
The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: Moving Forward



**CALIFORNIA
COMMISSION
ON TEACHER
CREDENTIALING**

SEPTEMBER 2006

COMMISSION REPORT 06-03

September 2006

This report, like other publications of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution is requested.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 445-7254
(916) 445-7256
(888) 921-2682 (toll free)

This report is available at <http://www.ctc.ca.gov>

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing: Moving Forward

**State of California
Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor**



**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814
<http://www.ctc.ca.gov>**

Dale Janssen, Interim Executive Director



MEMBERS OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

MEMBERS NAME

POSITION

Banker, Catherine	Public Representative
Cheung, Caleb	Teacher
Cordeiro, Paula	Public Representative
Gaston, Margaret	Public Representative
Gomez, Guillermo	Teacher
Grant, Gloria	Teacher
Kenney, John	Teacher
Littman, Leslie	Designee of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
Molina, Aida	Administrator
Pearson, David	Faculty Member
Perry, Lillian	Teacher
Schwarze, Leslie P.	School Board Member
Stordahl, Jon	Teacher
Whitson, Loretta	Non-Administrative Services Credential Holder
Vacant	Public Representative

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

REPRESENTING

McGrath, Marilyn	California Postsecondary Education Commission
Symms Gallagher, Karen	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Waite, Athena	University of California
Young, Beverly	California State University

Preface

In April 2006 the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) released a report entitled *Modernizing the Functions of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing*. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing has provided a response to this report (see Appendix A). The LAO report served as the impetus for the inclusion of language in the Supplemental Report of the 2006 Budget Act, 2006-07 Fiscal Year, to require the Assembly Education Committee and 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 is required to develop a report with recommendations.** The purpose of this document is to provide relevant and useful information to assist the discussions of the working group.

The content of this document is divided into four broad areas that correspond to the four themes in the LAO report. These areas are (1) educator credential governance; (2) educator licensing; (3), educator discipline; and (4) educator program accreditation. In total, these areas comprise the mission and core functions of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Introduction to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, an Independent Standards Board within the Executive Branch of State Government

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) is an agency in the Executive Branch of California State Government that operates as an independent standards board. The powers and duties that are currently within the jurisdiction of the Commission were once administered by the California Department of Education under the State Board of Education. In the late 1960's, Assembly Member Leo Ryan convened an Assembly Interim Committee on Education. The resulting product of this committee was a report, released in January 1967, titled "The Restoration of Teaching." The recommendations in that report led to successful legislation in 1970 to separate teacher licensing from the functions of the California Department of Education. The Commission today is a broadly representative state agency that is responsive to the public need for quality and flexibility in teacher preparation and licensing.

What Is The Importance of Independent Standards Boards for Educator Credential Governance?

The Commission is the oldest of the autonomous state standards boards in the nation and is considered a national leader. According to a December 2004 paper issued by the Education Commission of the States, there are now forty-six states that have some type of professional standards board. Fifteen states have *autonomous* boards; six states have *semi-autonomous* boards; and 25 states have *advisory* boards.¹ 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 that "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."²

The report further states that "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 greater 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 body. Finally, it would create a firewall between the political system and the standard-setting 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."³

¹ Burke, Molly, (2004, December), *Professional Standards Boards – State Policy*, ECS State Notes, Teaching Quality/Professional Standards Boards, Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States

² The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (1996, September). What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, p. 69

³ Ibid, pp.69-70

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
- Communicating its efforts and activities to the public

What is the Membership of the Commission?

The Commission consists of nineteen commissioners, fifteen of whom are voting members and four are ex-officio, non-voting members. The governor appoints fourteen of the voting Commission members and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction or his/her designee serves as the fifteenth voting member. The four ex-officio members are appointed by the major segments of the California higher education constituencies: the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities; the Regents of the University of California; the California Postsecondary Education Commission; and the Trustees of the California State University. The Commission members appointed by the governor include six classroom teachers, one school administrator, one school board member, one non-administrative services credential holder, one faculty member from an institution of higher education, and four public members. Commission members are typically appointed to four-year terms.

How Does the Commission Carry Out Its Responsibilities Related to Educator Licensing?

The Commission is responsible for issuing any and all licenses required by law to serve in an instructional, administrative, service or counseling position in the public schools in California. Education Code §44225 (see Appendix B for full text of the law) requires the Commission to award the following types of credentials to applicants whose preparation and competence satisfy its standards:

- (1) Basic teaching credentials for teaching in kindergarten, or any of grades 1 to 12 inclusive.
- (2) Credentials for teaching adult education classes and vocational education classes.
- (3) Credentials for teaching specialties, including bilingual education, early childhood education, and special education.
- (4) Credentials for school services, such as administrators, school counselors, speech-language therapists, audiologists, school psychologists, library media teachers, supervisors of attendance and school nurses.

The Commission's Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division (CAW) is the division within the agency responsible for the review and issuance of all credentials. Some of the paper applications submitted must go through an evaluation to ensure that the applicant has met all the requirements for the appropriate credential. One of the challenges that CAW has faced over the past eight years is a significant increase in the number of applications received while at the same time the number of staff has been reduced.

The Commission entered into a contract with International Business Machines in June 2001 to develop and implement the Teacher Credential Service Improvement Project (TCSIP). Phase 1 of the TCSIP was launched in October 2001, allowing teachers and administrators to view the status of applications online and provide public access to teachers' credentials online. This feature has proven to be very popular with well over 1,000 hits per day on the web site. Feedback from County Offices of Education and institutions of higher education (IHEs) has been very positive regarding the real-time access to credential holder information.

Phase 2, which was successfully implemented in June 2002, allows credential holders to renew and pay for their credentials online. Currently approximately 5,000 credential holders are renewing their credentials online every month. This has resulted in faster processing time for these documents as well as decreased credential processing workload. The workload efficiency provided by the online renewal has been a critical accomplishment, as it has allowed the Commission to redirect staff to address the workload associated with positions that have been lost as a result of the budget process. While candidates continue to submit paper applications, over half of the applications received by the Commission are now done so electronically. In view of this fact, the Commission took action to require all clear, professional and professional clear credential holders to renew their credentials online effective January 1, 2007. This system allows the credential application to be processed in about 10 days.

How Does the Commission Carry Out Its Responsibilities Related to Educator Discipline?

A primary goal for all regulatory licensing agencies is the monitoring of applicants and licensees in order to protect the public and to preserve the integrity of the profession. Through the Division of Professional Practices (DPP) and the Committee of Credentials (Committee), the Commission investigates and reviews all allegations of misconduct against credential applicants and current teachers to enforce the State's high standards for educator character fitness, and to ensure a safe school environment for California's public school students. The review and investigation of allegations of misconduct is commonly referred to as "professional discipline." All initial applications are reviewed to determine if there are any reports of criminal convictions on the criminal history information supplied by the California Department of Justice and/or the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In addition, all applicants for any credential must complete a Professional Fitness questionnaire as part of the credential application process.

Cases involving credential holders are generated in several ways: (1) by the holder requesting a new/different credential or renewal of a credential which cases are referred from CAW; (2) by subsequent arrest and/or conviction reports; and (3) by the filing of affidavits from complainants and/or by reports from school districts. In each instance, once jurisdictional requirements are

met all applicants and holders subject to review are afforded full due process rights before any action is taken. In addition, the Commission hears Petitions for Reinstatement of previously revoked credential holders and reviews proposed decisions of administrative law judges.

The Commission's disciplinary role includes ensuring that:

- appropriate actions are taken in a timely manner against teachers and applicants whose conduct or behavior violates the standards set forth in statute and regulation
- the school children of California are protected because teachers and applicants who do not meet the standards set forth in statute or regulation are either not allowed in the public school classrooms and/or are promptly removed from the classroom
- complaints against credential applicants and teachers are promptly, fairly and thoroughly investigated
- recommendations by the Committee are based on complete information
- teachers and applicants who have not engaged in misconduct have their cases closed and their names cleared at the earliest opportunity
- appropriate due process protection is provided to holders and applicants

How Does the Commission Carry Out Its Responsibilities Related to Educator Program Accreditation and Administration?

The Commission has important policy making duties in the area of educator preparation as well as critical enforcement responsibilities in the area of program/institutional accreditation. Much of the essential background work for the policy formulation efforts of the Commission falls within the duties of the Professional Services Division (PSD). This particular division within the Commission has broad responsibilities in terms of conducting policy research and policy monitoring duties in the field of educator preparation, as well as operating for the Commission one of the largest educator examination systems in the country, with over 180,000 individual examinations administered each year and overseeing a variety of state-funded teacher development programs. In addition, PSD administers the Commission's accreditation system for all of the colleges, universities, and local program sponsors that prepare educators in the state.

With respect to **educator preparation**, the Commission is required to establish standards for educator preparation programs that prepare candidates for each type of credential. The Professional Services Division is responsible for drafting language for any new or revised standards for the Commission's approval. The Commission recognizes and values the expertise represented by stakeholders in the field and thus has always worked with stakeholder groups to advise the development of any new or revised standards. Two highly representative examples of this collaborative relationship are the most recent changes to the standards governing teacher preparation programs and the standards governing the various subject matter programs, pursuant to SB 2042. In the revising of each of these standards, the Commission brought together advisory panels broadly representative of each of the major stakeholder groups interested in the work of the Commission. These advisory panels assisted in preparing draft language for their respective standards to present to the Commission for approval and implementation.

With respect to **educator examinations**, the Commission, through the Professional Services Division, is responsible for administering examinations of candidate subject matter competency

(e.g., the California Subject Examinations for Teachers, or CSET); of candidate ability to teach reading effectively (e.g., the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment, or RICA); of candidate basic skills (e.g., the California Basic Educational Skills Test, or CBEST); and of candidate ability to effectively instruct English learners (e.g., the Crosscultural Language and Academic Development, or CLAD, and the Bilingual Crosscultural Language and Academic Development, or BCLAD examinations), among others. This large-scale examinations program is administered on a monthly basis year-round.

With respect to **teacher development programs**, the Professional Services Division is also responsible for overseeing the various local assistance teacher development grant programs established by law. These local assistance grant programs are designed to support prospective teachers in completing the requirements for a teaching credential. Taken together, these programs represent a learning-to-teach continuum that has proven to be effective in recruiting, training, and retaining California teachers. A brief overview of each teacher development program follows:

- ***Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program (PTTP)*** — The PTTP is designed to support paraeducators (instructional assistants/aides) through a local education agency-based career ladder program. The paraeducators are expected to complete a bachelor's degree, a teacher preparation program and a teaching credential. Participants receive assistance with college/university tuition, fees, and books, as well as support services to promote success in the program. Participants must be working as paraeducators to participate in the program.
- ***Alternative Certification (Internship) Program*** — The Internship Program allows for completion of teacher preparation program coursework concurrent with a first and/or second-year paid teaching position. The program is designed to provide an alternative route into the teaching profession by providing coursework and an organized system of support from college and district faculty. To be eligible to participate, candidates must fulfill subject matter requirements prior to entering an internship program. Interns who successfully complete the program earn a full teaching credential. The goals set forth for the program by statute include expanding the pool of qualified teachers by attracting into teaching those individuals who might not otherwise enter the classroom, enabling local education agencies to respond immediately to their teacher recruitment needs, and providing effective supervision and intensive support to meet the individual learning needs of new interns.
- ***Troops to Teachers (TTT)*** — TTT is a federally funded program designed to assist separating or retiring members of the Armed Forces, and prior civilian employees of the Department of Defense, as they obtain teacher certification and employment as teachers or teachers' aides. While the program is administered through a county office of education, the Commission collaborates with the county office to help the program meet its goal of helping improve American education by providing mature, self-disciplined, experienced and dedicated personnel for the nation's classrooms. In California, the program also provides advisement regarding credential requirements.

-
- ***Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA)*** — BTSA, which is co-sponsored by the Commission and the California Department of Education, provides opportunities for fully prepared first- and second-year teachers to expand and deepen their teaching knowledge and skills. Current law requires holders of Preliminary Teaching Credentials to complete an induction program, (or a fifth year of study, under very specific circumstances), in order to obtain a Professional Clear Credential. Participants work closely with support providers to determine areas of prior accomplishment and areas where further growth in teaching may be needed. The BTSA Program offers distinct learning opportunities and collegial services that are at a developmentally different level than the offerings of the Intern Program.

The Professional Services Division is also responsible for **program accreditation**. Senate Bill 149 (Chapter 1455, Statutes of 1988) required the Commission to develop and adopt “Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness” as the primary basis for the approval of credential preparation programs. As a significant step toward making education "more professional," Senate Bill 655 (Chapter 426, Statutes of 1988) delegated to professional educators the important responsibility of implementing the Commission's policies, and of enforcing the Commission's preparation standards. These functions are now the responsibilities of the Committee on Accreditation (COA). Under the law and the *Accreditation Framework*, the Commission retains the exclusive authority and responsibility to adopt standards for educator preparation, and to make all other policy decisions that govern the system of professional accreditation in education. Education Code Section §44370, et seq. establishes the COA and defines its duties and responsibilities. The COA is charged with, among other duties, making decisions about the accreditation of educator preparation and making decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs in educator preparation. PSD is responsible for assisting and supporting the Committee on Accreditation in accomplishing its duties. To ensure that accreditation decisions would be made solely on the basis of professional expertise, the law requires that (a) all members of the Committee be appointed by the Commission, and (b) all members serve on the basis of their professional judgment, and not as representatives of the organizations or institutions to which they belong. In establishing the Committee on Accreditation, the Commission did not cede any of its policymaking authority over the preparation of educators or the accreditation of institutions.

In carrying out its responsibility to continuously update its policies and procedures, the Commission directed the COA in January 2004 to undertake a self-study by meeting 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. At its meeting in May 2004, the Commission authorized the formation of an accreditation review group made up primarily of stakeholders and supported by PSD staff. This group, comprised of four members of the COA and representatives from the education stakeholder community, is charged with reviewing the Commission's current accreditation system and suggesting to the COA any changes that would strengthen the system. In turn, the COA is charged with submitting its preferred options for changes to the accreditation system to the Commission for its consideration. This work is currently in process, with recommendations being brought to the Commission as of the writing of this report.

How Has Credentialing Changed Over the Years?

Over the past several years significant education reforms have taken place in California which have had an impact on the way educators meet standards and satisfy credential requirements. In effect, we have come full circle from the undergraduate education major, to the fifth year credential program, to today's implementation of the 5-year blended education program which is essentially an interdisciplinary education major. A summary of the effects of several major policy initiatives implemented over the past four decades is provided below.

The Fisher Act

Referred to as the "Certificated Personnel Law," the Fisher Act (Statutes of 1961) reflected a strong belief among academic college instructors that public schools in California had lost sight of their major purpose: to inculcate within the school children of the state a skill in the basic subjects. It was felt that schools had added too many non-essential elements to the curriculum and that the schools had employed teachers who lacked a clear focus or expertise in the traditional liberal arts disciplines. The Fisher Act sought to address this weakness in teacher preparation by codifying many of the recommendations of a Committee on the Revision of the Credential Structure which was appointed by the President of the California Council on Teacher Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Fisher Act reduced the number of basic credentials from forty to five, established new standards designed to serve as the basis for completing a new credential structure, and addressed several related items.

The Ryan Act

The Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970, or Ryan Act, sought to set broad minimum standards and guidelines for teacher preparation and teacher licensing to encourage both high standards and preparation alternatives. This Act made three important changes in the preparation and certification of teachers. First, it created an independent teacher certification agency (independent standards board) known initially as the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing, and now known as the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. This Commission was designed to be comprised of teachers, administrators, higher education faculty, and the public. The charge given to the Commission was to establish and enforce standards and procedures for certifying teachers, to approve teacher preparation programs and to certify educator fitness. Second, the Ryan Act provided an alternative route to establishing subject matter competency through testing. Prior to the Act's passage, subject matter competency could only be established through completing an approved teacher preparation program offered by an institution of higher education. Third, it limited the amount of professional course work in education required before student teaching, and required that supervised teaching in the schools be included within each one-year professional preparation program. The Act required that supervised teaching be at least one semester long, and that it comprise at least one-half of each program. Additionally, institutions were prohibited from requiring candidates to complete more than twelve semester units in professional education courses as prerequisites for supervised teaching.

Senate Bill 2042

In 1992 Senate Bill 1422 (Chapter 1245, Statutes of 1992) was enacted in response to a public concern that teacher preparation reforms had been introduced in a piecemeal fashion over several decades. Teacher credential requirements were neither articulated with each other nor cohesive for candidates who wanted to become teachers. SB 1422 created an Advisory panel for the Comprehensive Review of Teaching Credential Requirements and charged it with developing recommendations for a coherent system of teacher preparation and certification. After a two-year period, the Advisory Panel offered 111 recommendations for reform and restructuring of teacher certification. The Advisory Panel recommended multiple pathways into teaching and comprehensive support systems for teachers who pursue each option. Moreover, the Advisory Panel defined a new, two-level credential structure, based on current knowledge of learning to teach.

Senate Bill 2042 (Chapter 548, Statutes of 1998) extended the efforts of SB 1422 by establishing the Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards to actually implement the recommendations resulting from the two-year review of teacher credentialing requirements. This new advisory panel was charged with completing the work necessary to:

- Implement new standards to govern all aspects of teacher development, including subject matter studies, professional preparation, induction into teaching and continuing growth and to align these standards with the K-12 student academic content standards
- Redesign teacher preparation to provide an option that integrates the subject matter studies with the pedagogical course work and field experiences in teaching at the undergraduate level
- Imbed a standards-based teacher performance assessment in teacher preparation programs that will assure teacher quality and inform induction support providers about the beginning teacher's strengths and weaknesses
- Provide an induction program for every beginning teacher in California.

The resulting work of this advisory panel is a learning to teach continuum that provides a seamless route to a professional teaching credential, whether the credential candidate chooses the traditional program, the blended program of undergraduate teacher preparation or an alternative program route.

What Studies About the Commission Have Been Completed?

The Commission has been the subject of several external and internal management studies and audits that examined its processes and practices. While none of these reviews uncovered systemic problems in the Commission's practices, each study suggested changes and recommendations to improve the Commission's work, as follows.

MGT of America, Inc. (MGT)-(1999)-- At the request of the Legislature, MGT was selected in August 1999 to conduct a study to determine the Commission's workload and staffing needs. The resulting report, titled "A Management Study of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing," and completed in February 2000, made several recommendations for improvements in processing that were implemented by the Commission. The report concluded "Although we did

not identify any single significant problem in the credentialing process, we identified several policy issues that should be reviewed as well as a number of opportunities to improve business processes.”⁴ In addition, as a result of the MGT study, the Commission hired KPMG Consulting to assist in reexamining its overall strategic plan, allowing for a web-based electronic application system and the acceptance of electronically paid credential fees. The Commission also pursued and began the TCSIP project which, as discussed in an earlier section of this report, was designed to provide application status information and to check credentials held electronically as well as to implement online submission of renewal applications.

KPMG Consulting (KPMG)-(2000)-- In a continuing effort to develop best practices following the MGT study, KPMG was retained to evaluate the potential for expanded use of information technology and other process improvements that would help the Commission to achieve its business goals, utilize technology, and reexamine its strategic plan to achieve its business goals and utilize technology as effectively and efficiently as possible. In 2000, the Commission approved a revised Strategic Plan to define its goals and objectives. (See Appendix C for the Commission’s goals). These goals serve as the basis for all Commission work.

Bureau of State Audits (BSA)-(2004)--In 2004, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee (JLAC) asked the BSA to conduct an audit of the efficiency and effectiveness of the teacher credential process as administered by the Commission. The report concluded there were minor efficiencies that could be implemented which the BSA determined could be helpful in making the Commission a more effective credentialing body. Following a review of the report, the Commission adopted and implemented the recommendations in 2005.

How Has the Commission Demonstrated Its Commitment to Efficient Business Operations?

In 2005, as a result of both the foregoing studies and the continued workload and staffing needs, the Commission directed staff to review current policies, regulations and statutes and bring recommendations for further streamlining and efficiencies to the Commission. With the budget crisis that affected most, if not all, state agencies in California state government, the Commission continued its effort to identify efficiencies and streamlining of its business processes. Although the work to improve processes and achieve efficiencies is ongoing, the following is a list of the efficiencies that the Commission has implemented to date, listed by Division:

Certification, Assignments and Waivers Division

- Systematized the redirection of staff to priority workload and cross-trained staff
- Automated the credentialing system to include public online access to credential status online credential renewal and online application through teacher education program, web-based credential guide for professionals in the field, and DOJ electronic interface
- Eliminated CTC staff level transcript review by allowing community colleges and universities to verify completion of requirements for Child Development Permits

⁴ MGT of America, (2000, February 29). **A Management Study of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**. Tallahassee, FL. p. 1-1.

Division of Professional Practices

- Reorganized workflow and legal staff responsibilities for quicker processing and more efficient Committee of Credentials' review
- Eliminated multiple extensions of time for receipt of documents before a case is rejected and closed
- Installed Department of Motor Vehicles terminals to check vehicle code violations, resulting in reduced paperwork and quicker processing of applications
- Transferred the mandatory revocation and suspension process from the Commission to the Executive Director for immediate processing, thereby eliminating both time lag and workload of placing items on the Commission agenda and ensuring that the most serious offenders are restricted from the classroom sooner
- Instituted electronic mailing of the All Points Bulletin to eliminate mailing and processing costs and provide districts with quicker access to information about disciplinary actions
- Instituted an early settlement procedure to contain the rising Attorney General litigation costs (33% increase in 4 years) and workload and speed resolution of cases

Professional Services Division

- Reduced the number of meetings required for preparation and subject matter program application review panels
- Used web-based review system for more efficient panel review procedure
- Incorporated development of program standards into examinations development contracts
- Moved to “no cost” contracts for test administration
- Posted reports, documents and other information used by stakeholders on the Commission's website

Executive Office

- Reduced and redesigned the number and length of Commission meetings, within existing statutory framework, reducing cost and allowing staff redirection to core functions
- Redesigned Agenda format to reduce staff time

Where Does the Commission Go From Here?

As an autonomous independent standards board, the Commission provides the avenue for practicing professionals and other education stakeholders to bring their expertise to the discussions that affect educator standards and ultimately impact teaching and learning in California's public school classrooms. Because knowledge in and about the profession constantly grows, there is a continual need for the Commission to update and reevaluate standards and practices. Similarly, the Commission as an agency also sees the need to make its own internal changes to grow along with the profession. As evidenced by the several efficiencies already implemented by the Commission, the agency is proactive in reflecting on its current practices and using that information to make changes that increase the Commission's effectiveness and efficiency in carrying out its multifaceted mandated responsibilities as described earlier in this document.

The ongoing review of the accreditation system has already resulted in the Commission's making decisions to strengthen the system by (1) revising the Accreditation Framework; (2) improving communication by requiring ongoing reports from the COA to the Commission rather than annual reports; (3) revising the accreditation cycle from a single visit once every six years to a series of activities over the course of seven years; (4) requiring programs to submit biennial reports to the COA; (5) revising the cycle from a 3-4 day comprehensive site visit to a system that includes annual data collection by the institution; and (6) establishing consistency in the system by including all credential and certificate programs in the accreditation process.

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
- Fully utilizing technology throughout the agency

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.

Appendix A
Modernizing the Functions of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing
A Report by the LAO (April 27, 2006)

CCTC Comments

Accrediting Teacher Preparation Programs

LAO Issue	CCTC Comments
<p>A New Performance Based Accreditation System Should Be Established</p>	<p><u>CCTC is considering a new performance-based accreditation system.</u></p> <p>In June 2004, the CCTC convened an accreditation review group (primarily made up of stakeholders) to develop and propose revisions to the existing accreditation system. In October 2005, the CCTC directed that the new model for accreditation be sent out for stakeholder review. This new model incorporates outcomes based accreditation, while maintaining the importance of standards that define a quality program.</p> <p>In this new model, biennial reporting data related to candidate outcomes would be required from every institution offering credentialing programs. This outcomes data serves as a critical information source for the accreditation process and for determining whether there are any areas of concern that merit a site visit sooner than scheduled.</p>
<p>Current System Almost Entirely Input Oriented</p>	<p><u>Outcome based data is the cornerstone of the CCTC accreditation review group proposed accreditation system.</u></p> <p>The current accreditation system considers both input and output measures. The accreditation review group agreed early on in the review process that the current system needed improvement and that the revised model needed to incorporate outcomes based measures. As a result, biennial reporting was developed that would be entirely related to candidate outcomes data and would serve as a major component in accreditation decisions.</p>
<p>Standards Are Vague, Reviews Subjective</p>	<p><u>The CCTC proposed system would be based on revised common standards focused more directly on candidate outcomes and the SB 2042 program standards.</u></p> <p>The LAO report bases much of its accreditation comments on the American Institutes for Research (AIR) report. Since the AIR report was conducted prior to the full implementation of the SB 2042 standards, it would not be a useful tool for analysis of the current system. The current SB 2042 program standards are much more specific than previous standards, especially given the addition of “required elements” within the standards. This provides the trained reviewers with clear criteria for reviewing programs.</p> <p>The accreditation review group supports the need to update CCTC’s</p>

LAO Issue	CCTC Comments
	common institutional standards. They are currently in the process of developing language that would be more specific and more focused on candidate outcomes data.
Accreditation Reviews Occur Too Infrequently	<p><u>The proposed system provides more frequent outcome based data and a more rigorous follow-up process.</u></p> <p>Early on in the process, the accreditation review group determined that accreditation activities occur too infrequently and that accreditation must be transformed from a one-time event into an on-going process. As a result, they developed a proposed structure that would require biennial reports focused on outcomes data, a 4th year program document review, and a 6th year focused site visit. In addition, the proposal includes a much more rigorous follow up process allowing more flexibility to ensure that the institution has rectified any inadequacies in their programs.</p>
Current Process Focuses on Institutions, Not Programs	<p><u>The proposed system focuses on both program findings and institutional findings.</u></p> <p>The current reviews focus on both the institution as a whole and its individual preparation programs. The accreditation review group sought feedback on this particular issue from institutional representatives. The review group's proposal includes maintaining the focus of accreditation on institutions, thereby allowing institutional representatives the leverage they need to bring about improvements from departments outside of their authority, while improving the manner in which results are reported for individual programs. Under the proposed new system, standard program findings would be reported for each program an institution offers in addition to the institutional, or unit, decision.</p>
Quality of Information Varies Significantly	<p><u>The proposed system reports similar institutional data.</u></p> <p>Under the accreditation review group's proposed new structure, all institutions and programs would submit biennial candidate outcomes data that would be very similar from institution to institution. It is anticipated that test scores, retention data, employer and candidate survey data would be common among all reports.</p>
System Should Include Annual Summary Data	<p><u>The proposed system would report biennially as one measure of program and institutional quality.</u></p> <p>The accreditation review group agreed that all institutions and programs should be collecting and analyzing outcomes data annually and that analysis of that data should serve as the basis for program improvement. Interim reporting of that data was endorsed by the accreditation review group, however the group opted for biennial, rather than annual summary data by programs and institutions. In addition to the biennial reporting of the data, institutions would be required to submit information about how that data was used to make programmatic improvements.</p>

Accrediting Teacher Preparation Programs (continued)

<p>System Should Include Annual Summary Data (continued)</p>	<p>The LAO proposal bases accreditation decisions solely on five specific data sources. The accreditation review group determined that, while the outcome measures currently available are informative and critical to the process, they are not sufficient by themselves to justify an accreditation decision. The group concluded that accreditation should be based on multiple measures, including a site visit, and adherence to all program standards.</p>
<p>Use of State’s Teacher Data System</p>	<p><u>The proposed system allows for incorporation into a teacher data system.</u></p> <p>A Teacher Data System is not currently operational. If the Teacher Data System is able to yield useful information on the quality of programs at an institution, it would be considered for use in the accreditation system.</p>
<p>Make Results Easily Accessible</p>	<p><u>The proposed system calls for clearer program findings in the accreditation report.</u></p> <p>Accreditation reports are currently public documents. Findings on individual programs and the institution would be clearer under the review group’s proposal. Candidate outcomes data included in biennial reports from institutions and each credential program will be public information as will accreditation site visit reports and accreditation decisions. Program findings will be more clearly included in the revised accreditation report allowing weaknesses in programs to be more explicitly identified, documented, and addressed.</p>
<p>Annual Accreditation Decisions Would Be Based on Five Specific Measures</p>	<p><u>LAO accreditation measures, while important, are insufficient to make accreditation decisions.</u></p> <p>The performance based system the LAO advocates includes five specific measures. The review group’s proposal includes 2 of the LAO measures, retention rates and employer satisfaction, among the types of data that will be collected biennially. However, the accreditation review group believes that multiple measures, including a site visit, along with adherence to standards more accurately reflect the quality and effectiveness of a program.</p> <p>Discussions by the accreditation review group concluded that an accreditation decision based on a small number of quantitative measures alone, such as the LAO proposal, would be insufficient to reach any defensible conclusions about the quality of an institution’s programs.</p>
<p>LAO Proposal Would Result in Net Savings to State</p>	<p><u>LAO proposal shifts costs from special funds to the state’s General Fund</u></p> <p>The LAO proposal would shift the accreditation function from a fee based system (CCTC) to a General Fund (CDE/SBE) agency. Currently, the accreditation system is not a cost to the General Fund.</p>

Accrediting Teacher Preparation Programs (continued)

LAO Issue	CCTC Comments
<p>New System Likely to Reduce Local Costs</p>	<p><u>LAO proposal might save on local costs at the expense of quality assurance.</u></p> <p>The LAO's proposed 5 data sources reporting could result in a local IHE cost savings, however the discussions of the accreditation review group suggest that such a structure would be inadequate for determining the quality of an institution's preparation program.</p>
<p>CDE Staff and SBE Would Make Accreditation Decisions</p>	<p><u>LAO proposal shifts accreditation decisions from professional educators to state bureaucrats</u></p> <p>The LAO proposal eliminates professional judgment, which is an essential feature in an accreditation process, and would remove the decision-making process from K-12 and higher education practitioners.</p> <p>Currently, review teams are composed of K-12 and higher education practitioners. In addition, the Committee on Accreditation is composed of 6 K-12 educators and 6 educators from institutions of higher education. This vests the responsibility of making decisions about educator preparation programs with professional educators.</p>

Credentialing Teachers

LAO Issue	CCTC Comments
<p>Dizzying Array of Documents.</p>	<p><u>Credentials are established through Legislative directive.</u></p> <p>All credentials are authorized by statute and while there may appear to be many types of credentials, they exist at the request of the Legislature and stakeholders. Moreover, in the interest of removing barriers for teachers entering the teaching profession, the Legislature has established multiple routes for earning a credential.</p>
<p>Teachers Face Credential Labyrinth</p>	<p><u>Teachers are required to demonstrate mastery of subject matter and teaching ability.</u></p> <p>Federal and state policy makers have determined that teachers need to be competent in the subject matter they teach. Since the 1960's California has required that teachers must either pass an exam or complete a university-based subject matter program in the subject they plan to teach. The CCTC charges one fee per application. It is important to note that each application may include multiple authorizations. Assuming the candidate qualifies for each of the authorizations, the candidate is assessed one fee for the application. If the candidate wishes to add additional authorizations at a later time an additional fee is charged because there is an evaluation required for the additional authorization.</p>

Credentialing Teachers (continued)

LAO Issue	CCTC Comments
Labor-Intensive and Time-Consuming Application Process	<p><u>CCTC's new application processes will eliminate the application backlog.</u> Regulations give the CCTC 75-working days to process an application. Until FY 2004-05 the CCTC met that requirement. However in 2004-05 the Certification Division's staff was reduced by 9%, yet the workload only dropped 1%. In FY 2004-05, the CCTC implemented a new computer processing system. The transition to the new system coupled with a reduction in staff resulted in a delay in processing paper applications. However, the new technology allowed teachers to renew credentials online and universities to recommend applications online and the CCTC now processes these online applications within 5 to 10 working days. During April 2006, 49% of all applications were submitted online.</p>
Credential Process Riddled with Redundancies	<p><u>University recommended applications are processed in 5 to 10 days.</u> The LAO report states that it takes 116 days to process applications submitted by colleges and universities. As part of the 2005-06 Budget Act, colleges and universities were required to submit all applications online. As a result in October 2005, universities began submitting applications online and the 116 days has been reduced to 5 to 10 days.</p>
Counties Have Devised Own Licensing System	<p><u>The Temporary County Certificate is not the same as state licensure.</u> The LAO report equates the Temporary County Certificate (TCC) process to issuing credentials. The TCC process was developed to allow employing agencies to place individuals in a classroom on an emergency basis. The LAO report states that counties issue TCCs for almost every credential renewal. The CCTC has offered an online renewal process for four years with a processing time of 5 to 10 days, thus eliminating the need for TCCs for renewal. With the advent of college and university online applications and online renewals, the need for TCCs will be greatly reduced for initial hires. In fact there should be no need for a TCC for credentials being recommended by a college or university.</p>
Simplifying Credential Requirements	<p><u>LAO recommendation would actually make credential requirements more complex.</u> The recommendation by the LAO basically restates the current credential structure. Credentials are already issued in broad categories and the state already funds two years of induction for new teachers. The LAO proposal does not take into account the No Child Left Behind requirement for Highly Qualified Teachers (HQT) that states the teacher must have a major in the specific subject they teach. It does not allow staff development to meet the HQT requirement. On page 16 of the report it states that teachers must go through a labyrinth to be credentialed. Based on the LAO recommendation, a teacher would have to be recertified each time he/she changes districts or counties.</p>

Credentialing Teachers (continued)

LAO Issue	CCTC Comments
<p>Devolve Most Credentialing Responsibility to Universities</p>	<p><u>LAO recommendation would not further simplify credentialing process and create a cost shift from the state to each IHE offering credentialing programs.</u></p> <p>With the implementation in 2005 of the CCTC college and university online recommendation process, the redundancy that may have existed in the old system has been eliminated. There is a benefit to having only one entity issuing documents and only one entity storing the data. With the state issuing credentials there is a consistency across the 94 institutions that offer teacher preparation programs. University recommendations make up about 20% of the current CCTC workload.</p>
<p>Devolve Remaining Credential Responsibility to COEs</p>	<p><u>LAO recommendation would create a state mandated local cost to counties and increase potential for fraud.</u></p> <p>County personnel do not review every application the CCTC receives. They review approximately 50%. This would mean that the county's workload would increase. What consistency would exist from one county to another? Would this increase the possibility of fraudulent documents?</p> <p>The feasibility study report for the proposed Teacher Data System points out a need for a centralized source for the HOUSSE data. If the employing agencies desire a central source for HOUSSE data, why would they then want to decentralize credential data?</p>

Monitoring Teacher Conduct

LAO Issue	CCTC Comments
<p>Fingerprint Teachers Once at County Level.</p> <p>Eliminate Committee of Credentials' Review and Recommendation Process As Well As the Commission's Final Decision Making Process</p>	<p><u>LAO proposal compromises student safety and jeopardizes teacher due process.</u></p> <p>If a criminal record exists, the Department of Justice (DOJ) provides a criminal history which results in a review by CCTC to determine if the criminal history prevents the applicant from obtaining a credential. CCTC also obtains licensing information regarding adverse actions taken by other states. Based on this information CCTC completes a fitness review. Under current law, most criminal convictions fall under a "discretionary" review category whereby CCTC determines whether the teacher is fit to be granted a credential. When an allegation of misconduct that did not result in a criminal conviction occurs, CCTC completes an investigation and review of the case to assure that the applicant had not been terminated or resigned from employment due to the misconduct in this state or another state.</p> <p>County Offices of Education (COE) do not have any of these processes in place.</p>

Monitoring Teacher Conduct (continued)

<p>Eliminate Committee of Credentials' Review and Recommendation Process As Well As the Commission's Final Decision Making Process (continued)</p>	<p>In addition to fingerprint checks, CCTC also conducts fitness reviews which are begun when a triggering event occurs including when CCTC receives a rap sheet on an applicant or credential holder, when an applicant answers 'yes' to one of the character and fitness questions on the credential application, or when another state verifies that the applicant holds a license but is not in good standing in the verifying state. The fitness review is an evaluative process to determine if the applicant is eligible to receive a credential or if the credential holder is eligible to maintain the credential held. It is not clear how CDE would obtain jurisdiction to review discipline cases without fingerprinting/criminal history, and information currently obtained as a result of a review of fitness questions on the credential application.</p> <p>The Committee of Credentials is the avenue through which an applicant or a holder is afforded her/his due process right to an administrative hearing. It is unclear from the report at what point this would take place at CDE.</p>
<p>Fund Monitoring Activities With Test Fee Revenue</p>	<p><u>LAO jeopardizes funding for teacher examinations.</u></p> <p>Currently, in accordance with Education Code §44253.8 the CCTC charges examination fees "that are sufficient to recover the costs of developing and administering the examinations, including the costs of periodic studies of the examinations, except to the extent that these costs are recovered by appropriations from another source of funds." It is unclear whether these fees could support disciplinary activities in addition to complying with the statutory mandate to support exam activities.</p>

Appendix B
Education Code §44225. Powers and Duties

The commission shall do all of the following:

- (a) Establish professional standards, assessments, and examinations for entry and advancement in the education profession. While the Legislature recognizes that the commission will exercise its prerogative to determine those requirements, it is the intent of the Legislature that standards, assessments, and examinations be developed and implemented for the following:
 - (1) The preliminary teaching credential, to be granted upon possession of a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution in a subject other than professional education, completion of an accredited program of professional preparation, and either successful passage of an examination or assessment that has been adopted or approved by the commission in the subject or subjects appropriate to the grade level to be taught, to include college level reading, writing, and mathematics skills, or completion of an accredited program of subject matter preparation and successful passage of the basic skills proficiency test as provided for in Article 4 (commencing with Section 44250). The commission shall uniformly consider the results of the basic skills proficiency test in conjunction with other pertinent information about the qualifications of each candidate for a preliminary credential, and may award the credential on the basis of the overall performance of a candidate as measured by several criteria of professional competence, provided that each candidate meets minimum standards set by the commission on each criterion. Upon application by a regionally accredited institution of higher education, the commission may categorically grant credit to coursework completed in an accredited program of professional preparation, as specified by this paragraph, by undergraduates of that institution, where the commission finds there are adequate assurances of the quality of necessary undergraduate instruction in the liberal arts and in the subject area or areas to be taught.
 - (2) The professional teaching credential, to be granted upon successful passage of a state examination or assessment in the subject or subjects appropriate to the grade level to be taught, to include college level basic reading, writing, and mathematics skills, and completion of a period of beginning teacher support that includes assessments of ability to teach subject matter to pupils, ability to work well with pupils, classroom management, and instructional skills. A candidate who successfully passes the examination or assessment pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be deemed to have passed the state examination or assessment in the subject or subjects to be taught pursuant to this paragraph.
- (b) Reduce and streamline the credential system to ensure teacher competence in the subject field or fields, while allowing greater flexibility in staffing local schools. The commission shall award the following types of credentials to applicants whose preparation and competence satisfy its standards:
 - (1) Basic teaching credentials for teaching in kindergarten, or any of the grades 1 to 12, inclusive, in public schools in this state.
 - (2) Credentials for teaching adult education classes and vocational education classes.
 - (3) Credentials for teaching specialties, including, but not necessarily limited to, bilingual education, early childhood education, and special education. The commission may grant

credentials to any candidate who concurrently meets the commission's standards of preparation and competence for the preliminary basic teaching credential and the preliminary specialty credential.

- (4) Credentials for school services, for positions including, but not limited to, administrators, school counselors, speech-language therapists, audiologists, school psychologists, library media teachers, supervisors of attendance, and school nurses.

The commission may establish standards and requirements for preliminary and professional credentials of each type.

- (c) Review and, if necessary, revise the code of ethics for the teaching profession.
- (d) Establish standards for the issuance and renewal of credentials, certificates, and permits. In setting standards, the commission shall seek to ensure, through its credentialing of teachers, that public school teachers satisfy all of the following criteria:
- (1) Are academically talented.
 - (2) Are knowledgeable of the subjects to be taught in the classroom.
 - (3) Are creative and energetic.
 - (4) Have the human skills to motivate and inspire pupils to achieve their goals.
 - (5) Have the sensitivity to foster self-esteem in pupils through recognition that each pupil has his or her own goals, talents, and levels of development.
 - (6) Be willing to relate the educational process and their instructional strategies to meet pupils' needs.
 - (7) Are able to work effectively with and motivate pupils from a variety of ethnic, socioeconomic, cultural, academic, and linguistic backgrounds.
 - (8) Have an understanding of principles and laws related to educational equity, and the equitable practice of the profession of education among all pupils regardless of their ethnicity, race, gender, age, religious background, primary language, or handicapping condition.
- (e) Determine the scope and authorization of credentials, to ensure competence in teaching and other educational services, and establish sanctions for the misuse of credentials and the misassignment of credential holders. The commission may grant an added or supplementary authorization to a credential holder who has met the requirements and standards of the commission for the added or supplementary authorization. The commission shall exempt the holder of a teaching credential obtained prior to January 1, 1974, who adds an authorization by successfully completing a commission approved subject matter examination, from the requirements of subdivision (e) of Section 44259 and Sections 44261, 44261.5, and 44261.7.
- (f) Collect, compile, and disseminate information regarding exemplary practices in supporting and assessing beginning teachers.
- (g) Establish alternative methods for entry into the teaching profession, and into other certificated roles in the schools, by persons in varying circumstances, including persons who have been educated outside of California, provided that each applicant satisfies all of the requirements established by the commission. One alternative method shall be the successful completion of at least two years of classroom instruction under a district intern certificate, pursuant to Article 7.5 (commencing with Section 44325). In establishing alternative methods for entry into the teaching profession, the commission shall develop strategies to encourage classroom aides to become credentialed teachers.

-
- (h) Adopt a framework and general standards for the accreditation of preparation programs for teachers and other certificated educators pursuant to Article 7 (commencing with Section 44320).
- (i) Appoint classroom teachers, school administrators, other school services personnel, representatives of the public, and public or private higher education representatives to one or more standing committees, which shall be given authority to recommend to the commission standards relating to examinations, performance assessments, program accreditation, and licensing. The commission shall establish criteria for membership on those committees, and shall determine the terms of committee members. Appointments to standing committees by the commission shall reflect, to the extent feasible, the ethnic and cultural diversity of the California public schools.
- (j) Consult with classroom teachers, faculty members from institutions of higher education that maintain accredited programs of professional preparation for teachers, administrators or other school services personnel, and other experts to aid in the development of examinations and assessments, and to study the impact of examinations and assessments on the teaching profession. To increase the fairness of its certification decisions, the commission may uniformly consider the results of tests, subtests, and assessments in conjunction with each other, and in conjunction with other pertinent information about the qualifications of each candidate. The commission may award credentials on the basis of average overall performances by candidates on several criteria of professional competence, provided that each candidate meets minimum standards set by the commission on each criterion.
- (k) Adopt standards for all examinations and assessments which shall ensure that all prospective teachers demonstrate an understanding of the history and cultures of the major ethnic populations of this state and of teaching strategies for the acquisition of English language skills by non-English-speaking pupils.
- (l) Determine the terms of credentials, certificates, and permits, except that no credential, certificate, or permit shall be valid for more than five years from the date of issuance. This article shall govern the issuance of any credential, certificate, or permit, except as follows:
- (1) A credential, certificate, or permit shall remain in force as long as it is valid and continues to be valid under the laws and regulations that were in effect when it was issued.
 - (2) The commission shall grant teaching credentials pursuant to statutes that were in effect on December 31, 1988, to candidates who, prior to the effective date of regulations to implement subdivision (a), are in the process of meeting the requirements for teaching credentials that were in effect on December 31, 1988, except that neither enrollment as an undergraduate student nor receipt of a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution prior to the effective date of the regulations shall, by themselves, exempt a candidate from the requirements of subdivision (a). Enrollment in a preparation program for teachers prior to the effective date of the regulations shall not exempt a candidate from the requirements of paragraph (2) of subdivision (a), if the candidate's preliminary credential was granted after the effective date of the regulations.
- (m) Review requests from school districts, county offices of education, private schools, postsecondary institutions, and individual applicants for the waiver of one or more of the provisions of this chapter or other provisions governing the preparation or licensing of educators. The commission may grant a waiver upon its finding that professional preparation equivalent to that prescribed under the provision or provisions to be waived will be, or has

been, completed by the credential candidate or candidates affected or that a waiver is necessary to accomplish any of the following:

- (1) Give a local education agency one semester or less to address unanticipated, immediate, short-term shortages of fully qualified educators by assigning a teacher who holds a basic teaching credential to teach outside of his or her credential authorization, with the teacher's consent.
- (2) Provide credential candidates additional time to complete a credential requirement.
- (3) Allow local school districts or schools to implement an education reform or restructuring plan.
- (4) Temporarily exempt from a specified credential requirement small, geographically isolated regions with severely limited ability to develop personnel.
- (5) Provide other temporary exemptions when deemed appropriate by the commission.

No provision in this chapter may be waived under Section 33050 and 33051, after June 30, 1994, by the State Board of Education.

- (n) It is the intent of the Legislature that the commission develop models for voluntary use by California colleges and universities which do not have these models in place, to assist in the screening of applications for admission to teacher education programs. The models shall give emphasis to the following qualifications of the applicants: academic talent, knowledge of subjects to be taught, basic academic skills, creativity, experience in working with children and adolescents, ability to motivate and inspire pupils, and willingness to relate education to pupils with a wide variety of cultural, ethnic, and academic backgrounds. The commission may continue to administer the state basic skills proficiency test, in order (1) to utilize the results of this test in awarding preliminary teaching credentials and emergency permits, and (2) to enable colleges and universities to utilize this test in conjunction with other appropriate sources of information in teacher preparation admission decisions. However, it is the intent of the Legislature that applicants for admission to teacher preparation programs may not be denied admission solely on the basis of state basic skills proficiency test results. The commission may recover the costs of administering and developing the test by charging examinees a fee for taking the test.
- (o) It is the intent of the Legislature that the commission encourage colleges and universities to design and implement, by August 1, 1990, concentrated internship programs for persons who have attained a bachelor's degree in the field in which they intend to teach. Those programs would be targeted at subject area shortages, would substitute for conventional training programs, and would include a full summer session of college level coursework, a one-year internship, or the equivalent, a seminar throughout the internship, and a summer session following the internship. Educator preparation through internship programs shall be subject to Article 10 (commencing with Section 44370).
- (p) Grant a field placement certificate to any candidate who has been admitted to an accredited program of professional preparation, and who must complete a supervised practicum in public elementary or secondary schools as a condition for completion of the program. The commission shall establish standards for the issuance of field placement certificates.
- (q) Propose appropriate rules and regulations to implement the act which enacts this section.
- (r) Adopt subject matter assessments for teaching credentials after developing those assessments jointly with the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Appendix C
Goals Adopted by the Commission in November 2000

Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators
- Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates
- Assess and monitor the efficacy of the Accreditation System, Examination System and State and Federal Funded Programs
- Evaluate and monitor the moral fitness of credential applicants and holders and take appropriate action
- Implement, monitor and report on the outcomes of new program initiatives

Goal 2: Continue to refine the coordination between Commissioners and staff in carrying out the Commission's duties, roles and responsibilities

- Conduct periodic review of the efficiency of the day-to-day operations and financial accountability of the Commission
- Continuously improve the development, distribution and dissemination of agenda and information to the Commission initiatives
- Orient new Commissioners and staff on the roles and responsibilities of the Commission initiatives
- Continuously update the Commission's policies and procedures initiatives

Goal 3: Provide quality customer service

- Use technological innovation to maximize operational efficiency and improve customer access to information and services
- Provide timely, accurate and responsive processing of credential applications

Goal 4: Continue effective and appropriate involvement of the Commission with policy makers on key education issues

- Sponsor legislation as appropriate
- Influence legislation regarding the preparation and certification of professional educators
- Respond to policy makers' information inquiries
- Sustain productive relations with key policy makers and staff

-
- Collaborate with and advise appropriate agencies
 - Design and develop strategies to implement new legislation

Goal 5: Enhance effective, two-way communication with the Commission's stakeholders

- Pursue strategies to refine the Commission's public affairs activities

Goal 6: Provide leadership in exploring multiple, high quality routes to prepare professional educators for California's schools

- Work with education entities to expand the pool of qualified professional educators
- Pursue avenues with other organizations in expanding the pool of qualified educators