Profession 2005*. The report's researchers found that while California reduced the numbers of under-prepared teachers by half, under-prepared teachers were assigned more often to lower performing schools with high percentages of poor and minority students. The researchers also found that California will need to replace at least 100,000 teachers over the next ten years. The Center believed that this uneven distribution of under-prepared teachers to certain groups of students raises serious questions about the equity and fairness of the state's effort to resolve its teacher shortage. The Center recommended three broad strategies for action:

- Ensure that all teachers who enter the classroom have a thorough knowledge of the subject matter assigned and possess the pedagogical skill required to teach all children.
- Ensure that all students have equitable access to teachers who are fully prepared, experienced and appropriately assigned.
- Ensure that policy makers have a data system that allows adequate monitoring of state efforts to provide equitable access to fully prepared and experienced teachers.

SB 1209 addressed the following areas specific to programs and operations of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing:

- Professional growth requirements for the renewal of professional clear credential–Instead of teachers having mandatory professional growth requirements for credential renewal, school districts are directed to encourage teachers to participate in professional growth activities that align with the descriptions of professional growth requirements in the Education Code. This directive pertained to all teaching and service credentials, including designated subjects credentials.

- Requirements for out-of-state and out-of-country prepared teachers –SB 1209 changed the options available to out-of-state prepared teachers by directing the Commission to issue a five-year preliminary multiple subject, single subject and education specialist credential to a teacher with the following requirements:

  Holds a teaching credential in a state other than California.

  Passes California requirements for fingerprint and character and identification clearance.

  Meets the Basic Skills requirement.

  There were also additional options for out-of-state teachers to meet the requirements for the clear credential.
- Teacher examinations–There were provisions to explore ways to consolidate required examinations and to create alternatives.
- The Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) – SB 1209 required that the TPA be instituted as a statewide requirement for multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs beginning July 1, 2008. The Commission was required to ensure that each TPA model is state-approved, aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and consistently applied to candidates in similar preparation programs.
- Requirements for the education specialist credential – SB 1209 required the Commission to report to the Legislature and the Governor by December 1, 2007 on the current process and requirements for obtaining a specialist credential in special education and recommend modifications to enhance and expedite these procedures.
- Professional clear credential requirements for multiple and single subject credentials (Induction and fifth-year programs) – SB 1209 recast the requirements for professional clear credential programs (Induction and Fifth Year programs) to focus on application of knowledge and skills previously acquired in a preliminary credential. The bill deleted references to “the study of” specific subjects in favor of applied knowledge and skill in the areas of health, mainstreaming, and advanced computer-based technology.
- Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program and funding – SB 1209 required that by December 1, 2007, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Commission report on

the current status of the BTSA program. The report, at a minimum, was to review the articulation of teacher preparation programs and teacher induction programs to eliminate duplicative requirements and address certain areas, as specified. By July 1, 2008, the SPI and the Commission were to review and revise (as necessary) the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs* to ensure that these standards address the application of knowledge and skills previously acquired in a preliminary credential program and to remove any requirements or activities that cause candidates to duplicate the acquisition of knowledge previously obtained through coursework.

- Intern programs and funding – SB 1209 provided additional incentive funding to programs that agreed to add specific enhancements to their intern programs:

  40 clock hours of preparation in addition to the current 120 clock hours of pre-service preparation.

  At least 40 clock hours of annual site support for each intern by a similarly certified support provider at the intern's school.

  Maintain specified ratios and comparative percentages of new and experienced teachers in high priority schools.

The work initiated as a result of SB 1209 became a major focus of the Commission activities over the next few years.

On-Line Credential Processing

The California Code of Regulations, Title 5 required that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing reach an issuance decision for a credential or permit and notify the applicant within 75 working days of the receipt of the application. From mid-December 2004, through late May 2007, the Commission was unable to comply with the mandated 75 working day processing timeline. In 2004-2005, the Certification Division staff was reduced by 9%, yet the workload only dropped 1%. During this time, the number of inventoried applications reached an all time high of 85,000 with an estimated processing time of 210 working days. In February 2005, the Commission completed the final phase of the Teacher Credentialing Service Improvement Project (TCSIP), implementing a web-based, browser-based system with a robust and

comprehensive architecture that allowed the Commission to rapidly develop and implement emerging e-business applications in response to customer (internal and external) needs. However, the transition to the new system coupled with the reduction in staff resulted in a delay in processing paper applications.

Commission staff addressed the massive application inventory by: (a) hiring retired annuitants, in addition to student assistants, and using existing seasoned staff to perform one year of voluntary overtime; and (b) developing and implementing web-based application processes (i.e., online renewal, recommendations of candidates, and certificate of clearance applications and payments), transforming labor-intensive manual evaluation processes into automated processes. To ensure the continuance of and reliance upon these efforts, the Commission took action to make it mandatory that all renewal applications be submitted online as of January 1, 2007.

In February 2007, Executive Director Janssen reported on the progress of online renewals since the Commission's action to require online renewal beginning in January 2007. During January 2006 approximately 6,000 applications were renewed online and for January 2007 that number doubled to 12,000. At the June 2007 Commission meeting, Executive Director Janssen discussed the reduction in credential processing time, noting that the Commission was well under the 75 days required by regulations and state law. He added that the credential processing time averaged nearer 50 days and those applications processed via the on-line system were finished in less than 10 days. By mid 2007, 54% of all applications were completed on-line compared with 25% at the same time in 2006. The reduction of time for processing credentials in 2007 served the Commission well in its relations with the legislature and other constituent groups. As a result of this effort, the Commission began to experience the rewards brought about by these initial efforts towards utilizing technological solutions.

Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA)

The concept of assessment of beginning teacher performance and incorporating such a process or system in the credentialing of teachers in California had long been a goal of the Commission. In the early and mid 1970s, the Commission identified a list of teaching behaviors that it was

believed, would ensure beginning teacher competence. It was believed by some that if you could reduce certain teaching activities into specific behaviors and incorporate them in teacher education programs in the state, you could then credential teachers from these approved programs. The Commission's first adopted guidelines listed certain teaching behaviors, such as, teaching behavior guidelines and sub-elements of each guideline. Institutions were to respond to each guideline and the sub-elements of each guideline.

However, the specific teacher behaviors had not been studied or researched by the Commission to determine validity or reliability. In the late 1970s, the Commission and West Ed (Far West Labs) in San Francisco were funded by the federal government to research effective behaviors for beginning teachers. The study was known as the "Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study" (BTES). Under the direction of David Berliner, Charles Fisher and Marjorie Powell, staff at the Far West Labs did identify selected teacher behaviors and activities such as, "Time on Task" and "Engagement Time" that were directly linked to student achievement in math and reading at first, third and fifth elementary grade levels. However, many of the Commission adopted teacher behaviors that were adopted earlier were not studied or researched or did not yield information showing student achievement. The Commission continued to rethink, review and refine the type of beginning teacher behaviors that would be required for teacher education programs during the late 1970s and early 1980s.

In the mid-1980s, after several statewide studies and field tests, in 1987, the Commission adopted new standards for multiple and single subject programs for the state. Also, from 1987 to 1991, the Commission and the California Department of Education (CDE) funded the California New Teacher Project (CNTP) involving 15 pilot projects, over 2000 beginning teachers, several County Offices of Education and 33 school districts. The support and formative assessment system in each program was found to be successful with positive research results presented in a published document, *"Success for Beginning Teachers."* The successes of the CNTP lead to the eventual creation of the *"Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment"* (BTSA) program. In the early-1990s to mid-1990s, BTSA expanded to serve most first and second year teachers in the state. Much of the assessment system was grounded in the *California*

Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). The CSTP had been researched and validated through studies sponsored by the Commission and CDE. The success of the formative and summative assessment procedures and activities in BTSA both informed and complemented Commission efforts to require specific, valid candidate formative assessment in teacher preparation induction programs for new teachers.

However, it was not until Senate Bill 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) that the concept of a summative teaching performance assessment became a reality for all preliminary teaching credential candidates. SB 2042 required all candidates for a preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential to pass an assessment of teaching performance in order to earn a preliminary teaching credential. This assessment of teaching performance was designed to measure the candidate's knowledge, skills and ability with relation to the CSTP. The assessment required candidates to demonstrate through their performance with K-12 students that they had mastered the knowledge, skills and abilities required of a beginning teacher, as exemplified in California's *Teaching Performance Expectations* (TPEs). The 13 TPEs, are based on the CSTP and represent the range of knowledge, skills and abilities expected of a beginning teacher.

When the SB 2042 program standards for the multiple and single subject credentials were adopted by the Commission in 2001, there was a requirement that the program had to include a Teaching Performance Assessment. In 2002, the Commission adopted five Assessment Quality Standards to guide the further development of the TPA and a plan for implementation. All program sponsors of teacher preparation programs were required to implement the TPA requirement beginning in 2003-04. However, in April 2003, the Commission delayed implementation of the five Assessment Quality Standards and the implementation of the TPA in response to requests received from the Secretary of Education and members of the Legislature, due to the state's fiscal crisis at the time. Programs that voluntarily wished to continue using the state model TPA (known as the CalTPA), however, could continue to do so.

In September 2006, the Governor signed new legislation (SB 1209, Chap. 517, Statutes of 2006) that required the statewide implementation of a teaching performance assessment by all professional multiple and single subject teacher preparation programs as of July 1, 2008. At its

meeting of November-December 2006, the Commission took action to reinstate the Assessment Quality Standards for multiple and single subject professional teacher preparation programs and to approve the initial implementation plan for the teaching performance assessment requirement pursuant to SB 1209.

There were several models of an assessment of teaching performance available to teacher preparation programs. The state-developed model was the California TPA (CalTPA). It was developed as a series of performance tasks that measure the candidate's performance on California's TPEs. These tasks are completed during the teacher preparation program**.** The CalTPA was originally developed in conjunction with Educational Testing Service (ETS) and California educators. In addition, a consortium of universities led by Stanford University developed an assessment known as the Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT). Also, one other university has developed a local TPA. Within each TPA model, there are several tasks that candidates must complete satisfactorily to demonstrate mastery of the TPEs. All TPA models have been approved by the Commission and programs must implement an approved TPA model.

Special Education/Education Specialist Credentials

In 2005, the Commission began a discussion of possible changes in special education credential requirements. The current structure and program standards had been in place for approximately eight years and it was time to review them again given changes at both the state and federal level. Further, since the Education Specialist Credential was implemented as a basic credential with its two-level structure in 1997, the Commission also had reformed the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials through SB 2042. The Multiple and Single Subject Credentials were now in a two level credential structure that included a formal induction program to complete the Clear Credential requirements. The second level programs of the Education Specialist and the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials were quite different in design and content. There was also a concern that Education Specialist candidates were not prepared to work with English Learners and that possibly the Education Specialist requirements should be adapted to include the

necessary EL content, in order to qualify the holder for an EL authorization.

At its May 31-June 1, 2006 meeting, the Commission reviewed the key issues and directed the following actions relative to the Special Education credential structure:

1. To require all Education Specialist teacher preparation programs to embed English learner (EL) content in their programs and to respond to the appropriate English learner-related Preliminary and Professional Level teacher preparation standards.
2. To conduct voluntary stakeholder meetings be held to begin the review the structure of the Education Specialist Credential including professional level credential and subject matter preparation issues.
3. To convene a work group of interested stakeholders to determine whether the current structure for special education credentials continues to be most appropriate to meet the needs of California's schools and students. The Special Education Workgroup was to review the information gathered in the field meetings and the data from the staff studies.

In July 2006, the Commission was notified that the Governor's budget included funds to support the Commission's efforts to examine and revise the structure and requirements of the Education Specialist Credential. A total of $200,000 was allocated from Title II funds to support the effort. Further, Senate Bill 1209 (Chapter 517, Statutes of 2006) amended Education Code Section 44265.1, and stated that, "by December 1, 2007, the commission shall report to the Legislature and the Governor on the current existing process and requirements for obtaining a specialist credential in special education and recommend modifications to enhance and expedite these procedures." The workgroup was to provide recommended modifications to the Commission in October, 2007.

The stakeholder meetings held during the summer and fall of 2006 served as a very rich source of information for the use of the Special Education Workgroup that began its work in February 2007. Twenty-five persons were selected for the Workgroup from more than one hundred persons who submitted their applications. In addition five persons were selected to represent professional organizations. Monthly

meetings were scheduled through October, 2007. The Work Group spent the first few meetings in the "information collection phase," including learning the history of Special Education credentials in California, discussing other states' efforts regarding Special Education credentials, and coordinating efforts of other California state level workgroups such as the Blue Ribbon Panel on Autism and the Superintendent of Public Instruction's Autism Advisory Committee. The Work Group also began discussions related to the four themes that emerged from the stakeholders meetings:

- Structure of the Education Specialist Credential
- Transitions and Professional Level Instruction
- Subject Matter Requirements
- Revisions in the Credential Program Curriculum

The Workgroup was assisted by the National Center for Special Education Personnel and Related Service Providers (Personnel Center). Simultaneously, the staff began working with the California Comprehensive Center (CC) to gather information about the federal implications of the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and IDEIA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act), particularly as it related to subject matter and California Special Education credentials. The CC has also played a significant role in the development, dissemination, and data collection of a job analysis survey.

In addition to the ongoing discussions of the Work Group, two public forums were held (one in Southern California and the other in Sacramento) to allow any issues to be brought forward which had not yet been addressed and which might be relevant to the review of the Special Education credentials and to seek reactions to the proposed modifications in the Education Specialist structure and requirements.

The deliberations of the workgroup were guided by a set of goals. The goals were to modify the current special education credential structure to accomplish the following:

- Provide improved services to California's students with disabilities;
- Provide more opportunities to become a special education teacher while reducing redundancies in preparation and streamlining the credential structure;

- Improve the skill levels and retention rates among special education teachers;
- Assist local education agencies in meeting their need for qualified special education personnel.
- Align California requirements with federal requirements.

The Workgroup presented its report and 25 recommendations to the Commission. The report on special education certification was approved in December 2007, to be sent to the Governor and Legislature pursuant to SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006). Some of the key recommendations were:

1. The current Education Specialist Certification and Other Related Services credential structure should be maintained, but the authorization would be expanded to allow the credential to be more flexibly used. Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD) instruction should be provided in all credential areas and the credential authorization should reflect this preparation.
2. There should be multiple entry points into special education teacher preparation programs and options available to facilitate prospective teachers in achieving preparation closely related to career goals.
3. To clear an Education Specialist Credential, a program would combine advanced coursework and supported induction and should be available to all preliminary credential holders. An Individualized Induction Plan would be completed by a site level support provider, program representative and the credential holder. Professional development activities, will be provided by the preparation program and the LEA in partnership, to support the candidate as an effective and reflective practitioner.
4. Added Authorizations should be made available to allow Education Specialist Credential holders to expand their credential authorizations without having to earn a new credential.
5. Opportunities for special education teachers should be available at all stages of adult learning. Teacher preparation programs should be more predisposed to grant equivalent credit for prior experiences where demonstration of skill and performance can be shown.

6. Credential holders would need to hold the appropriate subject matter preparation consistent with NCLB that would be consistent with the type of classroom to which they are assigned.
7. Each Education Specialist shall have opportunities to acquire foundational knowledge about students with disabilities and demonstrate the instructional strategies that will enable students to achieve their potential.
8. Each Education Specialist candidate shall have multiple opportunities for observation, practice and demonstration of the performance expectations for Education Specialist teachers. To earn a preliminary credential, each candidate shall demonstrate the ability to perform each Teaching Performance Expectation for Education Specialist teachers through a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA). (Although the TPA was a recommendation of the Workgroup, the Legislature did not implement the requirement.)
9. The Education Specialist must have the ability to provide universal access within any educational setting. The Education Specialist must understand and be able to assist in implementing multitier intervention services such as "Response to Intervention" (RtI) including working with general education students at the early intervention level.

At the January 31, 2008 Commission meeting, the Commission adopted a plan to implement the recommendations of the Special Education Workgroup. Implementation of a number of the recommendations required revision to the program standards and that activity was among the first steps in implementing the plan, beginning in February 2008. To accomplish that task, the Executive Director appointed a design team (a group formed to do more specialized work in developing new structures, such as developing standards or examinations) to assist in writing the Special Education standards as well as Teaching Performance Expectations. Assisting the design team and the Commission staff were standards subcommittees who provided expertise for each of the specialist and services credential areas. Seven of the recommendations required Title 5 Regulations and staff initiated the process. The implementation of the standards and regulations would

take multiple years, but the expectation was that full implementation would begin by 2011.

Implementation of the SB 2042 Teacher Preparation Standards

In 2007, the Commission received a status report on the implementation of this landmark piece of legislation, an overview of topics needing further attention, and a plan for the further consideration of those topics by the Commission. This gave an opportunity for "mid-course correction" in the implementation process. Over the next two years the Commission consulted with stakeholders and made decisions about the identified issues.

Changes related to Program Standards:

- The Commission reviewed its unit-wide Common Standards and determined that in some areas there was overlap with the Program Standards. Those redundancies were removed.
- The format of the program standards was revised to make it less cumbersome for institutions to respond to them.
- In December 2007, the Commission adopted a 10 year schedule to review all program standards.

Pedagogical Teacher Preparation Program Issues:

- The program standards were modified to include program information related to internship and blended (integrated) teacher preparation programs.
- The Commission determined that there would no longer be emphasis programs contained within the teacher preparation program standards.
- The reading pedagogical content was updated to align the standards with the revised content specifications for the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) and the new state Reading and Language Arts Framework.

Clear Credential Program Issues:

- The Induction Program Standards were reviewed and modified as directed by provisions of SB 1209 that called for a refocusing of content (from acquisition of new knowledge to application of what

one learned in preliminary programs) for Induction Clear Credential programs.

- The Fifth Year of Study program standards were reviewed, renamed as Clear Credential program standards, and made more consistent with the Induction program standards.
- The California Standards for the Teaching Professions (CSTP) were updated, since they were now over ten years old.

Language Related Topics

Updating the CLAD/BCLAD Structure

Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1059 (Statutes of 1999, Chapter 711) California Education Code Section 44259.5, provided that all California Multiple and Single Subject Credential teacher preparation programs were required to satisfy a new standard established by the Commission for the preparation of teachers to serve English learners. These AB 1059 coursework requirements, which resulted in an authorization to teach English learners, were also embedded in SB 2042 teacher preparation programs. As a result of this, the previous CLAD Emphasis programs were phased out since the EL content was now addressed in the Multiple Subjects and Single Subject credential programs.

For credential holders who did not have the new required coursework, or who had not yet earned an equivalent authorization to teach English learners, the CLAD examination route and program route and the BCLAD examination route (at the time, the Education Code did not make allowance for a program route) were still available. The Commission updated the CLAD examination and program routes for experienced teachers who had not earned a prior authorization to teach English learners in English by adopting the new California Teacher of English Learners (CTEL) Examination and program standards. This option became available in 2006.

This was also the appropriate time to review the requirements for a bilingual teaching authorization, since the previous CLAD/BCLAD structure was being modified through SB 2042 credential program preparation requirements and the emphasis option was eliminated from the credential structure. The Commission formed a Bilingual

Certification Advisory Work Group to assist in the process. The work group met four times from October 2005 to March 2006 and developed a report and a number of recommendations for the Commission's consideration. Some of the recommendations were within the Commission's purview to implement and others required a change in the Education Code and/or Title 5 Regulations. The recommendations contained three global themes:

1) Multiple routes: There should be multiple certification routes available to those seeking a bilingual teaching authorization. This is for both those seeking an initial credential and those currently credentialed teachers seeking a bilingual authorization. These multiple routes could include coursework and/or examinations for everyone seeking the authorization. The routes would be aligned with SB 2042 standards and would be based upon a prerequisite English learner authorization. The Knowledge, Skills and Abilities (KSAs) for bilingual teachers need to be updated and this information would drive the development of both the program standards and the examinations.
2) Number of languages: The Commission should maintain the bilingual authorization for the current nine languages and to explore how to add additional languages into the BCLAD system.
3) Newer models of instruction: The bilingual authorization should continue to authorize a teacher to teach in subjects and classroom settings for which they are authorized and in any bilingual setting currently available in California's K-12 public schools. The revalidation of the KSAs should reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for all bilingual instructional settings, including two-way immersion program models.

The Commission received the report and directed staff to develop an implementation plan for updating bilingual certification routes. The implementation plan was presented at the August 2006 meeting and was adopted by the Commission. The Commission then formed a Bilingual Certification Design Team to develop the KSAs to lead to the revised bilingual examination and to work on developing new program standards that could ultimately guide the development of a program route to bilingual certification via approved bilingual teacher preparation

programs, subject to legislation authorizing the program route. Program standards were adopted in January, 2008 and legislation authorizing the program route was passed in 2008, effective on January 1, 2009.

Language Examination Consolidation

During the process of working to increase the number of languages available for bilingual certification, examinations especially for less commonly taught languages other than English and how best to meet the legislative expectations, the opportunity to rethink how the Commission addressed language examinations in general led to consideration of a new option: to look at the possibility of consolidating Commission owned language examinations. Consolidating these two sets of language examinations was considered to be feasible and to have significant merit. since both the foreign language and the bilingual specifications shared much in common in terms of the knowledge, skills and abilities required to teach in another language regardless of the overall purpose of that instruction (i.e., bilingual vs. second/foreign language learning). Simplifying the language examinations structure was seen as a way to streamline the process for foreign language teachers to be able to work within bilingual instructional settings, and for bilingual teachers to be able to work within foreign language instructional settings.

Meetings with stakeholders identified the following advantages of the proposed consolidated examinations and streamlined authorization structure:

1) Candidates would need to take only a single set of language-related examinations.
2) The BCLAD content and the BCLAD examination route would not only continue to be maintained through the CSET structure, but would be expanded and updated to reflect the current status of the field as well as to include additional languages. The cost to the candidate for these low-participant examinations would continue to be as reasonable as possible.
3) Having a single combined set of language-related examinations would be a more efficient use of limited Commission resources.
4) There could be a potential reduction in costs for candidates who wanted both authorizations (bilingual and Foreign Language).

5) There would be reduced barriers for candidates, and increased linkages, between the bilingual and the foreign language authorizations.
6) Credential candidates would have increased options for meeting credential requirements.
7) There would be an acknowledgment that there is a common interest, and some shared content and approaches, across all spectrums of the language community who use a language other than English for instructional purposes, despite differences in the ultimate purpose and focus of that language instruction.

The Commission voted unanimously to approve the streamlining plan whereby the BCLAD examinations would: (a) be moved to the CSET examinations; (b) be updated to reflect progress in the field; (c) be revalidated. The work was done in parallel with the work of the Bilingual Certification Design Team to update and redesign, as needed, the routes to bilingual certification.

At its April 2008 meeting, the Commission approved a plan for subject matter competency assessment for less commonly taught languages other than English (LOTE). The plan involved languages for which the Commission did not have a California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET) examination and for which there were no single subject matter preparation programs available. In presenting an agenda item, staff pointed out that with the consolidation, the Commission at that time offered seventeen different CSET: LOTE subject matter competency examinations:

- American Sign Language
- Arabic
- Armenian
- Cantonese
- Farsi
- Filipino
- French
- German
- Hmong
- Japanese
- Khmer
- Korean
- Mandarin
- Punjabi
- Russian
- Spanish
- Vietnamese

Alternative Assessment of Language Competency

Although the above list is extensive, this set of language-related subject matter examinations as a whole did not cover the full range of languages taught in California public schools. Prospective single subject and/or bilingual teachers in certain other languages (for example, Hindi, Turkish, and Native American languages) did not have a means of establishing their subject matter competency. Without being able to establish subject matter competency, these individuals could not either obtain an initial credential in this area of authorization or, if they already held a valid California credential, or could not add the particular language authorization to that credential. Further, it would not be fiscally feasible for the Commission to develop, validate, and maintain a CSET: LOTE examination for all of these less commonly taught languages. The number of candidates wanting to establish subject matter competency in some of these languages was fewer than ten on an annual statewide basis, and in some years there were no candidates interested in a less commonly taught language.

The Education Code authorized the Commission to establish and implement guidelines for accepting alternative assessments for languages other than English performed by organizations that are expert in the language and culture assessed. However, any alternative assessment process for subject matter competency was required to be of similar rigor and cover similar content specifications for languages other than English as are assessed by the CSET.

An alternative assessment plan was proposed for less commonly taught languages other than Native American languages. It incorporated two types of candidate assessments: a standardized assessment to be developed that was adapted from current CSET: LOTE examination subtests, and an alternative language skills proficiency assessment process that was to be conducted by organizations expert in the target language and culture. Taken as a whole, these two complementary approaches assured that candidates in the less commonly taught languages were assessed with similar rigor and to similar content specifications as all other Single Subject LOTE and/or bilingual authorization candidates who established their subject matter competency via examination or by approved subject matter program completion. The local assessor was required to be a faculty member at a

college or university, or a credentialed K-12 teacher with expertise in the language and culture to be assessed, or have equivalent training, expertise and/or experience, if the assessor were a community member or member of a particular cultural organization. The assessor agency/organization would apply to the Commission for approval (using an on-line application form) to administer the alternative language assessment process, including in its application a description of the qualifications of the specific assessor(s) for each language.

Native American languages presented a special challenge for establishing candidate subject matter competency. The two-component alternative subject matter competency assessment process described above would not necessarily work for these particular languages, given that many of the qualified individuals available to assess candidates' language skills would not necessarily be faculty members or K-12 credentialed teachers but would instead establish their expertise based on local training and/or experience and/or tribal status.

After considering input from the field, staff proposed modified alternative subject matter competency assessment plan for the Native American languages group for adoption by the Commission. Under the modified assessment plan, local K-12 school districts who needed California credentialed teachers or who wanted to employ California credentialed teachers in any of the Native American languages, plus tribes and/or tribal organizations associated with a given Native American language, could apply to be the approved assessor agency for all aspects of candidate subject matter competency (including language skills, literary and cultural skills). The proposed assessor agency would need to provide the Commission in its application with details of its qualifications as an assessor agency, and would need to provide the qualifications of each local assessor, similar to the process previously described for languages other than Native American languages.

Benefits of this Approach:

- Allows for inclusion of an unlimited number of languages;
- Relatively minimal cost to the Commission;
- Is relatively equal to the candidate requirements for languages for which there are CSET examinations or approved subject matter preparation programs available;

- Is responsive to local employer needs as well as geographic constraints faced by areas of the state; and
- Takes advantage of local expertise.

English Learner Authorization Panel

In February 2008, a stakeholder meeting was held to discuss the current credentialing system as it relates to preparation to teach English learners (EL). This discussion led to the development of an agenda item presented to the Commission at its April 2008 meeting during which the Commission directed staff to convene an advisory panel to consider the range of English learner authorizations and make recommendations to the Commission as appropriate to meeting the needs of English learners. Commission direction to staff included asking the panel to look at the possibility of establishing a new single subject credential in the teaching of English as a New Language in addition to looking at English learner authorizations.

The English Learner Authorization Panel made a number of recommendations that the Commission reviewed. The Commission took action on the recommendations in October 2010 and set in motion a policy direction for strengthening credentialing for working with English learners as follows:

1) The Multiple Subject teacher preparation standards should be reviewed to strengthen the preparation with respect to English Language Development (ELD).
2) The Single Subject teacher preparation program standards should be reviewed, updated and revised to reflect the need for single subject teachers to develop the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to successfully use Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) strategies not only in general, but also as these strategies apply to the particular subject area of the credential. In the future, the credential should only authorize SDAIE.
3) The teacher preparation standards and the teacher induction standards relating to the preparation of teachers to teach English learners should be reviewed and updated/revised as necessary to reflect current research and issues in the field, including a specific focus on “academic language” and “academic literacy” in the context of teaching English learners.

4) The preparation standards for the Administrative Services Credential and the Pupil Personnel Standards should be reviewed and updated to assure that the content provided within preparation programs regarding English learners reflects current research and issues in the field, including but not limited to issues of "academic language," "academic literacy," program instructional models for EL students, EL student placement and course scheduling issues, and management of EL instructional programs to facilitate student learning.
5) The use of the terms "Languages Other Than English" (LOTE) and "Foreign Languages," and should be discontinued and instead the term "World Languages" should be used.
6) A new credential authorization in the area of English as a New Language, or English as a World Language, should be developed, and that a panel of experts in the field should be convened to develop subject matter competencies and program standards relating to this credential area.
7) Further study should be given to the possibility of establishing an advanced English Learner authorization in order to provide an instructional and a professional development resource to elementary and especially to secondary teachers, and potentially also to administrators, with respect to teaching English learners in the content areas.

The implementation of the policies described above over the next few years will result in a revised English Learner Authorizations system. This system should be more responsive to the needs of English learners to learn English for both academic and social usage in order to reduce the achievement gap between English learners and their English-primary language peers. The system should also address increased preparation of teachers for applying SDAIE strategies specifically within each of the content areas to improve services provided in English to English learners, especially at the secondary level.

Designated Subjects Credentials

The Designated Subjects Credential requirements and Program Standards were last reviewed in 1993. These credentials include vocational education, adult education, special subjects, and supervision

and coordination credentials. In 2006, the Commission began the review of the Designated Subjects Credentials, first in the area of vocational education and then later in the area of adult education.

Vocational Education/Career Technical Education

The Designated Subjects Vocational Education teaching credential authorized the holder to teach the "designated" vocational subjects named on the credential in grades 12 and below, and in classes organized primarily for adults, in technical, trade or vocational courses which were part of a program of technical, trade or vocational education. The subjects authorized by these credentials were based on five years of experience in the occupation, such as computer programming, rather than being based an academic program of study. In addition the credentials required completion of an approved two-level professional preparation program. The first level met the requirements for a preliminary credential. The second level completed the preparation for the professional clear credential.

In the time since the requirements and standards for Designated Subjects Vocational Education credentials were implemented in 1993, vocational programs had diminished, mostly due to the focus on academic achievement and lack of resources for vocational programs. On November 1, 2006, during a meeting of vocational education experts, Governor Schwarzenegger called attention to the need for all secondary school students to have access to alternatives to college preparation that are relevant and productive and indicated his support for the alternatives. To be able to provide such alternatives, schools would need to be able to offer programs and hire qualified teachers from the occupational fields most in demand. Because those fields shift in demand, it was important for teaching credentials and preparation programs to be updated to reflect the needs of the present day workplace, including both college preparation and career and technical preparation. At the November-December 2006 Commission meeting, the Commission directed staff to begin to review and update credential requirements and program standards for Designated Subjects Vocational Education credentials. An advisory panel was selected to assist in the process. The charge for the panel was to review vocational education credential requirements to determine if they are appropriate to meet the need for teachers in the K-

12 schools and to recommend new or modified requirements where necessary. The guiding criteria for the panel were to recommend changes that would increase teacher supply, streamline credential requirements, and improve the quality of preparation to teach California students. Also, on October 12, 2007, Governor Schwarzenegger signed the Career Technical Education bill, Senate Bill 52 (Chap. 520, Stats. 2007) into law.

At the November-December 2007 Commission meeting, staff presented the recommendations of the Career Technical Education Advisory Panel for changes to the Designated Subjects Career Technical Education credential requirements. The CTE panel's recommendations were also consistent with the provisions of SB 52.

Following were the most significant changes:

1. Changed the name of the credential to the Designated Subjects Career Technical Education (CTE) teaching credential.
2. Required the Commission to establish a list of authorized subjects for the CTE credential that reflects the 15 industry sectors identified in the California career technical education model curriculum standards adopted by State Board of Education.
3. Reduced the length of the term of the Preliminary CTE credential from 5 years to 3 years.
4. Reduced the required number of years of work experience from 5 years to 3 years.
5. Expanded the options for completing the advanced CTE preparation and included a requirement that all candidates complete preparation in CTE foundations and preparation in teaching English learners.
6. Established that the CTE credential should authorize both full- and part-time teaching assignments.
7. Added advanced industry certification to the list of activities that qualify as work experience.

As a result of the panel's recommendations, a proposed set of new credential requirements for both the preliminary and the clear credential were established. The Commission directed staff to proceed with the development of program standards. At the August, 2008 Commission

meeting, the Commission approved the proposed Standards and Quality and Effectiveness for Career Technical Education (CTE) Programs.

Designated Subjects: Adult Education

The Designated Subjects Adult Education credential authorizes an individual to teach the subject(s) named on the credential in courses organized primarily for adults. Adult education credentials are currently divided into those that authorize the individual to teach Academic subjects—those designed to support adults preparing to take and pass the General Equivalency Diploma examination (GED) and develop English language skills—and Non-Academic subjects—such as career technical education courses. The requirements for teaching academic subjects include a bachelor's degree and five years of work experience. The requirements for an Adult Education credential in a Non-Academic subject area includes five years of work experience in the area to be named on the credential and a high school diploma or the equivalent.

Adult education schools and courses are offered through most public schools and receive public funds for their operations. Over one and a half million adults are currently served in adult education programs in California. A large percentage of those adults attending adult education programs are English language learners. Adults with disabilities also rely on these programs for basic living skills and recreational support. In addition, students who exit high schools early without graduating depend on these programs to help them pass the GED, learn job skills, and manage their lives more effectively.

Shortly after the completion of work on the Career Technical Education Panel, an advisory panel was formed in May of 2008 to conduct a review of the Designated Subjects Adult Education credential. The Adult Education Advisory Panel developed recommendations to improve the ability to recruit and train teachers in adult education programs and to reflect the new Career Technical Education (CTE) credential requirements since both types of teachers teach some of the same content to different populations. Some consistency between the two credentials was considered to be essential for program maintenance, especially in geographically remote areas where these programs are important.

The Adult Education Advisory Panel believed that streamlined credential program structures for adult educators, similar to the structure put in place for CTE educators, would better serve both students and teachers. In March of 2009 the advisory panel recommended the following major changes for the preparation of adult education teachers:

1. The professional preparation program was responsible for recommending candidates for a preliminary credential.
2. An early orientation for program candidates would be required.
3. The term of the preliminary adult education credential was reduced from 5 years to 3 years.
4. The required number of years of work experience for non-academic credentials was reduced from 5 years to 3 years.
5. The options for completing the clear credential requirements were expanded
6. Established that the Adult Education credential should authorize both full- and part-time teaching assignments.
7. Updated the Adult Education Credential Subject areas and used the 15 industry sectors for the adult education vocational education options.

The Commission proceeded with the process of seeking necessary statutory and regulatory changes, along with the development of program standards. The revised requirements and standards were adopted on late 2010.

Conclusion

As can be seen through this chapter and the preceding ones, the certification of teachers has been at the center of educational reform efforts over the past 150 years. It is most likely that it will continue this way in the future. There will continue to be concerns that teachers and other professionals are not being prepared properly and that major changes must be made to ensure that the needs of California's students are being met by their teachers. It is likely that there will continue to be fluctuations in the supply and demand of new teachers. Given the cyclical nature of education, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, as an independent professional standards board, will at times be seen as a barrier to providing well qualified teachers, or at other times will be seen

as an important force in the improvement of teacher preparation and licensing of teachers.