

Overview:

The California teaching profession since the adoption of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession in 1997

This document was developed to provide background for the first meeting of the newly formed California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) advisory panel, selected in September 2008 by The Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of Education. Panelists will play a significant role in reviewing the standards and, as needed, recommending revisions to ensure their consistency with current California education policies, current research, and effective teaching practices¹. Panel members are expected to make their recommendations to the Commission and the Department in Spring 2009.

In preparation for the panel's deliberations, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California Department of Education jointly requested that the Regional Educational Laboratory West at WestEd (REL West) prepare a summary of some of the major changes in California's education context and policies that have affected the teaching context and profession since CSTP's 1997 adoption. Specifically, REL West was asked to provide:

1. An overview of three broad education issues that are expected to be relevant to the revision of the CSTP (i.e., new education accountability policies; English learners in the California student population; and the use of classroom technology), and
2. A discussion of influential legislation and policy related directly to the teaching profession, including a summary of all major standards and guidelines for the teaching profession that have been adopted since establishment of the CSTP.

To address this request, REL West researchers reviewed numerous recent policy reports, professional standards documents, as well as certain state and federal data.

The state's evolving education landscape

For teachers, California's education landscape has changed considerably in the last dozen years, starting with the 1996 passage of class-size reduction legislation. While that legislation and other changes have impacted the working conditions for California teachers, other changes have directly influenced the profession itself. Among significant changes was the establishment in 1997 of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), the state's first comprehensive set of professional standards for teachers, adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), approved by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and endorsed by the State Board of Education. For a timetable of such changes over the past 12 years, see figure 1 on page 4.

This report starts by describing three contextual shifts that the CTC and the California Department of Education (CDE) have identified as especially relevant for the advisory panel as it considers revisions to California's existing standards for the teaching profession. Specifically, this first section provides an overview of state and federal student accountability programs that have been established since 1997; the growing number of English learner (EL) students in California schools; and the expanding use of new

¹ Ed Code section 44279.2(a)(7) specifies this process for periodically evaluating the validity of the CSTP

technology for instruction. The second section then describes key changes more directly related to the teaching profession itself.

Key changes in California's teaching context

Standards-based assessment and accountability

The *Public Schools Accountability Act* of 1999 (PSAA) created an education accountability system for California's public schools. Principally, the program led to expanded state content standards and curriculum frameworks across a variety of subjects, including English language arts, mathematics, science, history-social sciences, and career technical education (CTE). The PSAA also generated a system of assessments, as part of California's "Standardized Testing and Reporting" (STAR) program, which is now aligned to the state academic content standards. Notable among these assessments are the California Standards Tests (CSTs) at grades 2–11, which assess student knowledge in core content. In July 2003, the California State Board of Education mandated, as part of the statewide accountability system, that members of the graduating class of 2006 had to pass the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) in order to earn their high school diploma; these students took CAHSEE for the first time as 10th graders in February 2004. Another significant element of statewide accountability is the statewide Academic Performance Index (API), a system built to evaluate the academic performance and growth of schools across multiple academic measures.

Two years after PSAA was enacted, the federal government passed the influential *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), which included its own accountability provisions. Under NCLB, states are required to establish measures of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) toward the goal of all students reaching proficiency in English language arts and mathematics on state assessments by 2014.

In addition to introducing requirements about student assessment, NCLB seeks to address teacher quality, requiring that all teachers of core academic subjects be "highly qualified" by the end of the 2005/06 school year (*No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, Public Law 107-110). Under this federal law, California defines a highly qualified teacher as one who has a bachelor's degree, has demonstrated competence in his or her assigned subject area, and has a credential or is working toward one. Since NCLB's adoption, California has seen a decrease in the number of emergency-permit holders and an increase in the number of interns (Esch et al., 2005).

English learner students

California educates by far the most EL students in the United States (Parrish et al., 2006), with the nearly 1.6 million EL students representing about one quarter of the state's total enrollment of 6.3 million. While the number of EL students in California schools has grown from 1.4 million a decade ago, the proportion of overall K–12 enrollment that EL students represent has remained relatively flat (24.6 percent in 1997/98 compared to 24.7 percent today).² As a group, these students tend to struggle in school. On many measures of student performance in California, even on largely nonverbal tests, EL students trail their non-EL peers (Maxwell-Jolly & Gandara, 2006).

In 1998, California voters passed Proposition 227, which effectively put an end to nearly three decades of bilingual education in the state. Proposition 227 mandated that English learners entering California schools be placed in structured English immersion for a period not normally to exceed one year, then be transferred to mainstream classrooms taught overwhelmingly in English. However, according to the recent multiyear evaluation of Proposition 227, limitations in statewide data "make it impossible to definitively resolve the longstanding debate underlying Proposition 227 as to whether one instructional model is more efficacious for California's ELs than another" (Parrish et al., 2006, p. viii). The factors

² English learner data retrieved August 2008 from the California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS), online at <http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/dataquest.asp>.

identified in the evaluation as most critical to the success of EL students were staff capacity to address the linguistic and academic needs of these students, a schoolwide focus on English language development and standards-based instruction, and systematic, ongoing assessment and careful use of data to guide instruction (Ibid.).

The year after Proposition 227 was passed, the California legislature passed Assembly Bill 1059, which required all teacher preparation programs to satisfy a new standard for preparing teachers to serve EL students (Suckow & Gee, 2006). Required competencies were embedded into the standard teacher credential curriculum in an effort to ensure that every California teacher has some knowledge of teaching EL students (Maxwell-Jolly & Gandara, 2006). Among other EL-related requirements, teacher candidates must “demonstrate knowledge and application of pedagogical theories, principles, and practices for English Language Development leading to comprehensive literacy in English and for the development of academic language, comprehension, and knowledge in the subjects of the core curriculum” (CTC 2007, Program Standard 13, p. 63).

The *No Child Left Behind Act* also focused a federal spotlight on EL students. Specifically, Title III of the law seeks to ensure that these students attain proficiency in English and meet the same challenging academic content and achievement standards as other students. Under NCLB, California must make certain that EL students in districts and schools that receive Title III funds meet annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs), which are related to both Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) objectives and growth on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) (CDE, 2005).

Educational technology

Early proponents of computer technology in education praised its potential for infusing curricula with real-world connections (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000) or for expanding the classroom via new social and information networks (Roschelle et al., 2000). Over the past decade, classroom technology availability and use has expanded in California. The ratio of students per Internet-connected computer fell from about 19 to 1 in 1999 to 6 to 1 in 2004, and the percentage of fourth graders using computers for schoolwork increased from 33 in 1998 to 56 in 2003. During a similar period, the percentage of California teachers who reported using the Internet for instruction grew from 55 to 66.³

Although California generally trails other states in these technology-related areas, the state is taking steps towards setting standards to support the effective use of technology. The state’s teacher preparation program standards (revised in 2007⁴) require candidates to “use appropriately computer-based technology to facilitate the teaching and learning process,” “demonstrate knowledge of current basic computer hardware and software terminology,” and “select and evaluate a wide array of technologies for effective use in relation to the state-adopted academic curriculum” (CTC 2007, Program Standard 9, p. 56).

Key changes in California’s teaching profession

Within California’s teaching profession, significant changes have resulted from a combination of the adoption of various standards, guidelines, and frameworks; fluctuations in the teacher labor market; and the passage of teacher-related legislation. The state is also working toward implementing a new data system for tracking teachers longitudinally, which is expected to help to advance collective knowledge about California teachers. This section provides a description of these changes. (Appendix A provides a

³ Technology data are based on national surveys of schools and state IT officials; data retrieved August 2008 from Editorial Projects in Education (*Education Week*), Education Counts data system, at <http://www.edcounts.org/createtable/step1.php>.

⁴ Although they were revised in 2007, the standards are currently under revision again. Adoption of the newly revised standards is expected to be in early 2009.

more thorough description of the key teaching standards, guidelines, and frameworks adopted since 1997. Appendix B includes descriptions of the teacher-related legislation reviewed for this summary.)

Figure 1 is a timeline of major events and initiatives affecting classroom instruction and the teaching profession in California.

Figure 1. Timeline of key events and initiatives

- 1996 Class Size Reduction program (AB 354) passed
- 1997 California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) adopted
- 1998 Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) adopted
English language arts (ELA) and mathematics content standards adopted
- 1998 Influential omnibus teacher standards legislation (SB 2042) passed
Proposition 227 passed
Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program implemented
Science and History-Social Science content standards adopted
- 1999 California *Public Schools Accountability Act* (PSAA) implemented
Standards-based instructional materials program (AB 2041) passed
Teacher preparation requirement for serving English learner students (AB 1059) passed
English Language Development standards adopted
- 2001 Federal *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) passed
Teacher Preparation Program Standards adopted
Height of California teacher shortage, many new state programs enacted to increase teacher recruitment
Visual and Performing Arts content standards adopted
- 2002 Teacher Induction Program Standards adopted
- 2003 California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) diploma requirement implemented
State budget crisis results in cuts to many teacher programs
- 2004 *Williams v. California* settlement
Certain teacher programs consolidated into block grants (AB 825)
- 2005 Career Technical Education (CTE) and Physical Education content standards adopted
- 2006 Influential omnibus teacher workforce legislation (SB 1209) passed
California Longitudinal Teacher Integrated Data Education System (CALTIDES) legislation passed (SB 1614)
Math and reading professional development program (AB 466) reauthorized by SB 472
- 2007 Revised Teacher Preparation Program Standards adopted
- 2008 Revised Teacher Induction Program Standards adopted

Standards, guidelines, and frameworks

Since the CSTP were adopted, California has developed an integrated set of standards and guidelines for various aspects of the teaching profession. Program standards for both teacher preparation and induction programs now set program requirements for individual programs, guide the preparation and induction of new teachers, and are used to monitor through the Commission's accreditation process. The state's teacher preparation program standards were adopted in 2001 and revised in 2007,⁵ while the induction

⁵ See note 3 about current revision process.

standards were adopted in 2002 and revised in 2008. Adopted after the CSTP, California's Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) are designed to define what preliminary teaching credential candidates should know and be able to do. Together, the Teacher Performance Expectations and the CSTP "create California's articulated continuum of teaching knowledge, skills, and abilities" (CSTP, appendix). The Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA), which is designed to assess candidates on the knowledge, skills, and abilities articulated in the Teacher Performance Expectations, is currently being implemented across teacher preparation programs in the state.

As previously noted, during this same general period the state was also writing and adopting K–12 content standards and corresponding curriculum frameworks. Together, California's curriculum frameworks and content standards serve as cornerstones for both the state accountability system and the state review of instructional materials. As such, they also help guide teachers in what to teach.

Teacher labor market

In July 1996, California embarked on its largest ever education reform: a nearly \$1 billion class-size-reduction effort to improve literacy in the primary grades. The program provided funding for districts to reduce class size in up to three grades, with priority given to first grade, then second grade, and then either third grade or kindergarten. In 1996/97, 18,400 new classes were added in public schools across the state, an increase of 28 percent (Wexler et al., 1999). Almost overnight, fully credentialed elementary teachers were in short supply (Shields et al., 2003). In 2000/01, 14 percent of California's teacher workforce (and one of every two new hires) had not completed their preparation before taking charge of a classroom (Wechsler et al., 2007).

The policy response to this shortage was multifaceted. California invested hundreds of millions of dollars in such recruitment programs as the Teacher Recruitment Incentive Program (TRIP), the California Centers for Teaching Careers (CalTeach), and the Teaching as a Priority (TAP) program (Esch et al., 2005). The percentage of underprepared teachers subsequently dropped from 14 percent in 2000/01 to 5 percent in 2006/07 (Wechsler et al., 2007). Despite this progress, schools in the lowest achievement quartile continue to employ a higher percentage of underprepared teachers than schools in the highest achievement quartile (Wechsler et al., 2007).

As the economy has weakened, so too has funding for teacher recruitment initiatives (Esch et al., 2005). Today many teachers (particularly at the secondary level) are assigned to "out-of-field" classes for which they have minimal or no preparation (Wechsler et al., 2007). However, the 2004 settlement of the *Williams v. California* lawsuit⁶ has led to some increased scrutiny of teacher assignments, especially in low-performing schools. The Williams oversight, coupled with the high-quality teacher provisions of NCLB, has intensified the spotlight on staffing practices and added pressure on districts and schools to hire teachers certified in their subject area and certified to teach EL students (Esch et al., 2005).

Teacher preparation and induction

For the past decade, beginning with the 1998 passage of the omnibus Senate Bill (SB) 2042, policymakers and practitioners have sought to establish a coherent and coordinated teacher development system in California (Wechsler et al., 2007). SB 2042:

- Created a two-tiered teaching credential system;
- Led to new state standards in teacher preparation and induction;
- Aligned teacher preparation standards with the K–12 academic content standards for students and the CSTP; and
- Established multiple routes into the teaching profession (Gee & Suckow, 2007, p. 30).

⁶ In August 2004, the state of California agreed to settle *Williams v. California*, a civil rights case brought by Eliezer Williams. The suit challenged the state to ensure quality learning conditions for all students.

In short, the legislation inspired “the most far-reaching changes in credentialing and teacher preparation in close to 30 years” (Vixie Sandy, 2006, p. 15).

The two-tiered credentialing system established by SB 2042 grants preliminary credentials (or Level I credentials) to candidates who have successfully completed either a traditional fifth year or blended program. Preliminary credential holders can then progress to a clear credential (or Level II credential) after completing a two-year induction program. In 2004, Assembly Bill (AB) 2210 specified that a Commission-approved induction program was the preferred⁷ route to a Level II multiple-subject or single-subject clear credential (CTC, 2004a).

California’s longstanding Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) induction program, co-administered by CDE and the CTC, is the “preferred” pathway to a clear credential.⁸ The program provides formative assessment and individualized mentoring support for newly credentialed teachers. There are currently more than 169 SB 2042-approved BTSA programs across California.⁹

Another major omnibus teacher bill (SB 1209) was passed in 2006. Among other provisions, this key teacher workforce bill:

- Removed the mandatory professional growth requirement that had been in place for renewal of professional clear credentials. As a result, all clear credential holders (except child development permit holders) no longer are required to participate in 150 hours of professional growth for renewal of their credentials every five years.
- Required preparation programs to assess candidates via the TPA beginning in July 2008.
- Established \$6,000 awards for veteran teachers for teaching in low-performing schools and mentoring novice teachers during their internship or induction.
- Required a review of the requirements to become a special education teacher, which has led to establishment of an advisory panel. The panel is currently developing revised program standards for all education specialist teaching credentials.
- Streamlined requirements for teachers prepared outside the state who seek a teaching credential.
- Required a review of BTSA induction programs aimed at identifying duplicative requirements between teacher preparation and induction programs.

Professional development and evaluation

California also responded to the teacher shortage induced by class size reduction by authorizing multiple programs to support and evaluate teachers as they transition into the classroom. As was the case with several of the state’s recruitment initiatives, though, funding for many of these programs weakened over time. Under AB 825 in 2004, several professional development programs were consolidated into the state’s Professional Development Block Grant, while BTSA was incorporated into the Teacher Credentialing Block Grant (Esch et al., 2005).

Key changes to California teacher professional development programs

- The California Subject Matter Projects, which aim to improve teachers’ subject area content knowledge and develop teacher leaders, are now overseen by the University of California and organized around regional councils (via AB 1734). Since 2002/03, the operating budget for these projects has been reduced from \$35 million to \$9.4 million (Esch et al., 2005, p. A-4).

⁷ Unless an eligible employer signs a form stating that induction is not available or the candidate needs to complete certain NCLB requirements.

⁸ BTSA Basics web page, online at http://www.btsa.ca.gov/BTSA_basics.html.

⁹ Data from BTSA Basics web page, online at http://www.btsa.ca.gov/BTSA_basics.html.

- The Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program was established by AB 466 in 2001 and includes training during the school year and summer that is specific to teachers' grade levels and their schools' curricular adoption. Although in the 2003/04 fiscal year the program budget was cut from \$63 million to \$31.7 million (where it remained in 2004/05 and 2005/06), SB 472 (2006) reauthorized the program through July 2012 and added \$25 million in funding for the professional development of teachers of EL students (Guha et al., 2006, p. 45).
- The Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program directed mentor teachers to improve the instructional practices of teachers who receive unsatisfactory evaluation ratings; PAR funds can also be used to finance districts' BTSA programs or other activities that support or train new teachers. Initially funded at \$125 million in 1999 (via AB X1), PAR saw its funding cut to \$87 million in 2002/03 and then to slightly more than \$25 million in the 2003/04 budget. In subsequent years PAR has been funded between \$26 and \$29 million (Esch et al., 2005; Guha et al., 2006).

Teacher data system (CALTIDES)

Currently, data about teachers reside in multiple databases in different agencies and there is no mechanism to integrate these data. This arrangement hampers efficient data collection and maintenance as well as analysis for research. To begin to address these issues, SB 1614 in 2006 called for the development of the California Longitudinal Teacher Integrated Data Education System (CALTIDES). A contractor to design the database is expected to begin work in July 2009 and the system is expected to be operational in 2010/11. Once developed, the hope is that CALTIDES will enable better program evaluation, monitoring, and analysis (Wechsler et al., 2007).

Appendix A: What standards govern the teaching profession in California?

CA Standards	Purpose(s)	Main Categories/Domains	Intended Use(s)
<p>Teacher Preparation Program Standards (TPS) (adopted 2001, revised 2007¹⁰)</p>	<p>The TPS set prerequisites for teacher preparation program accreditation and “guide the pedagogical preparation of new teachers... build on the subject matter competence that all candidates must demonstrate... (and develop) a candidate’s teaching ability in relation to the state-adopted content standards and frameworks, and... instructional planning, classroom management, and classroom instructional skills” (CCTC TPS, p. 4).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Prerequisites 2 Common Standards 3 Program Standards <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A Program Design, Governance, and Qualities (Standards 1–5) B Preparation to Teach Curriculum to All Students in CA Schools (Standards 6–9) C Preparation to Teach All Students in CA Schools (Standards 10–14) D Supervised Fieldwork in the Program (Standards 15–18) E Teaching Performance Assessment (Standards 19–21) 	<p>To earn accreditation in California, all teacher preparation programs must show that they meet the TPS for each program area by providing pertinent information to accreditation teams (CCTC TPS, p. 1). (In addition, all programs must meet the Commission’s Common Standards and Prerequisites). The TPS couple with the teacher induction standards “to reflect the continuum of learning to teach” (CCTC Induction, p. 6).</p>
<p>Teacher Induction Program Standards (adopted 2002)</p>	<p>These standards set prerequisites for program accreditation and “establish the [state’s] expectations... for new teacher induction” (CCTC Induction, p. 6) that lead to a teacher earning the clear credential.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Foundational Standards for All Multiple-Subject and Single-Subject Professional Teacher Induction Programs (Standards 1–9) 2 Implementation Standards for All Multiple-Subject and Single-Subject Professional Teacher Induction Programs <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A Program Design (Standards 10–14) B Teaching Curriculum to All Students in California Schools (Standards 15–16) C Teaching All Students in 	<p>To receive California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Induction Program funds, “participating school districts and county offices of education must develop and implement teacher induction programs that meet (these) standards... (and) only induction programs that meet these standards may recommend candidates for a Professional Teaching Credential” (CCTC Induction, p. 6). “Prospective program sponsors must submit a detailed program proposal... (which) were evaluated on each standard and its elements, and as a whole” (CDE’s BTSA program website)... “through an extensive annual peer program review process and on-going formal,</p>

¹⁰ Although they were revised in 2007, the standards are currently under revision again. Adoption of the newly revised standards is expected to be in early 2009.

CA Standards	Purpose(s)	Main Categories/Domains	Intended Use(s)
		California Schools (Standards 17–20)	summative peer reviews” (BTSA Basics website). These standards couple with teacher preparation standards “to reflect the continuum of learning to teach” (CCTC Induction, p. 6).
Teacher Induction Program Standards (revised 2008)	These standards are the updated program standards for teacher induction as required by SB 1209 (Chap 528, Stats 2006).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Programs Exhibit Effective Design Principles B Programs Provide Opportunities for Participants to Demonstrate Effective Teaching 	As of July 1, 2008, induction programs are revising their programs and documents to address the newly adopted standards.
California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP)	The CSTP “represent a developmental, holistic view of teaching, and are intended to meet the needs of diverse teachers and students in California” (CSTP, p. 1). They “describe best teaching practices at an accomplished level” (p. 4) and “guide teachers as they define and develop their practice” (p. 1). They are “designed to be used by teachers to: prompt reflection about student learning and teaching practice; formulate professional goals to improve teaching practice; and guide, monitor, and assess the progress... toward professional goals and professionally-accepted benchmarks” (p. 2).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning 2 Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning 3 Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning 4 Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students 5 Assessing Student Learning 6 Developing as a Professional Educator 	The CSTP are intended to reflect and shape most aspects of teacher practice in California. They “were used as the framework for the development” of the state’s Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs), and also served as the basis for the California Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) (CSTP, appendix; CCTC TPA, p. 3; Loeb & Miller, p. 37). The CSTP also influence teachers’ preparation (CCTC TPS, p. 73), induction (CCTC Induction), professional development and learning activities (CSTP, p. 2), and formal evaluations (CFTL, p. 48). In addition, the CSTP serve as the basis for the state’s High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) under <i>No Child Left Behind</i> [5 CA ADC §6104(b)].
Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs)	A TPE is “a statement describing an integrated set of knowledge, skills, and abilities that are significantly related to the act of teaching, and defines what preliminary teaching credential candidates in California should know and be able to do” (CSTP, appendix).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students B Assessing Student Learning C Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning D Planning Instruction and Designing 	Preparation programs introduce the TPEs and give teachers “multiple opportunities to become familiar with them” (CCTC TPA, p. 3). By the conclusion of their student teaching, candidates are expected to be proficient at the beginning teacher level on the TPE performance indicators (CCTC TPE, p. 1), and the TPA

CA Standards	Purpose(s)	Main Categories/Domains	Intended Use(s)
	<p>“Within each TPE are a number of performance indicators of teaching practice... (representing) what teachers should know and be able to do as professionals” (CCTC TPE, p. 1).</p>	<p>Learning Experiences for Students E Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning F Developing as a Professional Educator</p>	<p>“measures the domains of the (TPEs) that describe what California teachers need to know and be able to do before being recommended for a Preliminary Credential” (CCTC TPA, p. 3).</p> <p>As a candidate leaves a teacher preparation program, he or she has been assessed on the TPEs and the information will be used in induction to support and extend the knowledge and skills of the teacher through the CSTP. Together the TPEs and the CSTP “create California’s articulated continuum of teaching knowledge, skills, and abilities” (CSTP, appendix).</p>
<p>K–12 Content Standards</p>	<p>Adopted by the State Board of Education beginning in 1997, these standards delineate the specific knowledge and skills students should acquire in each subject.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · English Language Arts (1997) · Mathematics (1997) · History-Social Science (1998) · Science (1998) · Visual & Performing Arts (2001) · Physical Education (2005) · CTE (2005) 	<p>Together with the state’s more detailed state curriculum frameworks (below), the content standards serve as the core of the state’s accountability system and the core of the instructional material evaluation process. As such, they help guide teachers in what to teach.</p>
<p>K–12 Curriculum Frameworks</p>	<p>The objective of the curriculum frameworks is to provide guidance on how to teach each content standard in a given subject. The frameworks elaborate on the state content standards “by specifying the design of instructional materials, curriculum, instruction, and professional development” (CDSMC RLA, p. 2).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Physical Education (1994) · Reading/Language Arts (1998, 2006) · Mathematics (1999, 2006) · Foreign Language (2001) · Health (2002) · Science (2004) · Visual & Performing Arts (2004) · History-Social Science (2005) · Career Technical Education (2007) 	<p>The curriculum frameworks describe the “curriculum and instruction necessary to help students achieve proficiency” on the content standards (CDSMC RLA, p. v). Publishers are required to base their instructional materials on these frameworks.</p>

References

- CFTL: Wechsler, M., Tiffany-Morales, J., Campbell, A., Humphrey, D., Kim, D., Shields, P., & Wang, H. (2007). *The status of the teaching profession 2007*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. Retrieved June 2008, from <http://www.cftl.org/documents/2007/tcf07/TCFReport2007.pdf>
- CSTP: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing & California Department of Education. (July 1997). *California Standards for the Teaching Profession: A description of professional practice for California teachers*. Retrieved June 2008, from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/reports/cstpreport.pdf>
- CTC TPA: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (Revised August 2005). *California Teaching Performance Assessment: Candidate handbook*. Retrieved June 2008, from <http://www.ceis.csupomona.edu/organization/TPA/documents/Candidate%20Handbook.doc>
- CTC TPE: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. *California Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs)*. Retrieved June 2008, from <http://www.ced.csulb.edu/accreditation/standard1/supplement/documents/Teaching%20Performance%20Expectations.pdf>
- CTC TPS: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (September 2001, revised March 2007). *Standards of quality and effectiveness for teacher preparation programs for preliminary multiple and single subject teaching credentials*. Retrieved June 2008, from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/AdoptedPreparationStandards.pdf>
- CTC Induction: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (March 2002). *Standards of quality and effectiveness for professional teacher induction programs*. Retrieved June 2008, from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/Induction-Program-Standards.pdf>
- 5 CA ADC §6104(b): California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 6104. (2004). Retrieved June 2008, from <http://government.westlaw.com/linkedslice/search/default.asp?tempinfo=find&RS=GVT1.0&VR=2.0&SP=CCR-1000>
- CDSMC RLA: California Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission. (2007). *Reading/Language Arts framework for California public schools*. Retrieved August 2008, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ct/cf/allfwks.asp>

Appendix B: Key California teacher legislation (1997–2007)

TEACHER RECRUITMENT			
Legislation	Year	Purpose & Provisions	Status
SB 824	1997	Established the California Center on Teaching Careers (CalTeach) to serve as a “one-stop information, recruitment, and referral service” for prospective teachers. The program maintained a call center, website, and two regional offices, and engaged in outreach and advertising to recruit individuals to the profession (Esch et al., 2005, p. 7).	The bill initially provided \$500,000 for this program (CA Leg. Bill Analysis of SB 824). Funding peaked at \$11 million in 2000/01 and 2001/02, but was suspended in 2003/04. CalTeach’s website was replaced by the TEACH California website, which provides information to prospective teachers (Esch et al., 2005, p. 7).
SB 1666	2000	This bill both established the Teacher Recruitment Incentive Program (TRIP) and funded Teaching as a Priority (TAP) block grants. TRIP funded six regional recruitment centers that provided districts with assistance in recruiting potential new teachers; the focus was on recruiting qualified teachers to low-performing and difficult-to-staff schools with high numbers of emergency permits (Loeb & Miller, 2006, p. 44). The TAP competitive block grants were aimed at attracting and retaining credentialed teachers to low-performing schools; incentives included signing bonuses, improved working conditions, teacher compensation, and housing subsidies (Esch et al., 2005, p. 7).	Funding for TRIP and its regional recruitment centers was eliminated in 2003/04. A few of the centers continue to exist, but they are no longer supported by a specific allocation from the state. TAP funding peaked at \$118.7 million in the program’s first year (2000/01), and the program stopped receiving funding in 2003/04. TAP was incorporated into the Professional Development Block Grant in 2005/06 (Esch et al., 2005, pp. 6–7).
SB 112	2007	Designed to make it easier for districts to hire retirees or people who have taken time out of their teaching career by allowing returning teachers to meet basic skills requirements through passing scores on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE), Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), or the ACT. Returning teachers may also submit previous passing scores on the CBEST to meet basic skills requirements. Further, SB 112 exempts returning credentialed teachers from participating in the state’s teacher induction program (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 4).	Took effect January 1, 2008.

TEACHER PREPARATION & INDUCTION			
Legislation	Year	Purpose & Provisions	Status
AB 1266	1997	This bill substantially expanded the BTSA program, created via SB 1422 in 1992. AB 1266 provided \$3,000 per beginning teacher, to be matched locally with at least \$2,000 from other resources (CA Leg. Bill Analysis of AB 1266).	In the years since AB 1266, the number of BTSA programs has expanded from approximately 32 in 1997 (CA Leg. Bill Analysis) to 169 in 2008 (BTSA website). More recently, AB 825 transferred BTSA into the Teacher Credentialing Block Grant beginning with the 2005/06 school year. It is currently the only program in this block grant and AB 825 prohibits funds from being transferred out for purposes other than induction (Esch et al., 2005, p. 7).
SB 2042	1998	Influential omnibus legislation that called for a) new state standards in teacher development, professional preparation, induction, and continuing growth; b) alignment of all teacher preparation standards with the K–12 academic content standards for students and the CSTP; c) a two-tiered teaching credential; d) creation of a teaching performance assessment (TPA) for teacher preparation; and e) establishment of multiple routes into teaching (Gee & Suckow, 2007, p. 30).	Preparation program standards were adopted in September 2001 and induction standards were adopted in March 2002 (Gee & Suckow, 2007, p. 31). All preparation programs in the state and 169 induction programs have now been approved by the CCTC as aligned with SB 2042 (Gee & Suckow, 2007, p. 54; BTSA website). The TPA wasn't coupled with a budget allocation to fund test administration, making it essentially an inactive requirement (Esch et al., 2004, p. 38), but it became a requirement (via SB 1209) on July 1, 2008 (Gee & Suckow, 2007, p. 57).
AB 1059	1999	Required all teacher preparation programs to satisfy a new CCTC standard for the preparation of teachers to serve EL students (Suckow & Gee, 2006, p. 33). By embedding required competencies into the standard teacher credential curriculum, the aim was to ensure that every California teacher has some knowledge of teaching EL students (Maxwell-Jolly & Gandara, 2006, p. 109).	CCTC authorized a limited study in 2007 to examine the efficacy of this embedded EL training, but the study “did not yield definitive results” and “the question still remains” (CCTC, 2008, p. PSC 2E-2). Recent research has indicated that many of the new teachers who have earned credentials after receiving embedded EL training “were not even aware that they were authorized to teach English learners” (Maxwell-Jolly & Gandara, 2006, p. 110), and at the April 2008 CCTC meeting “most, if not all, participants supported the idea that the standards that govern (state) teacher preparation programs and induction programs need to be reviewed to make sure that the standards (are) up to date and sufficient to prepare teacher candidates and beginning teachers in the area of EL” (CCTC, 2008, p. PSC 2E-3).

SB 57	2001	In lieu of traditional teacher preparation coursework and student teaching, SB 57 allows qualified people to become teachers by successfully completing the Teaching Foundations Examination (TFE) in their field and performance assessment. Credential candidates must still meet other requirements — bachelor’s degree, subject matter competence, etc., and for the multiple subject credential, the RICA (Gee & Suckow, 2007, p. 53).	Now administered by Educational Testing Service (ETS), TFEs are available in the areas of Multiple Subjects, English, Mathematics, Science, and Social Science. The TFE is administered a number of times each year throughout California (see CCTC’s Examinations and TFE FAQ websites).
AB 2210	2004	AB 2210 specified that completion of a CCTC-approved induction program is the official, required route to earn a professional (Level II) multiple-subject or single-subject teaching credential. It only allowed candidates to complete a CCTC-approved “fifth year program” if an induction program was unavailable or if the candidate was taking subject matter coursework to meet NCLB’s “highly qualified” requirements (CCTC, 2004b).	Because AB 2210 contained an urgency clause, it became law immediately upon being chaptered. In October 2004 CCTC drafted new Title 5 regulatory language to comply with the legislation (CCTC, 2004b).
SB 193	2007	Provides funds to CCTC for grants for the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, and increases grants from \$3,000 to \$3,500 per paraprofessional (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 4).	Enacted in October 2007.

TEACHER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT & EVALUATION			
Legislation	Year	Purpose & Provisions	Status
AB 1734	1998	Reauthorized California Subject Matter Projects (CSMPs) with a new organizational structure under the University of California. Now involving regional councils, the CSMPs aim to improve teachers’ subject area content knowledge and develop teacher leaders (Esch et al., 2005, p. A-4).	The CSMPs’ operating budgets were reduced to \$20 million in the 2002/03 budget. Since 2003/04, the budget has remained stable with \$5 million in state funds and an additional \$4.4 million in federal Title II funds (Esch et al., 2005, p. A-4).
AB X1	1999	Established the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) program to pay master teachers to help colleagues overcome unsatisfactory ratings on personnel evaluations; funds can also be used to support districts’ BTSA programs, activities previously funded under the Mentor Teacher Program, or any activities that support or train new teachers.	PAR was initially funded at \$125 million, but state funds were pared to \$87 million in 2002/03 and over \$60 million more was cut from the budget in 2003/04 (Esch et al., 2005, p. A-7). PAR was funded at approximately \$29 million in 2006/07 (Guha et al., 2006, p. 44). Overall, the PAR program’s reach has been described as “quite limited”; although no data are available on the

			number of participating PAR teachers, in case study districts it appears that very few teachers participate because very few receive an unsatisfactory performance review (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 56).
AB 466	2001	Established the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development program (MRDP), which reimburses districts for professional development undertaken by teachers of reading and mathematics. Only State Board-approved providers can provide training; the program includes participation in a summer institute and training during the school year that is specific to teachers' grade levels and their school's curricular adoption (Esch et al., 2005, p. A-5).	MRDP had its budget cut from \$63 million to \$31.7 million in fiscal year 2003/04, and it has remained at this lower funding level (Esch et al., 2005, p. 9). AB 466 was to be repealed on 1/1/07 but SB 472 reauthorized the program to continue until 7/1/12.
SB 472	2006	Reauthorized MRDP program to continue until July 1, 2012; also provided additional resources for professional development for teachers of ELs (Guha et al., 2006, pp. 9–10).	Still in effect.

TEACHER QUALITY & DISTRIBUTION

Legislation	Year	Purpose & Provisions	Status
<i>Williams v. California</i> · SB 6 · SB 550 · AB 1550 · AB 2727 · AB 3001 · AB 831 · SB 512	2004, 2005	The <i>Williams</i> settlement “highlighted the inequitable distribution of instructional resources” to California’s lowest performing schools, in three primary areas: school facilities, textbooks, and teachers (Esch et al., 2005, p. 11). Multiple pieces of legislation were passed to implement the settlement in 2004 (SB 6, SB 550, AB 1550, AB 2727, AB 3001) and then clarify the initial implementation statutes the following year (AB 831, SB 512). With regard to the teacher provisions of the settlement, the legislation defined terms like “misassignment” and “vacancy” in statute and expanded the state’s monitoring of whether teachers hold appropriate credentials or certificates for their assignment (Guha et al., 2006, p. 7).	According to Guha et al. (2006), the monitoring and correction mechanisms initiated by the <i>Williams</i> settlement have resulted in a marked increase in the number of teachers with EL authorization. More veteran teachers appear to be aware of the EL authorization requirement and more seem to be seeking the requisite EL training. In the first two years of settlement implementation, “the percentage of veteran teachers (those with more than 5 years of experience) with EL authorization rose from 48% to 56%” (Guha et al., 2006, p. 8).
SB 1655	2006	Prohibits voluntary teacher transfers unless the principal agrees. (In districts where the collective bargaining agreement is in direct conflict with this legislation, the prohibitions will become operative when the current agreement expires.) SB 1655 basically	According to Wechsler et al. (2007), communication regarding this policy has been unclear; case studies revealed that some principals in low-performing schools knew the law existed but did not believe that they had the right to refuse transfers (pp 3–4).

		allows principals in API deciles 1–3 to refuse a teacher requesting to transfer into their school (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 3).	
CROSS-CUTTING TEACHER ISSUES			
Legislation	Year	Purpose & Provisions	Status
AB 825	2004	To allow districts more flexibility for spending money on teacher quality issues, AB 825 combined 22 different categorical programs into 6 block grants, including, most notably, the Teacher Credentialing Block Grant (for BTSA) and the Professional Development Block Grant (Esch et al., 2004, p. 5).	BTSA is the only program that is part of the Teacher Credentialing Block Grant (funded at \$80.9 million for 2004/05), and AB 825 prohibits funds from being transferred out for purposes other than induction. The Professional Development Block Grant was funded at \$239 million for 2004/05 (Esch et al., 2004, p. 5), \$259 million in 2005/06, and \$264 million in 2006/07 (Guha et al., p. 44).
SB 1209	2006	Omnibus teacher workforce bill calling for: a) Passing scores on the GRE, SAT Reasoning test, or ACT Plus Writing test to be substituted for passing CBEST; b) Preparation programs to begin assessing teacher candidates via the TPA in July 2008; c) Increased per teacher awards (from \$2,500 to \$3,500) for alternative certification programs that agree to distribute interns evenly in their district and maintain low mentor-to-intern ratios (5:1); d) A Certificated Staff Mentoring program (CSMP) that awards veteran teachers \$6,000 for teaching in low-performing schools and mentoring novice teachers during their internship or induction; e) School districts and teachers’ unions to apply for planning grants to develop alternative salary schedules; and f) Personnel Management Assistance Teams (PMATs) throughout the state to act as resources for districts in the hiring process (Wechsler et al., 2007, pp. 2–3).	Many elements of SB 1209 have been implemented across the state. For example, any candidate who begins a teacher preparation program on or after July 1, 2008 must now pass the TPA prior to recommendation for a credential. Also, eligible teachers are taking part in CSMP , agreeing to work in priority schools for five years and work with 1–5 interns and/or beginning teachers per year. And PMATs have been established in six regions of the state and CDE is providing funding and oversight. On the other hand, the GRE, SAT, and ACT alternative options for fulfilling the basic skills requirement are not yet available.
SB 1133	2006	Established Quality Education Investment Act (QEIA), providing \$2.9 billion to K–12 education over a seven-year period for low-performing schools to reduce class size and improve working conditions for teachers. Requires much monitoring, including	Appropriations began in fiscal year 2007/08 at \$268 million and are scheduled to continue through 2013/14 at \$402 million each year (CDE QEIA page). In May 2007, the State Board approved funding for 488 schools under QEIA (see May 2007 CDE memo).

		balancing teacher experience throughout the district and ensuring an average of 40 hours of professional development per teacher per year (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 3).	
--	--	--	--

TEACHER COMPENSATION

Legislation	Year	Purpose & Provisions	Status
AB 1114	1999	Established the Certified Staff Performance Incentive Act authorizing one-time performance bonuses up to \$25,000 per full-time teacher and other certified staff when student performance improved (beyond a minimum growth target at schools with an API rating in the bottom 50th percentile) (Loeb & Miller, 2006, p. 51).	This program was abandoned after just one round of bonuses in 2001 due to implementation and administrative challenges; though still on the books, it has been zero-funded in annual state budgets (Loeb & Miller, 2006).

TEACHER DATA

Legislation	Year	Purpose & Provisions	Status
SB 1614	2006	Established California Longitudinal Teacher Integrated Data Education System (CALTIDES) to integrate data collected by the CCTC, the CDE, and LEAs for the purpose of evaluating programs and automating teacher assignment monitoring requirements under state and federal law. System will also enable more sophisticated analyses of teacher workforce issues, including attrition and school and district teacher turnover rates (Wechsler et al., 2007, p. 3).	According to the most recent update available from CDE, the CALTIDES Request for Proposal (RFP) was submitted to the California Department of General Services (DGS) in early February 2008 and was scheduled for release to the vendor community in April 2008. CALTIDES is expected to be operational in 2010/11.

Appendix C: Bibliography

- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and School Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning*. National Academy Press.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2004a). CCTC coded correspondence 04-0009: Implementation of Assembly Bill 2210. Retrieved August 2008, from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/notices/coded/040009/040009.pdf>.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2004b). CCTC Commission Meeting: September/October 2004, Agenda Item 6B: Proposed Title 5 Regulations to Implement Assembly Bill 2210. Retrieved August 2008, from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2004-09/september-2004-6B.pdf>.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2007). *Standards of quality and effectiveness for teacher preparation programs for preliminary multiple and single subject teaching credentials*. Retrieved June 2008, from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/AdoptedPreparationStandards.pdf>.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2008). CCTC Commission Meeting: April 2008, Agenda Item 2E: Authorization to Teach English Learners. Retrieved August 2008, from <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/commission/agendas/2008-04/2008-04-2E.pdf>.
- California Department of Education. (2005). *Title III FAQs: Accountability requirements*. Retrieved August 2008, from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/sp/el/t3/title3faq.asp>.
- Esch, C., Chang-Ross, C., Guha, R., Tiffany-Morales, J., & Shields, P. (2004). *California's teaching force 2004: Key issues and trends*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Esch, C., Chang-Ross, C., Guha, R., Humphrey, D., Shields, P., Tiffany-Morales, J., Wechsler, M., & Woodworth, K. (2005). *The status of the teaching profession 2005*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Gee, J., & Suckow, M. (2007). *Annual report card on California teacher preparation programs 2005-06*. Sacramento, CA: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- Guha, R., Campbell, A., Humphrey, D., Shields, P., Tiffany-Morales, J., & Wechsler, M. (2006). *California's teaching force 2006: Key issues and trends*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Loeb, S., & Miller, L. (2006). *State teacher policies: What are they, what are their effects, and what are their implications for school finance?* Stanford University School of Education, Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice.
- Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Gandara, P. (2006). Chapter 7: Crucial issues in preparing teachers of English learners. In *Crucial issues in California education 2006*, Policy Analysis for California Education.
- Parrish, T. B., Merickel, A., Perez, M., Linqunti, R., Socias, M., Spain, A., et al. (2006). *Effects of the implementation of Proposition 227 on the education of English learners, K-12: Findings from a five-year evaluation* (Final report for AB 56 and AB 1116, submitted to the California Department of Education). Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.
- Roschelle, J. M., Pea, R. D., Hoadley, C. M., Gordin, D. N., & Means, B. M. (2000). Changing how and what children learn in school with computer-based technologies. *The Future of Children: Children and Computer Technology* 10(2), 76–101.

Appendix C: Bibliography

- Shields, P., Esch, C., Humphrey, D., Wechsler, M., Chang-Ross, C., Gallagher, H., Guha, R., Tiffany-Morales, J., & Woodworth, K. (2003). *The status of the teaching profession 2003*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Suckow, M., & Gee, J. (2006). *Annual report card on California teacher preparation programs for the academic year 2004–2005*. Sacramento, CA: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- Vixie Sandy, M. (2006). Timing is everything: Building state policy on teacher credentialing in an era of multiple, competing, and rapid education reforms. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 15(1), 7–19.
- Wechsler, M., Tiffany-Morales, J., Campbell, A., Humphrey, D., Kim, D., Shields, P., & Wang, H. (2007). *The status of the teaching profession 2007*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Wexler, E., Izu, J., Carlos, L., Fuller, B., Hayward, G., & Kirst, M. (1999). *California's class size reduction: Implications for equity, practice, and implementation*. PACE & WestEd.