



Home | [CA Home Page](#) | [Governor's Home Page](#) | [About the Commission](#) | [Credential Information](#) | [Examination Information](#) | [Coded Correspondence](#) | [Credential Alerts](#) | [Educational Standards](#) | [Reports-on-Line](#) | [Committee on Accreditation](#) | [Troops to Teachers](#) | [Other Sites of Interest](#)

Agenda - CTC



September 1-2, 1999 • Commission Offices • 1900 Capitol Avenue • Sacramento, CA 95814

Some of the agenda items are available for viewing on the web.

Click on the  to view the items that are available.

WEDNESDAY, September 1, 1999

Commission Office

1. Closed Session (Chair Norton) 1:00 p.m.

(The Commission will meet in Closed Session pursuant to California Government Code Section 11126 as well as California Education Code Sections 44245 and 44248)

2. Appeals and Waivers Committee (Committee Chair Harvey)

- A&W-1 Approval of the Minutes
- A&W-2 Commission Appeal
- A&W-3 Reconsideration of Waiver Denials
- A&W-4 Waivers: Consent Calendar
- A&W-5 Waivers: Conditions Calendar
- A&W-6 Waivers: Denials Calendar

THURSDAY, September 2, 1999

Commission Office

1.. General Session (Chair Norton) 8:00 a.m.

- GS-1 Roll Call
- GS-2 Pledge of Allegiance
- GS-3 Approval of the July 1999 Minutes
- GS-4 Approval of the September Agenda
- GS-5 Approval of the September Consent Calendar
- GS-6 Annual Calendar of Events
- GS-7 Chair's Report
- GS-8 Executive Director's Report
- GS-9 Report on Monthly State Board Meeting

2. Legislative Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Gary Reed)

-  LEG-1 Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission


3. Credentials and Certificated Assignments Committee of the Whole (Interim Committee Chair Ellner)

-  C&CA-1 Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Section 80001 Related to Definitions & Terms

 **C&CA-2** Performance Measures for the Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division in the CCTC Strategic Plan

4. Preparation Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Sutro)

 **PREP-1** Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs by Colleges and Universities and Designated Subjects Preparation Programs by Local Education Agencies

 **PREP-2** Fourth Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation and Recommended Minor Change in the Implementation of the Accreditation Framework

 **PREP-3** Pre-Intern Program Expansion and Augmentation Progress Report

5. Performance Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Katzman)

 **PERF-1** Update on the Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards

6. Fiscal Planning & Policy Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Veneman)

 **FPPC-1** Update on the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget

 **FPPC-2** Update on the Management Study Mandated by the 1999 Budget Act

 **FPPC-3** Proposed 2000-2001 Budget Change Proposals

7. Public Hearing 1:30 p.m.

 **PUB-1** Proposed Additions of Sections 80048.3.1 and 80412.3 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to Experienced, Out-of-State, Credentialed Teachers

8. Reconvene General Session (Chair Norton)

GS-10 Report of the Appeals and Waivers Committee

GS-11 Report of Closed Session Items

GS-12 Commissioners Reports

GS-13 Audience Presentations

GS-14 Old Business

•Quarterly Agenda for September, October & November 1999

GS-15 New Business

GS-16 Adjournment

All Times Are Approximate and Are Provided for Convenience Only

Except Time Specific Items Identified Herein (i.e. Public Hearing)

The Order of Business May be Changed Without Notice

Persons wishing to address the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing on a subject to be considered at this meeting are asked to complete a Request Card and give it to the Recording Secretary prior to the discussion of the item.

Reasonable Accommodation for Any Individual with a Disability

Any individual with a disability who requires reasonable accommodation to attend or participate in a meeting or function of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing may request assistance by contacting the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814; telephone, (916) 445-0184.

NEXT MEETING

October 6-7, 1999

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814**

[Top](#)

[Home](#)

[Top](#) | [CA Home Page](#) | [Governor's Home Page](#) | [About the Commission](#) | [Credential Information](#) | [Examination Information](#)
[Coded Correspondence](#) | [Credential Alerts](#) | [Educational Standards](#) | [Reports-on-Line](#) | [Committee on Accreditation](#)
[Troops to Teachers](#) | [Other Sites of Interest](#) | [Home](#)



California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: LEG-1

Committee: Legislative

Title: Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission

- ✓ Action
- ✓ Information

Prepared by: Rod Santiago
Office of Governmental Relations

BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

August 18, 1999

CCTC-Sponsored Bills

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
AB 309 - Mazzone Would increase the cap on per intern expenditures in the alternative certification program	Sponsor (3/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 457 - Scott Would add internet-based sex offenses to the list of specified mandatory revocation offenses	Sponsor (3/99)	Assembly Floor for Concurrence
AB 466 - Mazzone Omnibus clean-up bill	Sponsor (3/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 471 - Scott Would require CCTC to report to the Legislature and the Governor on numbers of teachers who received credentials, internships and emergency permits	Sponsor (3/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 1067 - Margrett Would bring Education Code provisions related to lewd and lascivious Penal Code violations into conformity	Sponsor (4/99)	Assembly Floor for Concurrence
AB 1282 - Jackson Would require CCTC to make improvements needed to enhance CBEST	Sponsor (4/99)	Senate Appropriations Suspense File

SENATE BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position	Status

	(date adopted)	
SB 151 - Haynes Would allow a person who meets prescribed requirements to qualify for a Professional Clear teaching credential	Seek Amendments (2/99) Oppose Unless Amended (4/99) Oppose (7/99)	Assembly Appropriations Suspense File
SB 179 - Alpert Would establish model alternative teacher preparation programs	Support if Amended (2/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 237 - Karnette Would require that a person may not qualify for an Administrative Services Credential unless he or she has ten years of teaching experience	Oppose (3/99)	Senate Education Committee
SB 395 - Hughes Would remove the sunset date on SDAIE staff development training	Seek Amendments (4/99) Support (7/99)	Assembly Floor
SB 472 - Poochigian Would establish a pilot program to provide grants to school districts using a mathematics specialist to teach mathematics aligned to the statewide content standards in grades 4, 5, and 6	Support (4/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 489 - Solis Would make findings and declarations related to educational paraprofessionals	Watch (4/99)	Senate Rules Committee
SB 573 - Alarcon Would create a telecommunications-based pilot project in LA county for the purpose of providing support for BTSA or pre-intern teachers in hard to staff schools	Watch (4/99) Support if Amended (5/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 624 - Schiff Would require SDE to include funding for updating prekindergarten learning development guidelines in future expenditure plans	Watch (4/99)	Assembly Human Services Committee
SB 883 - Haynes Would require CCTC to monitor the performance of graduates of various IHEs that provide educator preparation and would authorize CCTC to take administrative action against specified IHEs	Oppose (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
SB 1061 - Schiff Would waive the credential application fee for first-time specified credential applicants	Support (4/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 1076 - Vasconcellos Makes findings and declarations related to teacher preparation and credentialing and expresses legislative intent to enact legislation to redesign teacher preparation and credentialing to teach teachers both the process of teaching and the information the teacher is responsible for their pupils learning	Watch (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
SB 1262 - O'Connell/Karnette Would amend the Golden State Scholarshare Trust Act NOTE: Original bill language was incorporated into AB 1117 which has been signed by the Governor	Support (4/99)	Assembly Appropriations Committee
SB 1309 - Baca Would require CCTC to regularly notify	Oppose (4/99)	Assembly Floor

school districts about laws governing assignment of individuals when certificated teachers are not available

ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
AB 1X - Villaraigosa and Strom-Martin Would establish the Peer Assistance and Review Program for Teachers	Seek Amendments (2/99) CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor
AB 2X - Mazzone and Cunneen Would establish various programs related to reading and teacher recruitment	Support (2/99) Seek Amendments (3/99) CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor
AB 6 - Calderon Establishes the California Teacher Academy Program	Seek Amendments (2/99) CTC amendments adopted	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 17X - Bates Would delete option for local development by IHEs of a teaching performance assessment and require CCTC to administer the assessment	Oppose (2/99)	Dropped by the author
AB 18X - Zettel and Bates Would require all teaching credential holders to pass a subject matter exam to renew the credential. Would require CCTC to establish a Peer Review Task Force	Oppose Unless Amended (2/99)	Dropped by the authors
AB 25X - Baldwin Would make changes to statutes governing the demonstration of subject matter competence	Oppose (2/99)	Dropped by the author
AB 27X - Leach Would require CCTC to conduct a validity study of the CBEST	Oppose Unless Amended (2/99) CTC amendments adopted Watch (3/99)	Signed by the Governor
AB 28X - Leach Would make changes to statutes governing the accreditation framework	Oppose (2/99)	Held in Assembly Education Committee
AB 31 - Reyes Extends APLE Program to applicants who agree to provide classroom instruction in school districts serving rural areas	Support (2/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 108 - Mazzone Subject Matter Projects	Support (2/99)	Senate Appropriations Suspense File
AB 192 - Scott Would create the California Teacher Cadet Program	Support (3/99)	Senate Appropriations Suspense File
AB 578 - Honda Would require SPI, in consultation with CCTC and IHEs, to develop training requirements for teachers to ensure sufficient training on domestic violence recognition	Watch (4/99)	Senate Appropriations Suspense File
AB 615 - Runner	Oppose Unless	Senate Appropriations

Would place specified categorical funding programs into block grant programs	Amended (6/99)	Committee
AB 707 - House Would set forth requirements for a services credential with a specialization in school psychology	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 752 - Davis Would create two new single subject teaching credentials in dance and in theatre	Watch (4/99)	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 770 - Honda Would create a Middle Grades Certificate Program	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 899 - Alquist Would provide that on and after July 1, 2003 a teacher may not be initially assigned to teach math or science at the middle school level unless she or he holds a credential or supplementary authorization in the subject to be taught	Support (5/99)	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 908 - Alquist Would require CCTC to adopt or revise standards to address gender equity	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 949 - Wiggins Would include holders of services credentials in the definition of teacher for the purposes of participating in the APLE program, the California Mentor Teacher Program, and the BCLAD Certificate	Oppose Unless Amended (4/99)	Assembly Education Committee
AB 961 - Steinberg Would create the Challenged School Teacher Attraction and Retention Act of 1999	Support (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1006 - Ducheny Would establish a two-year pilot project to provide peer support and mentoring for school counselors	Support (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1059 - Ducheny Would make various provisions in law related to CLAD training	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 1242 - Lempert Would require CCTC to issue a California Professional Credential to persons meeting certain requirements	Seek Amendments (4/99) Oppose (6/99)	Senate Appropriations Suspense File
AB 1294 - Firebaugh Would require CCTC, SPI, and directors of teacher education at IHEs to produce an annual report related to teacher recruitment, education, and retention programs	Watch (4/99) Oppose (5/99)	Assembly Education Committee
AB 1296 - Firebaugh Would authorize holders of emergency permits and Pre-Intern program participants to participate in BTSA. Would also establish a hard-to-staff school program	Watch (4/99) Seek Amendments (5/99)	Assembly Education Committee





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-1

Committee: Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Title: Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Section 80001 Related to Definitions & Terms

✓ Action

Prepared by: Yvonne Novelli, Program Analyst

Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

Proposed Amendments Title 5 Regulation, §80001 Pertaining to Definitions and Terms

August 16, 1999

Summary

The following proposes to amend Title 5 Regulation §80001 related to definitions and terms. The proposal revises the currently listed definitions and adds the definitions for a number of new terms.

Fiscal Impact Statement

There will be a minor cost to the agency related to holding a public hearing if the recommendation is adopted, but there is no long-term fiscal impact either to the Commission or to other groups or individuals.

Policy Issues to Be Resolved

Shall the Commission revise the definitions found in §80001?

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the following amendments to Title 5 Regulation, §80001, for the purposes of beginning the rulemaking file for submission to the Office of Administrative Law and the scheduling of a public hearing.

Background

Section 80001 defines the terms used through out the Commission's division of the Title 5 Regulations. It plays a major role in correctly implementing the regulations that govern the Commission's responsibilities, and it adds consistency to the discussions between the Commission and its shareholders. This regulation was last revised in 1983. This was presented as an information item at the July Commission meeting.

Proposed Amendments to §80001

The current and proposed definitions and also the proposed addition of the forms are all listed in §80001, found at the end of this item. *The definitions and forms that are new or revised since the July meeting are italicized.* The proposed introductory paragraph to the regulations specifies that the definitions and terms pertain to all sections in Division VIII, yet it also allows for flexibility so any specific law or regulation may supersede them.

Most of the definitions state the interpretation commonly used by the Commission and the field. Of the few that do not, the following may clarify the significance of the definition used.

- Proposed subsections (e) and (hh) rename *Chairman* and *Vice-Chairman* to *Chair* and

Vice-Chair, respectively, to reflect the gender equality established within the Commission.

- In the proposal, subsection (f), "degree", has been deleted and replaced with subsection (c), which now defines both the baccalaureate and the master's degrees.
- In the proposed subsection (h), the term used to denote all certification issued by the Commission has been changed from "credential" to "document" because credential is only one type of available certification, and it is used in many regulations as a method to exclude permits and waivers. An example of this is the special education credential requirement for a preliminary Resource Specialist Certificate. If credential is defined as all documents, then someone with a waiver or emergency permit in a special education area could qualify for this.
- Proposed subsection (z) has been added to define a "professional clear" document and proposed subsection (y) defines "professional" and "clear" document so individuals may easily distinguish between these.
- A new form, *Application for Renewal of Document Authorizing Public School Service*, has been added. This can be found in proposed subsection (kk) and will be used to request the renewal of professional clear credentials, clear credentials, emergency 30-Day Substitute Teaching Permits, and emergency Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Permits.

80001. Definitions and Terms

The following definitions and terms are for purposes of Part Division VIII of the Title 5 California Code of Regulations, unless the term is redefined for a specific condition in a specific statute or regulation:

- (a) "Applicant" means any applicant individual applying for a credential document issued by the Commission
- (b) "Application for a credential" includes an application for a credential, an application for a renewal of a credential, an application to add new authorizations to an existing credential, or is a request to take any special action in relation to the issuance of a credential document issued by the Commission.
- (c) *"Baccalaureate or Master's Degree" means a baccalaureate or master's degree awarded by an institution of postsecondary education and that meets the criteria established by a regional accrediting body recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the United States Department of Education*
- (d) "Certificate of Eligibility" is a document issued when all document requirements have been met except the current-employment requirement.
- (c) *"Chairman Chairperson" means the Chairman of the Commission pursuant to*
- (e) *Education Code Section 44218.*
- (d) "Commission" means the Commission on Teacher Credentialing as defined in
- (f) Education Code Section 44203(a) and as constituted established under pursuant to Education Code Section 44210.
- (g) "Committee on Accreditation" means the twelve-member standing committee appointed by the Commission that has the responsibility of determining whether professional preparation institutions and programs meet the standards for initial and continuing accreditation that have been adopted by the Commission.
- (e) *"Credential Document" means any credential, life diploma, permit, certificate, or waiver or document issued by, or under the jurisdiction of, the Commission which entitles the holder thereof to perform services for which certification qualifications are required or verifies completion of specific requirements.*
- (f) "Degree" means a baccalaureate or higher degree as specified in Education Code Section 44259(a) earned through an approved college or university, regardless of its title, when the degree program contains no less subject matter preparation than a similar degree in a subject field other than professional education in the same institution.
- (g) (i) "Denial" includes the denial of either 1) all of an application for a document or 2) any portion of an application for a credential document even though the requested credential document is issued or renewed.
- (j) "Departmentalized Classroom" is one in which the teacher is assigned to instruct a group of students in a specific subject-matter area.
- (k) "Emphasis" means an area of specialization that is listed on a Multiple Subject or Single Subject Teaching Credential based on completion of a specialized program. Emphasis programs include, but are not limited to, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD), Bilingual Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD), Early Childhood Education, and Middle School.
- (l) "Employer" is the entity that contracts with or otherwise engages a holder or

applicant for the performance of educational services.

- (m) "Employing Agency" means a California public school district; county office of education; non-public, nonsectarian school or agency; state or federal agency; charter school; or private schools of equivalent status.
- (n) "Employment restriction" means a restriction placed on a document that limits employment to the employing agency that requested the document.
- (h) "Executive Secretary Director" means the Executive Secretary Director to the Commission pursuant to Education Code Section 44220.
- (o)
- (p) "Expiration date" means the last date the document is valid.
- (q) "Full-time experience" means serving a minimum of 4 hours a day, unless the minimum statutory attendance requirement for the student served is less. Experience must be on a daily basis and for at least 75% of the school year. Experience may be accrued in increments of a minimum of one semester. An individual may not be credited with more than one year from any school year.
- (r) "Grade of C or better" in an A through F grading pattern includes grades "Pass", "Credit", and "Satisfactory".
- (i)
- (s) "Issuance" means the granting of a credential document based upon completing the requirements and applying application for or renewal of that credential the document.
- (t) "Issue date" and "issuance date" mean the beginning validity date listed on a document.
- (u) "Life documents" are documents that were issued for the life of the holder, unless otherwise revoked, and do not require renewal.
- (v) "Non-public, nonsectarian school or agency" means a private school or agency granted non-public school or agency status by the California Department of Education.
- (w) "Non-remedial coursework" or "college-level coursework" for other than child development permits means coursework taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and applicable towards a baccalaureate or higher degree. "Non-remedial coursework" or "college-level coursework" for the child development permits means coursework taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and applicable towards an associate or higher degree.
- (x) "Private schools of equivalent status" are schools determined by the California Department of Education to be comparable to the public schools; serve pupils of the same age group as the public schools; follow a secular curriculum; follow a public school time schedule; and serve a diverse group of students.
- (y) *"Professional" or "clear" document means a teaching or service document for which all statutory and regulatory requirements have been met and issued with no further academic requirements, including professional growth and experience, needed for renewal.*
- (k) "Professional" credential means a credential for which all statutory and regulatory requirements have been met, excluding credentials issued on partial, preliminary, or emergency bases. A "clear" credential means a professional credential as herein defined.
- (z) *"Professional clear" document means a teaching or service document issued with professional growth requirements needed for renewal.*
- (aa) "Professional growth" means the activities that contribute to a document holder's competence, performance or effectiveness in the profession of education.
- (bb) "Professional preparation program" means either a set of courses including supervised field experience, or an equivalent alternative program, that provide a curriculum of systematic preparation for serving as an educator in California public schools (preschool, K-12, and programs for adults).
- (cc) One "quarter unit" equals two-thirds of a semester unit.
- (dd) "Regionally accredited institution of higher education" means an institution of postsecondary education accredited by a regional accrediting body recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the United States Department of Education. In California the regional accrediting body is the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).
- (ee) "School year" means a minimum of 175 days of service unless otherwise defined by the school district.
- (ff) "Self-Contained Classroom" is one in which all, or most, subjects are taught to one group of students by a single teacher.

- (gg) "Term of a document" means the period of validity of the document.
- (j) *"Vice-Chairman Vice-Chair" means the Vice-Chairman Vice-Chair to of the Commission.*
- (hh) *Application for Character and Identification Clearance* (form 41-CIC, rev XX/XX) is the form that must be submitted when professional fitness clearance is required.
- (jj) *Application for Document Authorizing Public School Service* (form 41-4, rev. XX/XX) is the form used to request the issuance of a document other than the Certificate of Clearance, waivers, replacements, duplicates, and name changes.
- (kk) *Application for Renewal of Document Authorizing Public School Service (form 41-REN, rev. XX/XX) is the form used to request the renewal of professional clear credentials, clear credentials, emergency 30-Day Substitute Teaching Permits, and emergency Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Permits.*
- (ll) *Declaration of Change of Name* (form CL-541, rev. XX/XX) is the form used to request the change of the document holder's name on a document.
- (mm) *Request for Duplicate or Replacement Document* (form CL-566, rev. XX/XX) is the form used to request a duplicate or replacement of a document.
- (nn) *Variable Term Waiver Request* (form WV1, rev. XX/XX) is the form used to request the waiver of any requirements for a document.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Section 44267.5 44225, Education Code. (Filed 7-25-83; effective thirtieth day thereafter; Register 83, No. 30).



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to September 1999](#)
[Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: C&CA-2

Committee: Credentials and Certificated Assignments

Title: Performance Measures for the Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division in the CCTC Strategic Plan

✓ Report

Prepared by: Donald Currier, Director
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

Report on Standards of Service for the Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

SUMMARY

According to the Legislative Analyst Office Report during the budget cycle 1999-2000, the Certification, Assignment and Waivers (CAW) Division has had a significant increase in workload over the past few years. The response to this increase in workload has been to use existing resources, in combination with increased staff, to cope with the additional load. This strategy has caused the CAW Division to focus on internal needs, rather than the needs of those we serve.

During the past six months, the staff in the CAW Division has made every effort to become customer focused and customer driven. Our goal has been to be more responsive to those who rely on us to perform our core functions. Our core functions are listed below. We have adopted the strategy of quality customer service by using technology and reorganization to increase our level of customer service.

FISCAL IMPACT

The strategy of quality customer service will not necessarily reap immediate or even long term cost savings, nor can it be expected to result in the reduction of staff. Employment of new technology and reallocation of staff will result in an increase in customer service and satisfaction.

BACKGROUND

Core Functions of CAW

1. To distribute accurate information in a timely manner to our customers (applicants, institutions of higher education, county offices of education, and local school districts).
2. To process Credential Applications accurately and within the time frame necessary to meet our customers' needs.
3. To process and thoroughly analyze waiver and appeal requests for timely submission to the Commission.
4. To monitor the assignments of teachers in public schools.

Standards of Service

In order to ensure we are performing our core functions in a way that meets the needs of our customers, we met with and discussed our performance with a variety of stakeholders. We intend to periodically validate our findings with customer surveys.

The standards of service listed below, and grouped by each of our core functions, have been developed in order to assist our staff to stay focused on the needs of our customers. Although we have been meeting most of the standards listed below with some regularity, we do not expect to consistently meet all standards of service until we have fully implemented all of the strategies listed.

Information Distribution

1. Callers will wait "on hold" no more than 5 minutes.
2. Callers will receive accurate information from courteous operators.
3. Faxes will be answered within 24 hours.
4. E-mail will be answered within 48 hours.
5. Postal mail will be answered within 2 weeks.
6. Applicants who use the public counter will be served promptly, but in all cases within 20 minutes.
7. Callers will incur no toll charges when calling the Commission for information.

Credential Processing

1. First time applicants who apply directly to the Commission will have their applications processed within 30 working days.
2. Renewals will be processed within 10 working days.
3. All other applications will be processed within 60 working days (if the application is not processed within 75 working days, the fees will be returned upon demand [5 CCR 80443]).
4. Applicants will have convenient payment options available when submitting their application.

Appeals and Waivers

1. Waivers will continue to be processed in a way that separates procedural issues from policy issues.
2. Staff will continue to present timely analyses that assist the Commission with preserving high teaching standards while balancing the need for local school districts to cope with the statewide teacher shortage.

Assignments

Staff will continue to monitor teaching assignments in accordance with relevant regulatory requirements.

Strategies for Meeting Standards of Service

Information Distribution

1. Only experienced Certification Officers will answer questions from the general public.
2. Certification Officers will work no more than 4.5 hours on each phone shift.
3. Telephone banks will be fully staffed at all times during the business day.
4. Implementation of a toll-free phone number.
5. Implementation of a new interactive voice response (IVR) phone system that will provide for increased call volume and allow callers to check on the status of their credential by phone, quickly, without speaking with an operator.

Credential Processing

1. The CAW Division will be brought to full staffing.
2. Technology solutions will be maximized to increase efficiency of existing staff.
3. Desktop computers, e-mail, and faster access to the Computer Automated System (CAS) have been implemented.
4. Paperless workflow and archiving solutions are being explored.
5. CAW will redesign and simplify the forms used for application and renewal.
6. Self-verification will replace submission of Professional Development Documents.

7. Renewal forms will be sorted from initial applications and processed separately.
 8. Certification Officers will be reclassified to ensure greater flexibility in work assignments.
-



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to September 1999](#)
[Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-1

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs by Colleges and Universities and Designated Subjects Preparation Programs by Local Education Agencies

✓ Action

Prepared by: Larry Birch, Ed.D., Administrator
Professional Services Division

Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs by Colleges and Universities and Designated Subjects Preparation Programs by Local Education Agencies

Professional Services Division
August 16, 1999

Executive Summary

This item contains a listing of subject matter programs recommended for approval by the appropriate review panels, according to procedures adopted by the Commission and Designated Subjects preparation programs recommended for approval by Commission staff, according to procedures adopted by the Commission.

Fiscal Impact Summary

The Professional Services Division is responsible for reviewing proposed preparation programs, consulting with external reviewers, as needed, and communicating with institutions and local education agencies about their program proposals. The Commission budget supports the costs of these activities. No augmentation of the budget will be needed for continuation of the program review and approval activities.

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the credential preparation programs recommended in this item.

I. Subject Matter Preparation Program Review Panel Recommendations

Background

Subject Matter Program Review Panels are responsible for the review of proposed subject matter preparation programs. This item contains a listing of subject matter programs recommended for approval since the last Commission meeting by the appropriate review panels, according to procedures adopted by the Commission.

A. Summary Information on Single Subject Matter Preparation Programs Awaiting Commission Approval

For the following proposed preparation programs, each institution has responded fully to the Commission's standards and preconditions for subject matter preparation for Single Subject Teaching Credentials. Each of the programs has been reviewed thoroughly by the Commission's Subject Matter Program Review Panels, and has met all applicable standards

and preconditions established by the Commission and are recommended for approval by the appropriate subject matter review panel.

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the following programs of subject matter preparation for Single Subject Teaching Credentials.

Art

- San Jose State University

English

- University of California, Riverside

Languages Other Than English

- California State University, Fresno (Spanish)

Mathematics

- University of California, Santa Cruz
- Whittier College

Music

- University of Redlands
- University of Southern California

B. Summary Information on Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs Awaiting Commission Approval

For the following proposed preparation program, the institution has responded fully to the Commission's standards and preconditions for subject matter preparation for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials. The program has been reviewed thoroughly by the Commission's Elementary Subject Matter Program Review Panel, and has met all applicable standards and preconditions established by the Commission and is recommended for approval by the appropriate subject matter review panel.

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the following program of elementary subject matter preparation for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials.

Elementary Subject Matter Preparation

- California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Gender, Ethnicity and Multicultural Studies; Pre-Credential Option

II. Designated Subjects Personalized Preparation Program Recommendation

Background

Commission staff is responsible for the review of proposed Designated Subjects personalized preparation programs, consulting with external reviewers, as needed. This item contains one Designated Subjects personalized preparation program submitted by the Fresno County Office of Education.

Summary Information on Designated Subjects Personalized Preparation Program Awaiting Commission Approval

The Fresno County Office of Education has responded fully to the Commission's standards and preconditions for Designated Subjects personalized preparation programs for Supervision and Coordination. The program has been reviewed thoroughly by Commission staff, and has met all applicable standards and preconditions established by the Commission and is recommended for approval by the Commission.

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the following program of personalized preparation for the Designated Subjects Teaching Credential proposed by the Fresno County Office of Education.

- Designated Subjects Supervision and Coordination Credential

| [Back to the Top](#) |

| [Back to September 1999](#)

[Agenda](#) |

| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |

| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-2

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Fourth Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation and Recommended Minor Change in the Implementation of the *Accreditation Framework*

- ✓ Action
- ✓ Information

Prepared by: Larry Birch, Ed.D., Administrator
Professional Services Division

Fourth Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation and Recommended Minor Change in the Implementation of the Accreditation Framework

Professional Services Division
August 16, 1999

Executive Summary

This agenda report includes the *Fourth Annual Accreditation Report* to the Commission by the Committee on Accreditation. As required by Education Code §44373 and the *Accreditation Framework*, the *Annual Report* summarizes the accomplishments, activities and plans of the Committee on Accreditation. Accomplishments during the past year (1998-1999) are described in the context of its workplan. Plans for next year (1999-2000) are presented as a proposed workplan for the Committee. Finally, for discussion and action by the Commission, a recommended minor change in the implementation of the *Accreditation Framework* is proposed.

Fiscal Impact Analysis

In accordance with the *Accreditation Framework*, the expenses of the Committee on Accreditation are the responsibility of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The budget for the Professional Services Division includes funds to offset the expenditures of the Committee on Accreditation, its assigned staff, and the accreditation system that the Committee oversees. Completion of the Committee's proposed workplan for 1999-2000 will not require an augmentation of the budget or a redirection of resources from another function of the Commission.

Recommendation

On behalf of the Committee on Accreditation, the staff recommends that the Commission receive the *Fourth Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation (August, 1999). Further staff recommends that the Commission choose one of the options presented for the selection of the Nominating Panel for the appointment and reappointment of members of the Committee on Accreditation.

Background Information about the COA and Its Responsibilities Under Law

The Commission is currently implementing the provisions of Senate Bill 655, which was sponsored by the Commission and

authored by Senator Marian Bergeson in 1993. In this legislation, the Commission proposed to change the system of quality assurance in educator preparation. The Commission recommended that the new system should "concentrate on the overall quality of educator preparation in credential programs" (Education Code Section 44371). This proposal was intended to separate the system of professional quality assurance from the regulatory procedures and compliance mechanisms that are commonly associated with government agencies.

To make the quality assurance system more "professional" and less "governmental," the Commission proposed to change the way in which educator preparation programs are governed. Specifically, the Commission proposed to "hold professional elementary, secondary, and postsecondary educators responsible for quality in the preparation of professional practitioners" (Education Code Section 44371). To establish a heightened sense of professional responsibility for quality, the Commission proposed to establish a new "professional jury of peers" to manage the accreditation of educator preparation programs.

The 1993 Commission recommended that a new Committee on Accreditation consist of twelve professional educators who would be selected by the Commission "for their distinguished records of accomplishment in education" (Education Code Section 44373). When Governor Wilson signed SB 655, it required that the following responsibilities be delegated to the new Committee on Accreditation.

The Committee shall . . . make decisions about the accreditation of educator preparation. The Committee's decision making process shall be in accordance with the *Accreditation Framework* adopted by the Commission.

The Committee shall . . . make decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation in accordance with procedures established by the Committee.

The Committee shall . . . determine the comparability of standards submitted by applicants with those adopted by the Commission, in accordance with the *Accreditation Framework*.

The Committee shall . . . adopt guidelines for accreditation reviews, and (shall) monitor the performance of accreditation teams and other aspects of the accreditation system.

The Committee shall . . . present an annual accreditation report to the Commission and respond to accreditation issues and concerns referred to the Committee by the Commission.

In drafting SB 655, the Commission wanted to establish a "professional jury of educators" who would be *responsible* for enforcing the Commission's standards, and who would hold colleges and universities *accountable* to these standards. At the same time, the Commission wanted the new Committee to be accountable to the Commission, primarily in the form of "an annual accreditation report to the Commission."

Overview of the Committee's Annual Report

The *Fourth Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation (attached) focuses on the Committee's major efforts during 1998-1999 to accomplish its primary responsibility under law: "make decisions about the accreditation of educators preparation." The *Report* reviews the Committee's implementation of that function in the accreditation visits conducted during the year.

The *Accreditation Report* also includes information about the Committee's second area of legal authority: "make decisions about the initial accreditation of new programs of educator preparation." The *Report* includes specific information about the Committee's decisions during 1998-1999 to grant initial accreditation to new programs of professional preparation, primarily in the areas of Multiple and Single Subject Programs and Education Specialist Credential Programs.

The *Accreditation Report* also presents a report on the 1998-1999 workplan for the Committee on Accreditation and a proposed workplan for 1999-2000. Summary information is given in the *Report* about each institutional accreditation report and subsequent Committee on Accreditation action. Also included are all initial program accreditation actions of the Committee and all other accreditation actions.

On September 2, the *Fourth Annual Accreditation Report* will be presented to the Commission by the two Committee on Accreditation Co-Chairs for 1998-1999, Anthony Aviña and Randall Souviney. After presenting the report to the Preparation Standards Committee, the two representatives of the Committee will be available to answer questions about the work of the Committee on Accreditation.

Recommended Minor Change in the Implementation of the Accreditation Framework - Proposed Modification of Procedure and Timeline for Nomination of Candidates for Appointment and Reappointment to the Committee on Accreditation

Overview

In July 2000, the Commission will conduct interviews and reappoint or appoint members to six Committee on Accreditation vacancies. The procedures for nomination and selection of committee members require considerable advance planning. In order to proceed in a timely and efficient manner, this item is being presented to the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation to receive early approval. Staff proposes that the Commission consider a modification of the procedures for nomination of candidates for appointment and reappointment to the Committee on Accreditation.

Provisions of the Accreditation Framework

According to the *Accreditation Framework* (Section 1 C 1), one of the responsibilities of the Commission related to the Committee on Accreditation is to "Establish a Nominating Panel - In collaboration with the Accreditation Advisory Council and subsequently with the Committee on Accreditation, the Commission establishes a Nominating Panel to solicit and screen nominations and recommend educators to serve on the Committee on Accreditation."

Another section of the *Framework* (Section 2 C 1), states that "A Nominating Panel of six distinguished members of the education profession in California identifies and nominates individuals to serve on the Committee on Accreditation. The Nominating Panel is comprised of three college and university members and three elementary and secondary members. The Commission and the Accreditation Advisory Panel must reach consensus on the members of the initial Nominating Panel. Subsequently, the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation will reach consensus on new members of the Nominating Panel. The terms of Nominating Panel members are four years long. Members of the Panel may not serve more than one term."

Procedures Previously Used for Selection of the Nominating Panel

For the initial selection of the Committee on Accreditation and the subsequent two elections, a joint committee was appointed consisting of Commission members and Committee on Accreditation members to select a six member Nominating Panel to screen nominations for the Committee on Accreditation. The joint committee consisted of 8 persons, four Commissioners and four Committee on Accreditation members. The group held one meeting and participated in mail and telephone follow-up to make its final selections. The joint committee, through a brainstorming process developed a large list of distinguished individuals from the two segments --elementary and secondary educators and postsecondary educators. The committee then voted in successive rounds until the desired number of members was achieved. Once the selections were made, staff contacted those selected to see if they would be willing to serve. Alternates were also selected so that staff could contact them in case those originally selected would not be willing or able to serve. The members selected by the joint committee were truly distinguished educators, however the process in selecting them was quite complicated.

Once the Nominating Panel members agreed to serve, staff was then required to coordinate the calendars of these very busy people to arrange for meetings of the Panel to accomplish its task of screening the nominations for the Committee on Accreditation. For two out of the three elections held, it was very difficult to find times for all of the members of the Nominating Panel to meet together. In fact, in one of the years, the business of the panel had to take place by mail and by telephone. In only one of the three election years did the Nominating Panel meeting process take place in an efficient manner. The four year terms of all six members of the Nominating Panel have expired. Panel members may not serve for a second term. Thus, it is necessary to select six new members for the Nominating Panel. Because of prior difficulties in the procedures for selecting the Panel, the Commission may wish to modify the selection procedures for the panel.

Alternative Selection Procedures for New Nominating Panel Members

The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation could decide to continue the prior practice for selection of the Nominating Panel. An eight member joint committee could be established and follow the procedures described above that were used in previous years.

However, the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation might wish to continue to select a distinguished Nominating Panel, but to improve on the efficiency of the process by approving a modification of the selection process. The modification would need to be consistent with the *Accreditation Framework*, but could be more efficient in the use of Commission member and Committee on Accreditation member time. The *Framework* does not specify how the Nominating Panel is to be selected but it requires the Commission, in collaboration with the Committee on Accreditation to establish the panel. Further, the two bodies are to reach consensus on new members of the Nominating Panel. Again, the *Framework* does not specify how. The primary responsibility of the Nominating Panel is to read and evaluate the nomination materials of those responding to the Commission's request for nominations. The Panel then, in a one day meeting, screens the nominations and recommends two nominations to the Commission for each vacancy on the Committee on Accreditation. At a later date, the Commission interviews the finalists and selects the members for the Committee on Accreditation.

As an alternative procedure to the one previously used, the Executive Director of the Commission could invite the President of the University of California, the Chancellor of the California State University, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities to select two distinguished representatives from each respective system to be considered as members of the Nominating Panel. The prospective panel members selected would have agreed to read and evaluate the nomination materials provided for them and to attend a one day meeting (with date and location specified) to make the final selections. In like manner, the President of the California Federation of Teachers, the President of the California Teachers Association and the President of the Association of California School Administrators would each be asked to select two distinguished representatives from their organizations. A joint committee of two Commissioners (one from elementary/secondary education and one from post-secondary education) and two Committee on Accreditation members (one from elementary and secondary education and one from post-secondary education) would then select the six members for the Nominating Panel from among the twelve named. These six members would be appointed to four year terms on the Nominating Panel.

As another alternative procedure, the Executive Director of the Commission could invite the President of the University of California, the Chancellor of the California State University, and the President of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities to select one distinguished representative (and an alternate representative) from each respective system to serve on the Nominating Panel. The prospective panel members selected would have agreed to read and evaluate the nomination materials sent to them and to attend a one day meeting (with date and location specified) to make

the final selections. In like manner, the President of the California Federation of Teachers, the President of the California Teachers Association and the President of the Association of California School Administrators would also be asked to select a distinguished representative (and an alternate representative) from their organization. These six members would be appointed to four year terms on the Nominating Panel. This option would not require the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation to form a joint committee, since the two bodies would have agreed on the process to be used to select the Nominating Committee.

Options for Selection of Nominating Panel

Option 1 --Continue the prior practice --A joint committee of four Commissioners and four Committee on Accreditation members would develop a list of potential Nominating Panel members and select the panel from that list.

Advantages - This procedure is consistent with the *Accreditation Framework*, and produces a comprehensive list of potential Panel members judged to be distinguished by the joint committee members.

Disadvantages - The joint committee to select the Nominating Panel is quite large and the selection process is cumbersome. In addition to the first meeting, follow-up meetings or mailings are necessary to arrive at the final list of prospective panel members. Even then, there is no assurance that any of those chosen are willing or able to serve. Once the final list of prospective panel members is developed, it is then necessary to inquire about their interest and availability to serve and then choose from among alternate selections, if those originally selected are not available.

Option 2 --Six organizations would name two distinguished representatives each. A joint committee of two Commissioners and two Committee on Accreditation members would select the six Nominating Panel members from the list of twelve named by the six organizations.

Advantages - This procedure is consistent with the *Accreditation Framework*, and produces a list of twelve potential panel members judged to be distinguished by the six organizations asked to provide representatives. The potential Nominating Panel members would have already consented to serve and would have agreed to be available for the one day meeting. The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation would achieve consensus on the new members by selecting one of the two representatives named by the organizations.

Disadvantages --Organizations may not be willing to present two potential representatives, they may prefer to select the one to serve on the panel.

Option 3 --Six organizations would name a distinguished representative and an alternate. The six representatives selected would become the Nominating Panel. The alternates would serve in the event that the representative selected would not be able to serve for some reason.

Advantages - This procedure is consistent with the *Accreditation Framework*, if the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation agree that "Consensus on new members of the Nominating Panel" could mean consensus on the process for selecting the new members, rather than on the actual members. This procedure would produce a list of six panel members judged to be distinguished by the six organizations asked to provide representatives (along with alternates). The organizations would likely prefer to name a representative to the Nominating Panel, rather than provide two or more names. The potential Nominating Panel members would have already consented to serve and agreed to be available for the one day meeting. An alternate would be available in the event that the member originally appointed is unable to serve.

Disadvantages --The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation may not feel that they have fully exercised their authority in the selection of the Nominating Panel.

Staff Recommendation --Staff recommends Option 2 or 3 because they make fewer demands upon the time of Commissioners and Committee on Accreditation members. Further, rather than having staff devote considerable time and energy to the process of selection of the Nominating Panel for screening of the nominations, more time could be devoted to the processing of the nominees for the Committee on Accreditation.

Calendar for Committee on Accreditation Election --July 2000

- Approval of the Selection Process of the Nominating Panel by the Committee on Accreditation and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing --August and September 1999.
- Appointment of the Nominating Panel --October and November 1999.
- Letter of Invitation to Submit Nominations for the Committee on Accreditation Mailed Out --six vacancies to be filled - -December 1999 to February 2000.
- Screening of the nominations and selection of the finalists by the Nominating Panel --April 2000
- Interviews of the finalists by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and election of the six members of the Committee on Accreditation --July 2000
- New Committee on Accreditation members seated --August 2000

[Click here for Table of Contents](#)





**FOURTH ANNUAL
ACCREDITATION REPORT**

By the
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

To the
**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON
TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

**Fourth Annual Accreditation Report to the
California Commission on
Teacher Credentialing**

**By the Committee
on Accreditation**

Assisted by the
**Professional Services Division
Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

**Sacramento, California
August 1999**

**Fourth Annual Accreditation Report
to the Commission by the
Committee on Accreditation**

Table of Contents

Letter of Transmittal to the Commission

The Committee on Accreditation (1998-1999)

Section I: Major Activities of the Committee on Accreditation

- (1) Election of Co-Chairs for 1998-1999
- (2) Committee Meetings During 1998-1999
- (3) Presentations by the Committee on Accreditation
- (4) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 1999-2000

Section II: Accomplishment of the Committee's Workplan in 1998-1999

- (Task 1) Create an Evaluation Plan for the *Accreditation Framework* and Secure Funding and Award Contract
- (Task 2) Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)
- (Task 3) Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs
- (Task 4) Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and Their Credential Preparation Programs
- (Task 5) Revise the *Accreditation Handbook* and Team Training Curriculum
- (Task 6) Maintain Public Access to Committee on Accreditation
- (Task 7) Receive Regular Updates on SB 2042 Advisory Panel and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation
- (Task 8) Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission
- (Task 9) Other Required Elements of the *Accreditation Framework* --Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.

Section III: Proposed Workplan for the Committee in 1999-2000

- (Task 1) Monitor the Evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework*
- (Task 2) Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)
- (Task 3) Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs
- (Task 4) Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and Their Credential Preparation Programs
- (Task 5) Revise the *Accreditation Handbook* and Team Training Curriculum
- (Task 6) Maintain Public Access to Committee on Accreditation
- (Task 7) Receive Regular Updates on SB 2042 Advisory Panel and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation
- (Task 8) Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission
- (Task 9) Other Required Elements of the *Accreditation Framework* -Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.

Section IV. Analysis of 1998-1999 Accomplishments

Appendix A: Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the Committee on Accreditation Based Upon Institutional Site Visits Conducted - 1998-1999

Appendix B: Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation - 1998-1999

Appendix C: Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation --1998-1999



(916) 323-4508 fax

COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
(916) 327-2967

July 31, 1999

Dear Commissioners:

It is with personal and professional pleasure that, on behalf of the entire Committee on Accreditation, we submit to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing the *Fourth Annual Accreditation Report* by the Committee on Accreditation in accordance with the provisions of the *Accreditation Framework*. This report presents an overview of the activities and accomplishments of the Committee in the past year and its proposed workplan for 1999-2000.

1998-1999 was the second year that the Committee fully exercised its responsibilities under the *Accreditation Framework*. Through the continued receiving of accreditation team reports and the accreditation decision-making activity, the Committee has gained a more comprehensive understanding of its work and has taken steps to enhance its procedures.

The Committee now looks forward to its third full year with operational responsibilities in 1999-2000. We have had a successful year and are confident that we have maintained the high standards set by the Commission. This report provides evidence of our preparation and our confidence.

Sincerely,

Anthony Avina
Committee Co-Chair

Randall Souviney
Committee Co-Chair

The Committee on Accreditation July 1999

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Sacramento, California

- **Anthony Avina**, COA Co-Chair
Superintendent
Whittier Union High School District
- **Carol Barnes**, Professor
Elementary, Bilingual & Reading Ed
California State University, Fullerton
- **Diane Cordero de Noriega**, Dean
College of Education
California State University, Sacramento
- **Sandy Fleishman**, Teacher Grades 4-5
Yerba Buena Elementary School
Las Virgenes Unified School District
- **Irvin Howard**, Professor
School of Education
Calif. State University, San Bernardino
- **Kim Lindley**, Director
Staff Development
Capistrano Unified School District
- **Bonnie Maspero**, Administrator
Educational Services
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified Sch. Dist.
- **Susan Seamans**, Coordinator
BTSA Programs
Tehama County Office of Education
- **Randall Souviney**, COA Co-Chair
Co-Director - Teacher Educ. Program
University of California, San Diego
- **Catherine Sumpter**, Principal
Bret Harte Middle School
Los Angeles Unified School District
- **Sue Teele**, Director
Education Extension
University of California, Riverside
- **Sally Thomas**, Director
Teacher Education Internship Program
Claremont Graduate University

Committee Support Staff (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing)

- **Dennis S. Tierney**, Director, Professional Services Division
- **Larry Birch**, Administrator of Accreditation, Professional Services Division
- **Philip A. Fitch**, Consultant, Professional Services Division
- **Shari Cooley**, Office Technician, Professional Services Division

Section I. Major Activities of the Committee on Accreditation

This section of the Annual Report provides specific information about the principal activities of the Committee on Accreditation. In addition, information is provided about the meetings of the COA and its presentations during the year. Finally, the meeting schedule and proposed workplan for 1999-2000 are provided.

(1) Election of Co-Chairs for 1998-1999

In its inaugural year of operation, the Committee agreed that Co-Chairs (one from postsecondary education and one from K-12 education) would be elected annually. In August of 1998, the Committee elected Anthony Avina and Randall Souviney to serve as Co-chairs during the 1998-1999 academic year.

(2) Committee Meetings During 1998-1999

In accordance with the duties assigned to the Committee on Accreditation and its adopted workplan for 1998-1999, the Committee on Accreditation held the following meetings. The Committee held either one-day or two-day meetings, depending on the amount of business before the body.

August 27, 1998	Riverboat Delta King, Sacramento, CA
October 28-29, 1998*	Shelter Pointe Hotel and Marina, San Diego, CA
January 28-29, 1999	Hawthorn Suites, Sacramento, CA
March 17-18, 1999*	Hotel De Anza, San Jose, CA
April 29-30, 1999	Commission Offices, Sacramento, CA
May 27-28, 1999	Commission Offices, Sacramento, CA
June 24-25, 1999	Commission Offices, Sacramento, CA

* These meetings were held in conjunction with the Fall and Spring Conferences, respectively, of the California Council on the Education of Teachers, State of California Association of Teacher Educators and California Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

(3) Presentations by the Committee on Accreditation

The Committee continued to make presentations about its activities, in order to make accurate accreditation information available to the education community. The Committee sought opportunities to present its work at appropriate occasions. In 1998-1999, the Committee made presentations at the following events.

California Council on the Education of Teachers, October, 1998
Credential Counselors and Analysts of California, October, 1998
California Council on the Education of Teachers, March, 1999

In addition to these presentations, the Committee on Accreditation has also taken advantage of the web-site operated by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. There is a separate "web page" devoted to accreditation activities and documents.

(4) Schedule of Committee Meetings for 1999-2000

August 26, 1999	Commission Offices, Sacramento, CA
October 27-28, 1999*	Shelter Pointe Hotel, San Diego, CA
January 20-21, 2000	Commission Offices, Sacramento, CA
March 22-23, 2000*	Hotel DeAnza, San Jose, CA
April 27-28, 2000	Commission Offices, Sacramento, CA
May 25-26, 2000	Commission Offices, Sacramento, CA
June 29-30, 2000	Commission Offices, Sacramento, CA

* To be held in conjunction with the Fall and Spring Conferences of the California Council on the Education of Teachers, State of California Association of Teacher Educators and California Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Section II. Accomplishment of the Committee's Workplan in 1998-1999

On August 27, 1998, the Committee on Accreditation adopted its workplan for 1998-1999. The Committee's elected Co-Chairs presented this workplan to the Commission one month later. The nine items that follow represent the key elements of the 1998-1999 workplan for the Committee on Accreditation. It includes a detailed explanation of each task and its current status.

(Task 1) Create an Evaluation Plan for the *Accreditation Framework* and Secure Funding and Award Contract

The *Accreditation Framework* calls for an outside evaluator to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the *Framework* over a four-year period beginning with the first official accreditation visits. The development of the plan for external evaluation of the *Accreditation Framework* was begun in 1996-1997, but this task was carried over until the necessary funding was appropriated and will continue for four years in accordance with the *Framework* requirements. The funding for the evaluation was part of the Commission's 1998-1999 budget and carries forward for three years. The proposed Evaluation Plan was reviewed by the Committee on Accreditation and recommended to the Commission for approval. The Commission approved the Evaluation Plan and staff has prepared and distributed a Request for Proposals to interested organizations. A three year contract will be awarded to the successful bidder.

(Task 2) Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected National Organizations (including NCATE)

The Committee has negotiated formal memoranda of understanding with national professional education organizations over the past two years. A Partnership Agreement has also been signed with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. These memoranda govern the portion of the *Accreditation Framework* that permits national accreditation of credential programs to substitute for state accreditation of those programs. The Committee monitors the ongoing implementation of these agreements and evaluates their effectiveness. The Committee reviewed the standards of national professional education organizations and determined that some should be reviewed for comparability to California standards. The task will be accomplished in the 1999-2000 year. A status report on the partnership with NCATE was given by NCATE staff at the June meeting. Proposed new accreditation standards of NCATE were discussed with the COA at the same meeting.

(Task 3) Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs

This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The Committee has developed a procedure for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs are not given initial accreditation until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's program standards are met.

During the 1998-1999 year, the following number of programs were given initial accreditation:

Administrative Services Credential Programs	6
Education Specialist Credentials and in Special Education and Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credentials	45
Multiple and Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Credential Programs and Internship Programs	28
Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs	2
Adapted Physical Education Programs	4
Non-University Professional Development Programs for the Professional Administrative Services Credentials	1
Multiple Subject Credential Programs for the Accreditation Pilot Project	8

A detailed listing of the programs granted initial accreditation is included in Appendix B.

(Task 4) Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and Their Credential Preparation Programs

This is the principal ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. The Committee on Accreditation concluded its second year of full responsibility to make the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of postsecondary education institutions and their credential programs. This task continues to make up the major portion of the March through June agendas of the Committee on Accreditation. During the 1998-1999 year, there were twelve accreditation visits to colleges and universities. A total of 106 accreditation team members participated in the visits. Following is the list of institutions and the accreditation status given by the Committee on Accreditation:

1998-1999 Accreditation Visits

Institution	Accreditation Decision
• Biola University	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations
• Christian Heritage College	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations
• California State University, Sacramento	Accreditation
• Fresno Pacific University	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations
• John F. Kennedy University	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations
• National Hispanic University	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations
• Santa Clara University	Accreditation with Technical Stipulations
• St. Mary's College of California	Accreditation
• University of California, Santa Barbara	Accreditation
• University of La Verne	Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations
• Whittier College	Accreditation

A more detailed report of each accreditation visit is included in Appendix A. For each institution, the introduction to the accreditation team report is presented, followed by the COA accreditation decision, the list of all credential programs authorized for the institution, any stipulations given by the Committee on Accreditation and the date of the next accreditation visit.

In addition to the above accreditation visits, the Committee on Accreditation conducted three accreditation re-visits and received follow-up information from other institutions who received stipulations in the 1996-1997 accreditation cycle or those who required some specific accreditation action. A summary of those accreditation actions is included in Appendix C.

(Task 5) Revise the *Accreditation Handbook* and Team Training Curriculum

The Committee on Accreditation is committed to continuous improvement in the accreditation process. Each year, the Committee reviews the *Accreditation Handbook* and its training curriculum to ensure that it provides accurate and useful information to its clients. During the 1998-1999 year, the Committee on Accreditation evaluated the accreditation decision-making process of the prior accreditation cycle. As a result, some minor modifications in accreditation procedures are being included in the revisions being made in the *Accreditation Handbook* and the BIR Team Training Curriculum.

(Task 6) Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation

The Committee made a formal presentation at the annual conference of the California Credential Analysts and scheduled its October and March meetings in conjunction with the Fall and Spring conferences of the California Council on the Education of Teachers. Throughout the year, individual members of the COA have made informal reports about the Committee at various professional meetings around the state. The Committee on Accreditation now has its own web page on the Commission's website.

(Task 7) Receive Regular Updates on SB 2042 Advisory Panel and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation

The Committee believes that the work of the SB 2042 Advisory Panel will have significant implications for its work in accreditation. Thus, it was regularly apprised of the progress of the panel throughout the year. The Committee also received reports on legislation, the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program, the pre-intern program, district internship programs, the reciprocity study (SB1620-Scott), the report of the technology advisory panel, and the pilot accreditation study (SB 2730-Mazzoni).

(Task 8) Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission

The Committee on Accreditation adopted its Fourth Annual Accreditation Report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at its August 1999 meeting. It was scheduled for presentation at the September meeting.

(Task Other Required Elements of the Accreditation Framework - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, 9) Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.

Each year, the Committee must elect Co-Chairs, adopt a meeting schedule, orient new members, prepare reports to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and review and modify its own procedures manual. In August 1998, the Co-Chairs were elected. The schedule of meetings was adopted in May 1999. The orientation of members elected in July 1998 was conducted prior to the August COA meeting, continued at the August meeting and concluded at the October meeting with the presentation of a simulated team report and subsequent Committee discussion and action.

Throughout the year, the Committee considered new and revised accreditation procedures for various circumstances. The Committee adopted procedures for the approval of blended programs of subject matter and professional preparation. The Committee recommended procedures for the initial accreditation of institutions to the Commission for subsequent adoption. The Committee discussed and adopted procedures to follow in the implementation of the Accreditation Pilot Project (SB 2730-Mazzoni). Accreditation procedures were adopted for District Internship Programs and for Non-University Programs of Professional Development for the Professional Administrative Services Credential.

Section III. Proposed Workplan for the Committee in 1999-2000

The items that follow represent the key elements of the 1999-2000 workplan for the Committee on Accreditation. As the Committee has moved into the implementation phase of the accreditation system, ongoing tasks make up a major part of the work and the oversight of the COA, rather than the development of policies and procedures. The nature of the workplan has gradually been shifting in that direction for the past two years.

(Task 1) Monitor the Evaluation of the Accreditation Framework

The *Accreditation Framework* calls for an outside evaluator to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the *Framework* over a four-year period beginning with the first official accreditation visits. The Commission and the Committee on Accreditation developed a plan for the evaluation and a Request for Proposals was approved by the Commission. Once the contractor is selected, the COA will assist in the gathering of data and monitor the progress of the evaluation. Regular reports will be made to the COA and the Commission in the spring of 2000, 2001 and 2002 with the final report due by December 2002.

(Task Monitor the Implementation of and Evaluate the Effectiveness of Accreditation Agreements with Selected 2) National Organizations (including NCATE)

The Committee has negotiated formal memoranda of understanding with national professional education organizations over the past two years. A Partnership Agreement has also been signed with the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. These memoranda govern the portion of the *Accreditation Framework* that permits national accreditation of credential programs to substitute for state accreditation of those programs. The Committee must now monitor the ongoing implementation of these agreements and evaluate their effectiveness. During the next year, the COA will conduct comparability studies of state and national standards in reading, special education and library media. Initial steps in the review and modification of the partnership with NCATE will be undertaken, since the partnership must be renewed in October, 2000.

(Task 3) Review and Initial Accreditation of New Credential Programs

This is one of the principal ongoing tasks of the Committee on Accreditation. The Committee has developed a procedure for handling the submission of proposed credential programs. Some of the decisions are made on the basis of expert review panel recommendations and some are made on the basis of staff recommendations. In all cases, programs are not given initial accreditation until the reviewers have determined that all of the Commission's program standards are met.

(Task Professional Accreditation of Institutions of Postsecondary Education and Their Credential Preparation 4) Programs

This is the principal ongoing task of the Committee on Accreditation. Effective September 1, 1997, the Committee on Accreditation assumed full responsibility to make the legal decisions regarding the continuing professional education accreditation of postsecondary education institutions and their credential programs. This task continues to make up the major portion of the March through June agendas of the Committee on Accreditation. During the 1999-2000 year, there are fourteen accreditation visits to colleges and universities and three accreditation visits to district internship programs. The following is a list of institutions and district internship programs to be visited.

Institutional Reviews

California Baptist University
California Lutheran University *
California State University, Fresno *
California State University, San Marcos *
Chapman University
Concordia University

Master's College
Occidental College
Pacific Union College
Pepperdine University
Point Loma Nazarene University
San Francisco State University *
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Santa Cruz

* Merged COA/NCATE Visit

District Internship Reviews

Compton Unified School District
Los Angeles Unified School District
Ontario-Montclair School District

In addition to the above accreditation visits, the Committee on Accreditation will continue to receive follow-up information from the seven institutions who received stipulations in the 1999-2000 accreditation cycle, including three re-visits. Actions will be taken to remove stipulations, approve the withdrawal of programs and to change the accreditation status of institutions, based upon the removal of stipulations.

(Task 5) Revise the *Accreditation Handbook* and Team Training Curriculum

The Committee on Accreditation is committed to continuous improvement in the accreditation process. Each year, the Committee reviews the *Accreditation Handbook* and its training curriculum to ensure that it provides accurate and useful information to its clients. Minor modifications of accreditation procedures are incorporated into the accreditation process and the training curriculum as they occur. A complete revision of the *Accreditation Handbook* will be prepared during the 1999-2000 year.

(Task 6) Maintain Public Access to the Committee on Accreditation

The Committee will continue to seek opportunities to make presentations to professional organizations. Written materials/publications will be developed when possible to carry this task forward. Individual committee members will be available to assist in the process.

(Task 7) Receive Regular Updates on SB 2042 Advisory Panel and Other Commission Activities Related to Accreditation

The Committee believes that the work of the SB 2042 Advisory Panel will have significant implications for its work in accreditation. Thus, it will be regularly receiving reports of the panel's activities. The Committee will also be receiving information related to other Commission activities related to accreditation issues.

(Task 8) Preparation and Presentation of COA Reports to the Commission

Each year the Committee on Accreditation presents its annual report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing at its August or September meeting. Interim reports to the Commission will be made as needed.

(Task 9) Other Required Elements of the Accreditation Framework - Election of Co-Chairs, Adopt Meeting Schedule, Orient New Members, On-Going Review of Accreditation Process and Procedures, etc.

Each year, the Committee elect Co-Chairs, adopts a meeting schedule, orients new members, and modifies its own procedures manual. In the process of the ongoing accreditation reports and discussions, the Committee is conducting an on-going review of the Accreditation process. As a result of those discussions, the Committee modifies and adopts accreditation procedures, as necessary.

Section IV. Analysis of 1998-1999 Accomplishments

The 1998-1999 year was important in the life of the Committee on Accreditation. After a full year receiving accreditation team reports and making accreditation decisions (1997-1998), the Committee reflected at a number of its meetings about ways to improve the accreditation decision-making process. The Committee decided to continue a practice initiated during its first year, of devoting part of each meeting to a de-briefing discussion of the accreditation decision-making process, after action was taken on each institution. The discussions have continued to be very helpful to the Committee in "fine tuning" the accreditation procedures.

The Committee believes that it has made very good progress in its second full year of responsibility. In addition to hearing and acting upon eleven accreditation team reports, the COA made initial accreditation decisions for 92 professional preparation programs, mostly in special education, multiple and single subject and school administration. The Committee was responsible for conducting a training sessions for new members of the Board of Institutional Reviewers. In summary,

APPENDIX A

Continuing Accreditation Decisions Made by the Committee on Accreditation Based Upon Institutional Site Visits Conducted 1998-1999

Introduction

Following is a summary of the continuing accreditation decisions made by the Committee on Accreditation during the 1998-1999 academic year, based upon team site visits. The institutions are listed in alphabetical order. For each of the thirteen institutions visited, the first part of the accreditation team report is printed. This includes the name of the institution, the dates of the visit, the accreditation team recommendation and the rationale for the recommendation. The list of team members is provided, along with a summary of the documents reviewed and the interviews conducted. This is followed by the accreditation decision made by the Committee on Accreditation.

[Biola University](#)	[Christian Heritage College](#)	[CSU, Sacramento](#)	[Fresno Pacific University](#)
[John F. Kennedy University](#)	[National Hispanic University](#)	[Santa Clara University](#)	
[St. Mary's College of California](#)	[UC Santa Barbara](#)	[University of La Verne](#)	[Whittier College](#)

Institution: Biola University

Dates of Visit: February 21-24, 1999

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

Rationale:

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that several standards in both Common and Program sections were worthy of being noted in areas of strength and in some cases, areas of concern. Although some areas of concern were noted in the team report, the overall quality of the programs mitigated some of the concerns. After thorough discussion, the team decided to recommend the status of "**Accreditation with Technical Stipulations.**"

The recommendation for "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" was based on the unanimous agreement of the team. The team felt that the concerns were of sufficient magnitude to place four stipulations on the institution, which are noted in the team report. However, the team determined the institution is determined to have overall quality and effectiveness in its credential programs, apart from the identified technical problems. In light of its investigation the team concluded that there were not important deficiencies or areas of concern that were related to matters of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence, or the ability of the institution to deliver programs of quality and effectiveness.

The Accreditation team recommends the following stipulations:

- That the institution develop and implement a plan to organize and provide adequate faculty and staff resources to meet the needs of the growing student population.
- That the institution provide evidence that candidates and prospective candidates receive consistent and accurate information, advisement and assistance
- That the institution provide evidence that systematic procedures to monitor and evaluate faculty supervisors have been implemented and that information collected is used to guide continued improvement.
- That the institution provide evidence of a systematic procedure for developing competencies and experiences to help candidates to demonstrate skills in teaching diverse students and English language learners.

DATA SOURCES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
8	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
9	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
38	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
17	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
5	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook

10	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
1	Advisors	0	Needs Analysis Results
3	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
2	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
0	Advisory Committee	0	Schedule of Classes
7	Other Faculty	X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae

Team Leader: James Mahler, California Lutheran University

Team Member: J.L. Fortson, Pepperdine University

Team Member: Paula (Polly) Bowers, Lake Elsinore Unified School District

Team Member: Marian Reimann, Los Angeles Unified School District

Committee on Accreditation Action

(1) The Committee acted to make the following accreditation decision for Biola University and all of its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution develop and implement a plan to organize and provide adequate faculty and staff resources to meet the needs of the growing student population.
- That the institution provide evidence that candidates and prospective candidates receive consistent and accurate information, advisement and assistance.
- That the institution provide evidence that systematic procedures to monitor and evaluate faculty supervisors have been implemented and that information collected is used to guide continued improvement.
- That the institution provide evidence of a systematic procedure for developing competencies and experiences to help students demonstrate skills in teaching diverse students and English language learners.

Based on this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credentials
- Single Subject Credentials

(2) The Team recommends that Biola University provide evidence about the actions taken to respond to all of the stipulations noted above, with a focused re-visit within one year of the date of this action.

(3) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
- Biola University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Biola University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Institution: Christian Heritage College

Dates of Visits: April 11-14, 1999

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

Rationale:

The team recommends "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" based on the policies of the Accreditation Framework and the findings arrived at after reviewing the self-study, interviewing all constituencies involved, and examining other documentation provided by the college. The overall strength and effectiveness of the program, confirmed by participants and employees of graduates, ameliorates the concerns which were raised. The team analyzed the concerns in conjunction with the program as a whole to come to unanimous agreement that they did not affect the overall high quality of the program. Concerns which the team members considered relevant to the overall effectiveness of the program, caused the team to recommend the following technical stipulations for the College:

- That the institution provide evidence that sufficient resources are available for adequate clerical support, for assigning and supervising field placements and for providing computer software and curriculum materials for all

- classes in the credential program.
- That the institution provide evidence that all Multiple Subject candidates are provided with instruction in mathematics methods.
- That the institution provide evidence that all Multiple Subject candidates are placed in primary and intermediate assignments.

Team Leader: Mary Humphreys
Buena Park School District

Team Members: Carla Eide
College of Notre Dame

Marilyn Vaughn
Bethany College

DATA SOURCES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
12	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
1	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
33	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
31	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
8	Employers of Graduates	X	Student Teaching Handbook
18	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
5	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
11	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
1	Credential Analyst	X	Teacher Education Program Handbook
15	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
		X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae
		X	Other

Additional Documents Reviewed:

Letters from graduates of the credential program
 Teacher Education Program Evaluation 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998
 Minutes, Faculty Development Committee
 Proposed Pay Scale: Adjunct Professors
 Minutes: Faculty Forum
 Graduate Follow-up Questionnaire
 Master Schedules for Students
 Mini course proposal
 Reading Standard proposal document to CCTC
 Pre-Service Workshop Proposals
 Teacher Education Program Admission Workshop forms
 Student Teacher Placement Forms
 Enrollment information summary sheet
 Admission interview data

Committee on Accreditation Action

- (1) The Committee acted to make the following accreditation decision for Christian Heritage College and both of its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence that sufficient resources are available for adequate clerical support, for assigning and supervising field placements and for providing computer software and curriculum materials for all classes in the credential program.
- That the institution provide evidence that all Multiple Subject candidates are provided with instruction in mathematics methods.
- That the institution provide evidence that all Multiple Subject candidates are placed in primary and intermediate

assignments.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

Multiple Subject Credentials
Single Subject Credentials

- (2) Christian Heritage College must provide evidence about the actions taken to respond to all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action, to be verified by Commission staff.
- (3) In addition:
 - Christian Heritage College's response to the preconditions is accepted.
 - Christian Heritage College is permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
 - Christian Heritage College be placed on the schedule of accreditation visit for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Institution: California State University Sacramento

Dates of Visit: April 11-14, 1999

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION

Rationale:

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the unit was based upon the following:

1. **Common Standards** - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. All were judged to have been fully met. There was considerable discussion about Common Standard #4 in terms of whether or not a sufficient level of systematic, comprehensive evaluation exists. There was variation from one program to another on this standard; however the team decided that it did not warrant a finding of met minimally. The team found it as a concern.
2. **Program Standards** - Results of reviews of standards for individual programs were presented to the team by cluster leaders with additional comments as needed by cluster members. Following discussion of each program, the team concluded that program standards were met in five areas. However, in three programs, standards were judged to have been met minimally. Each of the standards minimally met are summarized by program area below.

In the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs, Standard 33 on Determination of Candidate Competence was met minimally with quantitative concerns because signatures required of both the district field supervisor and the university supervisor were not found on evaluation documents of candidates in field work.

In the School Nurse Program, Standard #1 on Program Design, Rationale and Coordination, was met minimally with qualitative concerns. The team found a lack of coordination between the program's faculty, staff, with the Education unit, and other departments on campus. A review of documents also revealed a lack of distribution of content delineated in the standards across coursework required for the program.

- **Overall Recommendation** - The decision to recommend Accreditation was, in part, based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met. Furthermore, after reviewing all programs only two standards were judged to have been met minimally, one with quantitative concerns and one with qualitative concerns. The team concluded that all programs are effective and generally of high quality. The Deficiencies noted by the team are balanced by compensating factors in the program areas. Thus the team reached the decision that the overall evidence suggested the recommendation of Accreditation for the unit.

Team Leader: Robert Monke
California State University, Fresno

Common Standards Cluster:

Patricia Oyeshiku, Cluster Leader
San Diego Unified School District

Carolyn Haugen
Walnut Valley Unified School District

Curtis Guaglianone
California State University, Fresno

Program Faculty		46	64	29	34	13	186
Institutional Administration	12	14	3	2	18	8	57
Candidates		28	73	48	73	76	298
Graduates		12	30	22	39	15	118
Employers of Graduates		18	9	2	29	10	68
Supervising Practitioners		16	19	15	23	15	88
Advisors		4	2	0	18	5	29
School Administrators		6	7	7	25	5	50
Credential Analyst		3	0	0	2	2	7
Advisory Committee		5	2	1	9	6	23
Parents					8		8
					TOTAL		932

Committee on Accreditation Action

The Committee acted to grant **ACCREDITATION** to California State University, Sacramento, and all of its credential programs.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Preliminary Internship
 - Professional
- Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential
 - Language Speech and Hearing
 - Special Class Authorization
- Health Services/School Nurse Credential
 - Multiple Subject Credential
 - Multiple Subject,
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Philipino, Spanish, Vietnamese)
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Philipino, Spanish, Vietnamese) Internship
 - Middle Level Emphasis
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
 - School Counseling
 - School Counseling Internship
 - School Social Work
 - School Psychology
 - School Psychology Internship
- Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential
- Single Subject Credential
 - Single Subject,
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Philipino, Spanish, Vietnamese)
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Cantonese, Khmer, Korean, Hmong, Mandarin, Philipino, Spanish, Vietnamese) Internship
 - Middle Level Emphasis
- Education Specialist Credentials - Preliminary Level I
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Internship

Moderate/Severe Disabilities, Internship

- Concurrent Credential Options
Multiple Subject (CLAD Emphasis)/Education Specialist
Single Subject (CLAD Emphasis)/Education Specialist
Middle Level Emphasis/Education Specialist

(2) In addition:

- California State University, Sacramento's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- California State University, Sacramento is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- California State University, Sacramento will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Institution: Fresno Pacific University

Dates of Visit: **March 14-17, 1999**

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: **ACCREDITATION WITH A TECHNICAL STIPULATION**

Rationale:

The overall quality of programs at Fresno Pacific University is extremely high in the judgement of the team, based on its findings. The findings were identified by reviewing program documents, advisement materials, the university catalog and other university and graduate school documents; interviews with candidates, graduates, full time, adjunct and part-time faculty, university staff, coordinators, institutional administrators; K-12 site supervisors, teachers and administrators.

The team found that six Common Standards were fully Met, and two Common Standards, Resources and Faculty, were Met with Qualitative Concerns. In the credential program areas all standards were met with the following exceptions: Multiple Subjects --Standards 1,9, and 16; Single Subjects --Standard 9; Education Specialist --Standard 12; and Administrative Services --Standards 4 and 16. All of these were Met Minimally with Qualitative Concerns. While there are areas of concern noted in regard to Common and Program Standards, on balance, these are mitigated by the overall high quality of the institution and compensating strengths within these credential programs when all sources of evidence are considered. The finding of Accreditation with a Technical Stipulation is based on the one area for which the team was unable to find supporting evidence, faculty diversity.

The team found evidence of institutional attention to diversity such as the university fall retreat on diversity and the establishment of a university task force on diversity. Faculty knowledge about cultural, ethnic and gender diversity contributes to the quality of preparation for candidates preparing to work with linguistically and culturally diverse children. This finding was clearly supported in the documentation provided on faculty quality and in interviews with faculty, graduates and employers. However, there is little evidence that the faculty themselves are culturally and ethnically diverse, and that the unique perspectives of these large groups in California are embedded in the core program. This contrasts strongly with the local population with whom their candidates are being prepared to work. A previous WASC review team also noted the lack of diversity among faculty in its report. Interviews with administrators and faculty did not indicate a sense of urgency related to this concern. There appears to be a general feeling on campus that this is, and always will be, the condition, and that little, if anything, can be do in this regard. The team feels that accreditation with a technical stipulation will reinforce the need to develop a more proactive plan to address this serious concern.

Team Leader: Edward Kujawa
University of San Diego

Team Members:

Common Standards

Emily Lowe Brizendine
California State University, Hayward

Janet Minami
Los Angeles Unified School District

Basic Credentials Cluster

Reyes Quesada, Cluster Co-Leader
University of Redlands

Judith Greig, Cluster Co-Leader
College of Notre Dame

Wanda Baral
Ocean View School District

Alice Bullard
Newark Unified School District

Carolyn Csongradi
San Mateo Union High School District

Specialist Credentials Cluster

Janet Minami, Cluster Leader
Los Angeles Unified School District

Carol Adams
Lompoc Unified School District

Melinda Medina-Levin
San Diego Unified School District

Services Credential Cluster

Marcel Soriano, Cluster Leader
California State University, Los Angeles

Felicia Bessent
Elk Grove Unified School District

Bud Watson
University of Redlands, Emeritus

CCTC Consultant Margaret Olebe

DATA SOURCES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
83	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
29	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
238	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
86	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
50	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
48	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
21	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
18	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
2	Credential Analyst		Field Experience Notebook
39	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
2	Support Staff	X	Advisement Documents
5	High School Students	X	Faculty Vitae
1	BCLAD Examiner	X	Candidate Portfolios

The Committee on Accreditation Action

- (1) The Committee acted to make the following accreditation decision for Fresno Pacific University and all of its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION WITH A TECHNICAL STIPULATION

The stipulation is:

Fresno Pacific University should develop a comprehensive plan that includes overall goals, specific strategies and a timeline documenting its ongoing efforts to seek out and recruit a diverse pool of candidates for full-time faculty. This plan should be submitted within one year from the date of this action to the CCTC consultant assigned to the visit.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:

- Administrative Services

- Preliminary
- Preliminary Internship
- Professional
- Education Specialist
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities Internship
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities Internship
 - Physical and Health Impairments
 - Physical and Health Impairments Internship
 - Learning Handicapped
 - Severely Handicapped
 - Resource Specialist Certificate
- Multiple Subjects Credential
 - CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
 - CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Internship
- Single Subject Credential
 - CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
 - CLAD & BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Internship
- Bilingual Specialist
- Reading and Language Arts Specialist
- Library Media Services
- Pupil Personnel Services
 - School Counseling
 - School Psychology

(2) Fresno Pacific University is required to provide evidence to Commission staff about the actions in response to the above stipulation within one year of the date of this action, in the form of a written report.

(3) In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- Fresno Pacific University is permitted to propose new credential programs for approval to the Committee on Accreditation.

Fresno Pacific University will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Institution: John F. Kennedy University

Dates of Visit: **March 7-10, 1999**

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of the accreditation team for ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS was based on a thorough review of the self-study documentation presented to the team, additional information in the form of supporting documentation, interviews with campus and field-based personnel, interviews with candidates and graduates, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The recommendation of the team was based on the following:

Common Standards:

Six of the Common Standards were judged by the team to have been fully met.

Two of the Common Standards were judged to have been not fully met:

- Common Standard Two - Resources
- Common Standard Six - Advice and Assistance

The two Common Standards judged not to have been fully-met were based on the inadequacy of allocated resources to provide sufficient staffing of the program. Additionally, graduates reported inconsistencies in the area of advisement related to specific program requirements.

Program Standards: Multiple Subjects

All of the program standards were judged to have been fully met.

Program Standards: Single Subject

Nineteen of the twenty-one program standards were judged to have been fully met. Two of the program standards were

found to be minimally met with qualitative concerns.

Generally, John F. Kennedy University (JFK) candidates who complete professional programs in Education are judged by professionals in the field to be well prepared to practice. However, the team found inconsistencies in the quality of preparation of Single Subject candidates regarding Program Standard Two, the development of professional perspectives. Additionally with respect to Program Standard Four, the team identified weaknesses in the course presentations of reading, writing and language arts. These specific standards are identified in the report with the specific findings of the team.

Program Standards: Internship

Twenty of the program standards were judged to have been fully met. Program Standard Nine was found to be minimally met with quantitative concerns.

The Accreditation Team recommends the following stipulations:

- That the institution develop and implement a strategic plan which clearly articulates the university's commitment to provide sufficient resources to support the Department of Education.
- That the institution provide evidence that candidates and prospective candidates receive consistent and accurate information, assistance, advising and guidance.
- That the University address the needs of Single Subject Credential Candidates by ensuring that candidates have opportunities to learn the essential themes concepts and skills related to the subject area authorized by their credential.
- That the University ensure that, consistent with Program Standard Nine, every Intern has an on-site mentor.

ACCREDITATION TEAM MEMBERS

Team Leader: Rosemary Fahey
Chapman University, Orange

Team Member: Patricia Geyer
Sacramento City Unified School District

Team Member: Bert Goldhammer
Placer Hills Union School District

DATA SOURCES

Interviews Conducted:

	Common Standards	Multiple Subject	Single Subject	Internship	Total
Program Faculty	8	4	3	3	18
Adjunct Faculty	4	4	4	5	17
Institutional Administration	6	6	2	4	18
Candidates	5	2	3	15	25
Graduates	9	9	5	6	29
Employers of Graduates	3	2	2	5	12
Supervising Practitioners	5	3	2	3	13
Advisors	4	4	1	3	12
School Administrators	3	2	1	2	8
Credential Analyst	1		1	1	3

Documents Reviewed

X	Catalog	X	Follow-up Survey Results
X	Program Document	X	Needs Analysis Results
X	Course Syllabi	X	Information Booklet
X	Candidate Files	X	Field Experience Notebook

Committee on Accreditation Action

- (1) The Committee acted to make the following accreditation decision for John F. Kennedy University and all of its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution develop and implement a strategic plan which clearly articulates the university's commitment to provide sufficient resources to support the Department of Education.
- That the institution provide evidence that candidates and prospective candidates receive consistent and accurate information, assistance, advising and guidance.
- That the University address the needs of Single Subject Credential Candidates by insuring that candidates have opportunities to learn the essential themes concepts and skills related to the subject area authorized by their credential.
- That the University ensures that, consistent with Program Standard Nine, every Intern has an on-site mentor.
- On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:
 - Multiple Subject
 - Multiple Subject Internship
 - Single Subject
 - Single Subject Internship

- (2) John F. Kennedy University is required to provide evidence of the actions taken to respond to all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action, to be verified by a focused team re-visit. The institution is to provide a written progress report to the Committee on Accreditation within six months.

- (3) In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- John F. Kennedy University is not permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation until the stipulations are removed.
- John F. Kennedy University will not be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits until after the Committee acts upon the revisit report.

Institution: National Hispanic University

Dates of Visit: May 23-26, 1999

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

Rationale:

The team recommendation for Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one by one and then voted upon by the entire team. Four standards were judged to have been met, three met minimally and one not met.
2. Program Standards - The Program Standards were first reviewed one by one and then voted upon by the entire team. Sixteen standards were judged to have been met, three met minimally and two not met.
3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations was, in part, based on team consensus that all although three standards were not met and six standards were met minimally, the institution should be able to appropriately address the concerns. The areas of concern are mostly centered around organizational and administrative issues. Although the concerns are serious and must receive careful attention by the institution, the team was of the opinion that the candidates are well prepared and comparable to candidates prepared by other institutions. Employers reported that the combined efforts of both NHU and the school districts are producing teachers prepared to serve all students. The institution has entered into partnerships with businesses, city government, the local state university and school districts. Further, the campus is located in a neighborhood context and appears to serve a local constituency. The team reached the decision that the overall evidence clearly supports the above accreditation recommendation.

Team Leader: Charles G. Zartman, Jr.
California State University, Chico

Team Member: Priscilla Walton
University of California, Santa Cruz

Team Member: Clara Chapala
California Department of Education

DATA SOURCES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
15	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
2	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
33	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
15	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
8	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
5	Supervising Practitioners		Follow-up Survey Results
2	Advisors	X	Needs Analysis Results
12	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
1	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
4	Advisory Committee	X	Schedule of Classes
6	Interns	X	Advisement Documents
1	School Board Member	X	Faculty Vitae
1	University Education Dean		Other
TOTAL = 108			

Committee on Accreditation Action

(1) The Committee acted to make the following accreditation decision for National Hispanic University and all of its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence of the active involvement of the faculty in the governance of the program. The involvement must include sufficient full-time faculty to maintain effective coordination and management of the program.
- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive program evaluation system, involving the required constituencies, that collects data, analyzes it, and uses the information gathered for program changes and improvement, as needed.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of systematic procedures for the selection, orientation and evaluation of all master teachers.
- That the institution provide evidence of a clearly articulated program design based upon a conceptual framework which explains the rationale for the delivery system.
- That the institution provide evidence of a clear and focused incorporation of English Language Development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) instructional strategies throughout the program.
- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive and cohesive process of guidance, assistance and feedback for student teachers.
- That the institution provide evidence of the implementation of a final assessment process that is consistent with all of the elements of the standard.
- On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:
 - Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis
 - Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis Internship

(2) National Hispanic University must provide evidence to the Committee on Accreditation that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action. A focused re-visit will be

conducted to verify the appropriate institutional action in relation to all stipulations. In addition, the institution will provide an interim written report within six months of steps being taken to address the stipulations.

(3) In addition:

- National Hispanic University's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- National Hispanic University is not permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation until all stipulations are removed.
- National Hispanic University will not be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits until after the revisit.
- All current and entering students must be notified of the accreditation status of National Hispanic University with the Committee on Accreditation.

Institution: Santa Clara University

Dates of Visit: **May 2-5, 1999**

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**

Rationale:

The team recommendation of Accreditation with Technical Stipulations was a result of a thorough review and analysis of the Institutional Self-Study Report, additional supporting documents available during the visit, interviews with administrators, faculty, students and other individuals professionally associated with the institution. The team visited several school sites which gave valuable insights into the process. The decision was based on the following:

Common Standards

The Common Standards were first reviewed one by one and then voted on by the entire team. Consensus was reached that all, with the exception of Common Standards one and eight were fully met.

Findings about Program Standards were presented to the team by cluster leaders, assisted by the cluster members (for additional clarification). Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all program standards were met in all program areas.

Overall Recommendations

The decision to recommend Accreditation with Stipulations was based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met. Common Standards 1 and 8 were met minimally. Although the team has identified several strengths in the Division of Counseling, Psychology and Education, the stipulations are recommended as an indicator of the importance placed on the need to quickly address the areas stipulated, including addressing administrative personnel staffing needs (Common Standard 1), and implementing a formal monitoring process with regard to master teacher criteria and subsequent placement (Common Standard 8) in the Multiple/Single Subject Programs.

Compensating strengths are important to note, especially in the area of faculty expertise, collaboration with local school district constituents and the university-wide strategic plan with its articulated vision shared by administrators, faculty, and students. The team concluded that all credential programs were effective and of high quality. Although the team recommends two stipulations, the overall quality of the program is good.

Team Leader: Marsha Savage

California Baptist University

Common Standards:

Jim Scott

Eureka City School District

All Other Team Members

Basic Credential Cluster:

Diane Guay, Cluster Leader
College of Notre Dame

Rodger Cryer

Franklin McKinley School District

Suzanne Riley

California Department of Education

Specialist Credential Cluster:

Ken Engstrom, Cluster Leader
Fresno Pacific University

Documents Reviewed

Institutional Self-Study Report
 Division Catalogue and Brochures
 Strategic Plan for University
 Strategic Plan for Division
 Division and University Organizational Chart
 Division Guidelines
 Program Budgets
 Faculty Vitae
 Faculty Handbook
 Course Syllabi
 Course Evaluations
 Class Schedule
 Information to Students
 Application Packet
 Candidate Files
 Candidate Evaluations
 Candidate Portfolios
 Student Teaching Handbook
 Student Teacher Binders
 Field Experience Handbook
 Intern Portfolios
 Program Support Letters
 Program Evaluation
 Advisory Committee Minutes
 Open House Announcements
 Career Services File Information
 Job Announcements
 Community Needs Assessment
 Graduate Follow-up
 Agency Letters of Collaboration
 Agency Internship Support Letters
 Agency/University Contract
 Faculty Involvement Plan Form
 Intern Induction Plan Form

Documents Missing

Qualification form for Master Teachers
 Graduate Follow-up Forms since 1993

Interviews Conducted

Type	TOTAL
Program Faculty	74
Institutional Administration	34
Candidates	113
Graduates	45
Employers of Graduates	12
Supervising Practitioners	25
Advisors	15
School Administrators	11
Credential Analyst	7
Advisory Committee	6
TOTAL	342

* Each number reflects the number of interviews conducted. In a number of cases, the same individuals were interviewed more than once by a different team members.

Committee on Accreditation Action

- (1) The Committee acted to make the following accreditation decision for Santa Clara University and all of its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

- The institution is to provide evidence that adequate administrative personnel are available to provide leadership for credential programs by hiring to fill openings.
- The institution must provide evidence of the implementation of a systematic review of all resident (master) teacher candidates to insure that all established requirements for these positions are fully met. Further, the institution must provide evidence that resident (master) teachers are periodically evaluated.
- On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credentials:
 - Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Preliminary Internship
 - Professional
 - Multiple Subject Credential
 - CLAD Emphasis
 - CLAD Emphasis Internship
 - Single Subject Credential
 - CLAD Emphasis
 - CLAD Emphasis Internship
 - Specialist in Special Education Credential
 - Preliminary Level I and Professional Level II
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities, including Internship
 - Early Childhood Special Education including Internship

- (2) Santa Clara University is required to provide evidence through a written report to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action.

- (3) In addition:

- Santa Clara University's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- Santa Clara University is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Santa Clara University will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Institution: St. Mary's College of California

Dates of Visit: March 14-17, 1999

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION

Rationale:

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the institution. The decision was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. All, with the exception of Common Standard Two, were judged to have been fully met.
2. Program Standards - Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all program standards were met in all program areas.
3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation was based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met, although one was met minimally. The team further determined that there were numerous compensating strengths in the School of Education and that a stipulation should not be placed on the institution. Compensating strengths included consistent reports from employers that graduates were well prepared, competent, and effective. The team concluded that all credential programs were effective and generally of high quality. Therefore, the team reached the decision that the overall evidence clearly supported the above accreditation recommendation. Although the team identified some areas of deficiency or concern in this report, the overall quality of the programs is good.

Team Leader: Randall Lindsey
University of Redlands

Common Standards Cluster:

Jim Reidt, Cluster Leader
San Juan Unified School District

Crystal Gips
Chancellor's Office, California State University

Roger Harrell
Azusa Pacific University

Basic Credential Cluster:

Billie Blair, Cluster Leader
California State University, Dominguez Hills

Phil Barker
Visalia Unified School District

Jean Conroy
California State University, Long Beach (Emeritus)

Blanca Gibbons
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified School District

Advanced Credential Cluster:

Steve Riley, Cluster Leader
Galt Union High School District

Suzanne Tyson
Pleasanton Unified School District

Penny Roberts
California State University, Long Beach

Barbara Wilson
California Department of Education (Retired)

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
Institutional Self Study
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results
Needs Analysis Results
Information Booklets
Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae
Faculty Minutes

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	Adv Cred. Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	3	32	61	19	115
Institutional Administration	3	10	3	8	24
Candidates		40	154	55	249
Graduates		23	65	32	120

Employers of Graduates		10	7	7	24
Supervising Practitioners		15	15	6	36
Advisors		33	5	10	48
School Administrators		10	9	11	30
Credential Analyst		1	1	1	3
Advisory Committee		8	9	12	29
				TOTAL	678

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles. Thus, the number of interviews conducted exceeds the actual number of individuals interviewed.

Committee on Accreditation Action

(1) The Committee acted to grant **ACCREDITATION** to St. Mary's College of California and all of its credential programs:

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Professional
- Multiple Subject Credential
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
- Pupil Personnel Services Credential
 - School Counseling
- Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential
- Resource Specialist Certificate
- Single Subject Credential
 - CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
- Education Specialist Credentials - Preliminary Level I
 - Mild/Moderate Disabilities
 - Moderate/Severe Disabilities

(2) In addition:

- The institution's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- St. Mary's College is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- St. Mary's College will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Institution: University of California, Santa Barbara

Dates of Visit: May 17-20, 1999

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION

Rationale:

The unanimous recommendation of the accreditation team for ACCREDITATION was based on a thorough review of the self study documentation presented to the team, additional information in the form of supporting documentation, interviews with campus and field-based personnel, interviews with candidates and graduates, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the professional education unit's operation. The recommendation of the team was based on the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. All were judged to have been fully met.
2. Program Standards - Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members (for additional clarification). Following their presentation, the team discussed each program

area and determined that all program standards were met in all program areas; however, a few were not fully met. The team then discussed in detail each program standard that was less than fully met.

In the Administrative Services Credential Program, all of the standards for the Preliminary Program were fully met, and all but three of the Professional Standards were fully met. Professional Standard 8 --Design of the Professional Induction Plan, Standard 12 --Curriculum Content and Standard 18 --Nature of Non-University Activities were found to be met minimally with qualitative concerns. The Team was concerned with the absence of a final assessment component, insufficient breadth and depth in professional curriculum content and lack of a formalized system of approval for non-university activities in the professional program. These concerns are substantiated in the body of the Team report.

All other program standards were fully met. After the discussion about the standards, the team discussed and then voted on the accreditation recommendation.

3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation was, in part, based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met. Furthermore, even though three standards in one credential area were met minimally, the team determined that there were compensating strengths in that program area such as consistent reports from employers that graduates were well prepared, competent and effective. The team concluded that all credential programs were effective and of high quality. Therefore, the team reached the decision that the overall evidence clearly supported the above accreditation recommendation without stipulations.

ACCREDITATION TEAM MEMBERS

Team Leader: **Greta Pruitt**
Los Angeles Educational Partnership

Team Members:

Common Standards: **Sherman Sowby**
California State University, Fresno

Basic Credential Cluster: **Andrea Canady**
Burbank Unified School District

Mary Williams
University of San Diego

Natalie Kuhlman
San Diego State University

Services Credential Cluster: **Dennis Evans**
University of California, Irvine

Viola Mecke
California State University, Hayward

DATA SOURCES

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

- X Catalog
- X Institutional Self Study
- X Course Syllabi
- X Candidate Files
- X Fieldwork Handbook
- X Follow-up Survey Results
- Needs Analysis Results
- X Information Booklet
- X Field Experience Notebook
- X Schedule of Classes
- X Advisement Documents
- X Faculty Vitae
- Other

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	ServicesCred.Cluster	TOTAL
Program Faculty	9	14	17	40
Institutional Administration	7	3	1	11
Candidates	1	89	30	120
Graduates		28	20	48
Employers of Graduates		3	7	10
Supervising Practitioners		15	4	19
Advisors		5	0	5
School Administrators	1	4	14	19
Credential Analyst	1	1	1	1
Advisory Committee Members		0	15	15
TOTAL				288

Committee on Accreditation Action

- (1) The Committee acted to grant **ACCREDITATION** to University of California, Santa Barbara and all of its credential programs:

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis

Single Subject CLAD/BCLAD (Spanish) Emphasis

Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology

Preliminary Administrative Services

Professional Administrative Services

- (2) In addition:

- University of California, Santa Barbara's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- The University of California, Santa Barbara is permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- The University of California, Santa Barbara be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Institution: University of La Verne

Dates of Visit: April 18-22, 1999

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

The accreditation team unanimously supports the above accreditation recommendation based on a careful analysis of all available data presented in the institution's self study reports, documentation available at the time of the visit, and interviews with a wide variety of informants. Following are the specific stipulations:

- The institution must provide evidence of an effective, comprehensive program evaluation system that is implemented across all professional preparation programs and sites associated with the university. The evaluation system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement in the same ways that the quality management system implemented by the institution assures quality programs across colleges and departments.
- The institution must provide evidence that it has made provisions for all students to be able to access the campus-based infrastructure associated with learning resources. The evidence must indicate how all students, at all sites, are provided equal access to extant resources.
- The institution must provide evidence of a comprehensive system of orientation to professional preparation program information and institutional expectations for each field supervisor/cooperating teacher and to provide for their systematic evaluation.
- If Education Specialist program(s) are to be offered in the future, there must be evidence they are sufficiently resourced to allow meeting all appropriate standards on a continuing basis. This evidence must be provided through the initial program review process now underway.

The team recommends that University of La Verne provide evidence to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing staff that appropriate actions have been taken to address each of these stipulations within one year from the date of this action. A staff re-visit is recommended to verify the appropriate action in relation to all stipulations.

Rationale:

The recommendation of the accreditation team for ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS was based on a thorough review of the self study documentation presented to the team, additional information in the form of exhibits, extensive interviews with campus and field-based personnel, and additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgments about the institution's operation of its professional preparation programs. Although there are some common standards and program standards met minimally and there are concerns expressed by the team, the overall quality of the programs is good. The recommendation of the team was based on the following:

Common Standards: All eight common standards were met, however two were met minimally with quantitative concerns (Standard 3, Evaluation and Standard 8, District Field Supervisors) and one was met minimally with qualitative concerns (Standard 2, Resources). It was judged by the team that these concerns were of a technical nature and could be corrected within a reasonable amount of time.

Data, especially from students, graduates, and employers was very complimentary about the manner in which the University of La Verne organized its programs, the qualifications of faculty delivering program content, and the student's perceived learning, by students themselves and their employers. As a result of coursework and field experience, those recommended for credentials were prepared to function appropriately in classrooms, service positions, and specialist positions.

However, the team did identify some specific concerns, mostly related to the assurance of consistent excellence across program areas and across the variety of sites where programs are offered.

Program Standards: In general most of the standards for the range of programs offered by the University of LaVerne were met. However, there are a few standards in program areas that were met minimally. These areas of concern are detailed below:

Multiple and Single Subject: Three standards were met minimally. The team found that continued attention needs to be given to consistency of program offerings across the sites at which programs are offered. The areas where consistency needs to be assured are in coursework, student teaching supervision, and the establishment of consistent expectations for students and faculty in off-campus settings. It was also found that programs need to more effectively address the provision of field experiences for diverse ages and give more attention in preparing candidates for classroom management.

Reading/Language Arts: One standard was met minimally, related primarily to program coordination. There seems to be some confusion across multiple campus sites regarding the overall nature of the program, expectations related to course requirements, as well as expectations about meeting times. There seems to be one message delivered by those who recruit students and another by those who deliver programs.

Education Specialist: The Education Specialist program is in a state of transition from old program guidelines to new program standards. The institution is in the process of working to acquire new program initial accreditation. There has been specific feedback to the institution on its current submission in response to standards and additional suggestions from the accreditation team. For this reason, the team did not provide a standard by standard analysis, but rather provided information to be given to the Specialist in Special Education Program Review Panel. The process of initial program approval must be met before the institution may accept any additional students in to the Education Specialist program area.

Administrative Services: Only one standard was met minimally in the Professional level program. The institution needs to establish clearer mentor qualifications and follow these criteria in the selection and assignment of mentors to Professional level administrative services candidates.

Pupil Personnel Services: For this program, one standard was identified as being minimally met. The institution and those individuals who implement the Pupil Personnel Services program components need to pay closer attention insure that students in all clusters and the main campus gain a functional knowledge of mandated assessment instruments.

Team Leader: James Richmond

California State University, Chico

Common Standards Cluster:

Jean Conroy, Cluster Leader
California State University, Long Beach (Emeritus)

Linda Smetana
Holy Names College

John Yoder
Fresno Pacific University

Carol McAllister
Los Alamitos Unified School District

Basic Credential Program Cluster:

James Brown, Cluster Leader
Chapman University

Stacie Curry
Fowler Unified School District

Magdalena Ruz-González
Pacific Oaks College

Patricia Sako Briglio
Basset Unified School District

Mark Baldwin
California State University, San Marcos

Specialist Credential Program Cluster:

Carolyn Cogan, Cluster Leader
University of California, Santa Barbara

Mary Sickert
Escondido Unified School District

Sue Craig
Red Bluff Unified School District

Victoria Graf
Loyola Marymount University

Services Credential Program Cluster I:

Woodrow Hughes, Cluster Leader
Pepperdine University

Alex Pulido
California State University, Los Angeles

Hal Bush
Vacaville Unified School District

Mel Lopez
Chapman University

Services Credential Program Cluster II:

Bill Watkins, Cluster Leader
Davis Unified School District (Retired)

Mari Irvin
University of the Pacific

Albert Valencia
California State University, Fresno

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Course Syllabi
 Candidate Files
 Fieldwork Handbooks
 Follow-up Survey Results
 Needs Analysis Results
 Information Booklets
 Field Experience Notebooks
 Schedule of Classes
 Advisement Documents
 Faculty Vitae

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Stands. Cluster	Basic Cred. Cluster	Specialist Cred. Cluster	Services Cred. Cluster I	Services Cred. Cluster II	TOTAL
Program Faculty	2	33	24	16	17	17	126
Institutional Administration	4	13	8		2	4	31
Candidates		58	158	38	52	37	343
Graduates		30	37	11	49	20	147
Employers of Graduates		19	20	5	11	8	63
Supervising Practitioners		17	38	8	9	16	88
Advisors		6	1	2	3	2	14
School Administrators		8	22	1	1	7	39
Credential Analyst		3	(2)		(1)	(1)	3
Advisory Committee		3	8	12	2		25
					TOTAL		879

Committee on Accreditation Action

(1) The Committee acted to make the following accreditation decision for University of La Verne and all of its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

- The institution must provide evidence of an effective, comprehensive program evaluation system that is implemented across all professional preparation programs and sites associated with the university. The evaluation system must demonstrate the potential for assuring continuous program improvement in the same ways that the quality management system implemented by the institution assures quality programs across colleges and departments.
- The institution must provide evidence that it has made provisions for all students to be able to access the campus-based infrastructure associated with learning resources. The evidence must indicate how all students, at all sites, are provided equal access to extant resources.
- The institution must provide evidence of a comprehensive system of orientation to professional preparation program information and institutional expectations for each field supervisor/cooperating teacher and to provide for their systematic evaluation.
- If Education Specialist program(s) are to be offered in the future, there must be evidence they are sufficiently resourced to allow meeting all appropriate standards on a continuing basis. This evidence must be provided through the initial program review process now underway.

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
 - Preliminary
 - Preliminary Internship
 - Professional

- Multiple Subject Credential
 - CLAD Emphasis
 - CLAD Emphasis Internship
- Pupil Personnel Services
 - School Counseling
 - School Counseling Internship
- Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential
- Resource Specialist Certificate
- Single Subject Credential
 - CLAD Emphasis
 - CLAD Emphasis Internship
- Specialist in Special Education Credential
 - Learning Handicapped

(2) University of La Verne is required to provide evidence to the actions taken to respond to all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action, to be verified by a focused team re-visit

(3) In addition:

- University of La Verne's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- University of La Verne is permitted to propose new credential programs for accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation.
- University of La Verne be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Institution: Whittier College

Dates of Visit: March 21-24, 1999

Accreditation Team

Recommendation: ACCREDITATION

Rationale:

The team recommendation for Accreditation was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, and interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the unit was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one by one and then voted upon by the entire team. All were judged to have been fully met.
2. Program Standards - The Program Standards were first reviewed one by one and then voted upon by the entire team. All were judged to have been fully met, with the exception of one.
3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation was, in part, based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met. Although some areas of concern are noted in this report, the overall quality of the programs is good. Furthermore, the team determined that even though there were a few minor concerns, there were compensating strengths in the program area and that a stipulation should not be placed on the institution. Compensating strengths for this program included consistent reports from employers that graduates were well prepared, competent, and effective. The team concluded that all three credential programs were effective and generally of high quality. Therefore, the team reached the decision that the overall evidence clearly supported the above accreditation recommendation.

Team Leader: R. Douglas Robinson
Simi Valley Unified School District

Team Member: Nancy Brashear
Azusa Pacific University

Team Member: Gary Hoban
National University

Team Member: Bettie Bryan Howser
Moreno Valley Unified School District

Team Member: Robert Reimann
Los Angeles Unified School District

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED				DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
M	S	A	T		
20	20	6	26	Program Faculty	* Catalog
			2	Institutional Administration	* Institutional Self Study
32	12	11	55	Candidates	* Course Syllabi
12	7	2	21	Graduates	* Candidate Files
			6	Employers of Graduates	* Fieldwork Handbook
			4	Supervising Practitioners	* Follow-up Survey Results
			5	Advisors	* Needs Analysis Results
			3	School Administrators	* Information Booklet
			1	Credential Analyst	* Field Experience Notebook
			7	Advisory Committee	* Schedule of Classes
					* Advisement Documents
					* Faculty Vitae
					Other (Name)

M-Multiple Subject, S-Single Subject, A-Administration, T-Total

Committee on Accreditation Action

(1) The Committee acted to grant **ACCREDITATION** to Whittier College and all of its credential programs:

On the basis of this decision, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Multiple Subject CLAD Emphasis
- Single Subject
- Administrative Services
 - Preliminary
 - Professional

(2) In addition:

- Whittier College's response to the preconditions is accepted.
- Whittier College is permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
- Whittier College will be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

APPENDIX B

Initial Program Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation-- 1998-1999

Introduction

Following is a summary of the initial program accreditation actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation during the 1999-99 academic year. For each program area, the institutions are listed in alphabetical order. For each of the institutions, the specific programs accredited are named in each listing.

Initial Accreditation Based Upon Panel Review

The Committee on Accreditation granted initial accreditation to the following preparation programs, based upon the recommendations of the appropriate review panels. Each of the institutions listed responded fully and appropriately to the

adopted standards and preconditions by preparing a program proposal that described how each standard and precondition was met and that included appropriate supporting evidence. The program proposals were read by the appropriate review panels following the procedures adopted by the Committee on Accreditation. The programs were judged to meet all standards and preconditions.

A. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Administrative Services Credential

California State University, San Marcos	Preliminary
Fresno Pacific University	Preliminary Internship
Humboldt State University	Professional
Mills College	Professional
University of California, Los Angeles	Professional
University of San Diego	Preliminary

B. Non-university Programs of Professional Development for the Professional Administrative Services Credential

Los Angeles Unified School District	Administrative Academy
-------------------------------------	------------------------

C. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Education Specialist Credential and Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credentials

Azusa Pacific University

Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate Disabilities

California Lutheran University

Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Moderate/Severe Disabilities

California Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo

Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Moderate/Severe Disabilities

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Professional Level II
MildMildMild/Moderate Disabilities
MildModerate/Severe Disabilities

California State University, Fresno

Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate Disabilities, including Internship
Moderate/Severe Disabilities, including Internship
Deaf and hard of Hearing

Professional Level II
Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Moderate/Severe Disabilities

California State University, Long Beach

Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate Disabilities, adding Internship
Moderate/Severe Disabilities, adding Internship

California State University, Los Angeles

Preliminary Level I, including Internships in all areas and
Professional Level II
Early Childhood Special Education
Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Moderate/Severe Disabilities
Physical and Health Impairments
Visual Impairments

California State University, Northridge

Professional Level II
Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Moderate/Severe Disabilities

Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing
Early Childhood Special Education

California State University, San Marcos

Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Moderate/Severe Disabilities
Including Internship)

Fresno Pacific University

Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate Disabilities, including Internship
Moderate/Severe Disabilities, including Internship
Physical and Health Impairments, including Internship

Humboldt State University

Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Mills College

Preliminary Level I
Early Childhood Special Education

Pacific Oaks College

Preliminary Level I
Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Moderate/Severe Disabilities
Early Childhood Special Education

Point Loma Nazarene College

Professional Level II
Mild/Moderate Disabilities

San Diego State University

Preliminary Level I
Early Childhood Special Education
Mild/Moderate Disabilities, including Internship
Moderate/Severe Disabilities, including Internship
Physical and Health Impairments
Deaf and Hard of Hearing

San Francisco State University

Professional Level II
Mild/Moderate Disabilities
Moderate/Severe Disabilities
Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Physical and Health Impairments
Visual Impairments

Clinical Rehabilitative Services
Orientation and Mobility

D. Programs of Professional Preparation for Specialist Programs in Adapted Physical Education

California State University, Dominguez Hills

California State University, Sacramento

San Diego State University

San Francisco State University

Programs of Professional Preparation for the Multiple Subject Credential in the Accreditation Pilot Project Sponsored by Out-of-State Institutions Pursuant to Assembly Bill 2730 (Mazzoni).

University of Phoenix

Multiple and Subject: CLAD Emphasis

Antioch University of Southern California

Multiple and Single Subject: CLAD Emphasis

Accreditation for the duration of the Accreditation Pilot Project (1999-2000), subject to the institution's satisfactory participation in the Pilot Project.

● **Programs of Professional Preparation for the Multiple Subject Credential in the Accreditation Pilot Project Sponsored by California Institutions Pursuant to Assembly Bill 2730 (Mazzoni).**

Multiple Subject: CLAD Emphasis Internship Credential (CalState TEACH) at the following institutions:

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
California State University, Fresno
California State University, Fullerton
California State University, Hayward
California State University, Los Angeles
California State University, Monterey Bay

Initial Accreditation Based Upon Staff Review

The Committee on Accreditation granted initial accreditation to the following preparation programs, based upon the recommendations of the Commission consultants. Each of the institutions listed responded fully and appropriately to the adopted standards and preconditions by preparing a program proposal that described how each standard and precondition was met and that included appropriate supporting evidence. The program proposals were read by the appropriate consultant following the procedures adopted by the Committee on Accreditation. The programs were judged to meet all standards and preconditions.

A. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Multiple and Single Subject Credentials

Azusa Pacific University

Multiple Subject Internship Program

California State Polytechnic University

Multiple Subject: BCLAD Emphasis - Add Korean

California State University, Bakersfield

Single Subject CLAD Emphasis

California State University, Dominguez Hills

Multiple Subject: BCLAD Emphasis - Add Tagalog

California State University, Fresno

Single Subject: CLAD Emphasis

California State University, Fullerton

Multiple Subject: BCLAD Emphasis - Add Vietnamese

California State University, Long Beach

Multiple Subject: Middle Level Emphasis Program

California State University, Long Beach

Multiple Subject: BCLAD Emphasis - Add Khmer, Vietnamese

California State University, Los Angeles

Multiple Subject: BCLAD Emphasis - Add Cantonese, Mandarin

California State University, Northridge

Multiple Subject: BCLAD Emphasis - Add Korean

Fresno Pacific University

Multiple Subject: CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Internship
Single Subject: CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Internship

Holy Names College

Multiple Subject: CLAD Emphasis Internship Program
Single Subject: CLAD Emphasis Internship Program

John F. Kennedy University

Multiple Subject Internship
Single Subject Internship
(These two programs are subject to all accreditation stipulations adopted by the Committee on Accreditation at the April 1999 meeting.)

Pacific Oaks College

Multiple Subject: CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Internship Program

Pacific Union College

Multiple and Single Subject: CLAD Emphasis

St. Mary's College of California

Single Subject: CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)

San Francisco State University

Multiple Subject Middle Level Emphasis and CLAD Emphasis Program, Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Program in Mild/Moderate Disabilities

Single Subject Middle Level Emphasis and CLAD Emphasis Program, Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Program in Mild/Moderate Disabilities

San Jose State University

Single Subject Internship

Sonoma State University

Multiple Subject: CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Internship Program
Single Subject: CLAD Emphasis Program

St. Mary's College of California

Multiple Subject: CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis Internship

University of California, Riverside

Multiple Subject Internship: CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)

University of La Verne

Multiple Subject: CLAD Emphasis Internship Program
Single Subject: CLAD Emphasis Internship Program

B. Programs of Professional Preparation for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential

California State University, Los Angeles

Pupil Personnel Services Internship Program with Specialization in School Counseling and Child Welfare and Attendance

Phillips Graduate Institute

Pupil Personnel Services with Specialization in School Counseling

APPENDIX C

Additional Accreditation Actions Taken by the Committee on Accreditation - - 1998-1999

Introduction

Following is a summary of other accreditation actions taken by the Committee on Accreditation during the 1998-1999

academic year. Actions include the withdrawal of programs, reinstatement of programs, removal of accreditation stipulations and changing of accreditation status.

A. Reinstatement of Professional Preparation Programs

In October, 1998, the Committee took action to reinstate the Health Services (School Nurse) Credential Program at **California State University, San Bernardino**. The institution is required to submit a complete response to the Commission's standards for the program and have it approved by the COA by the end of the 1998-1999 academic year.

B. Withdrawal of Professional Preparation Programs

In October, 1998, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Program of Professional Preparation for the Child Welfare and Attendance Specialization of the Pupil Personnel Services: School Social Work Credential at **California State University, Sacramento**.

In October, 1998, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the the Program of Professional Preparation for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Psychology Credential at **University of California, Davis**.

In October, 1998, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Program of Professional Preparation for the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential in Audiology at **San Jose State University**.

In March, 1999, the Committee approved the voluntary withdrawal of the Professional Preparation Program for the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential and the Professional Preparation Program for the Specialist in Special Education Credential at **Simpson College**.

All four programs no longer accept candidates and the programs are not included in any continuing accreditation visits. A withdrawn program may be re-accredited only when the institution submits a new proposal for initial accreditation according to the policies of the Committee on Accreditation. From the date in which candidates were no longer admitted to the program the institution must wait at least two years before requesting re-accreditation of the program.

C. Removal of Accreditation Stipulations

In January 1999, the Committee voted to remove two stipulations on the programs of professional preparation at **Sonoma State University**. The programs were the Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD Internship and the Single Subject CLAD Emphasis. The institution was required to submit a complete program proposal responding to the Commission's standards and have the program recommended for initial accreditation. The Committee on Accreditation made the initial accreditation decision for both programs at its January 1999 meeting.

In June 1999, the Committee voted to remove four stipulations placed on the programs of professional preparation at **San Jose State University**. The stipulations were related to implementation of a comprehensive program evaluation system, allocation of resources for programs and technology infrastructure and training and evaluation of field supervisors. The institution provided written evidence of steps taken to address the stipulations. The institution was given additional time to remove the remaining stipulation related to the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Program.

D. Removal of Accreditation Stipulations and Change of Institutional Accreditation Status

In August, 1998, the Committee voted to remove the stipulation on the faculty standard at **California State University, Stanislaus**, based on the staff evaluation of the institutional response to the stipulation. Further, the Committee on Accreditation voted to change the accreditation status of California State University, Stanislaus from "Accreditation with a Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation" based upon the removal of the above stipulation.

In August, 1998, the Committee voted to remove the technical stipulation placed on a Program of Professional Preparation at **California State University, Northridge** for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program in School Psychology. The institution was required provide a response to the Committee on Accreditation about actions taken to remedy all standards less than fully met within one calendar year from the date of the original action. A written report was provided for staff review, providing the requested information. The Committee on Accreditation also voted to change the accreditation status of California State University, Northridge from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation" based upon the removal of the above technical stipulation.

In January 1999, the Committee voted to remove the stipulations on the Programs of Professional Preparation at **San Diego State University**. The institution was required to submit a revised program proposal for the Deaf/Hard of Hearing Program, make certain adjustments in Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program in School Social Work. The institution supplied the requested written information. On the basis of the removal of the stipulations, the Committee on Accreditation also voted to change the accreditation status of San Diego State University, from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation."

In March 1999, the Committee voted to remove the four stipulations on the Programs of Professional Preparation at **California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo**. The institution was required to submit written information related to the four stipulations and have the responses verified by a re-visit team. The institution supplied the requested written information and the team determined that the stipulations should be removed. On the basis of the removal of the stipulations, the Committee on Accreditation also voted to change the accreditation status of California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo, from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation."

In May, 1999, the Committee voted to remove the technical stipulation placed on the Program of Professional Preparation at **Patten College** for the Multiple Subject Credential Program related to the design and rationale of the program. The institution was required provide a response to the Committee on Accreditation about actions taken to remedy the stipulation within one calendar year from the date of the original action. A written report was provided for staff review, providing the requested information. The Committee on Accreditation also voted to change the accreditation status of Patten College from "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" to "Accreditation" based upon the removal of the above technical stipulation.

In May, 1999, the Committee voted to remove the two remaining stipulations placed on the Programs of Professional Preparation at **Sonoma State University** related to the comprehensive program evaluation system and the selection, training and evaluation of field supervisors. The institution was required provide a response to the Committee on Accreditation about actions taken to remedy the stipulations within one calendar year from the date of the original action. A written report was provided for staff review, providing the requested information. The Committee on Accreditation also voted to change the accreditation status of Sonoma State University from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation" based upon the removal of the above stipulations.

In May 1999, the Committee voted to remove the five stipulations on the Programs of Professional Preparation at **Simpson College**. One stipulation related to concerns expressed about the Common Standards. Additional stipulations were placed on the following four programs: Multiple Subject Program, Single Subject Program, Administrative Services and the Reading/Language Arts Program. The institution was required to submit written information related to the five stipulations and have the responses verified by a re-visit team. The institution supplied the requested written information and the team determined that the stipulations should be removed. On the basis of the removal of the stipulations, the Committee on Accreditation also voted to change the accreditation status Simpson College, from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation."

In May 1999, the Committee voted to remove the four stipulations on the Programs of Professional Preparation at **California State University, Monterey Bay** related to advice and assistance, evaluation of faculty supervisors, faculty supervision assignments and procedures for candidate assessment. The institution was required to submit written information related to the four stipulations and have the responses verified by a team re-visit. The institution supplied the requested written information and the team determined that the stipulations should be removed. On the basis of the removal of the stipulations, the Committee on Accreditation also voted to change the accreditation status of California State University, Monterey Bay from "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" to "Accreditation."



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to September 1999 Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |
| [PDF](#) version of [COA Annual Report](#) | (Adobe Acrobat Reader
Required)





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PREP-3

Committee: Preparation Standards

Title: Pre-Intern Program Expansion and Augmentation Progress Report

✓ Action

Prepared by: Helen Hawley, Assistant Consultant
Professional Services Division

Pre-Internship Program Expansion and Augmentation Progress Report

Professional Services Division
August 12, 1999

Executive Summary

In January 1999 the Commission approved an augmentation of \$100,000 for local programs to collaborate in developing program services for pre-interns. The development issues focused on subject matter preparation, peer coaching, and program administration. This agenda item details the achievement and progress of those augmented services and describes the development plans for the additional augmentation approved in a June agenda item. The January agenda item also received Commission approval for program expansion for the balance of \$11.8 million approved by the legislature in the 1998-99 fiscal year. Staff and the review recommended 26 new programs and 17 existing programs to continue for a total of 43 programs statewide. These programs include both multiple and single (mathematics, science, and English) subject programs. This agenda item reports briefly on the disbursement of those grants and looks forward to the next funding cycle plans to expand the program further with 1999-2000 funds.

Policy Issues to be Resolved by the Commission

1. Shall the Commission release funds approved for the 1999-2000 fiscal year as soon as possible?
2. Are there other policy issues raised by the existing and proposed program developments in this program that should be considered?

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal one: To promote educational excellence in California schools.

Goal six: Work with schools of education, the Department of Education, and school districts to assure teacher quality.

Fiscal Impact Statement

The Pre-Internship Program has been funded by state monies through the General Fund in the amount of \$11.8 million for the 1998-99 fiscal

year. In January 1999 the Commission approved the distribution of \$100,000 of these funds to augment current local pre-intern programs to collaboratively develop program services. In June 1999 the Commission approved another augmentation of \$100,000 to continue program service development through local programs. The balance of the grant funds (\$11.6 million) was distributed as local assistance to continuing and new pre-intern programs. The legislature has approved continued funding for the 1999-2000 fiscal year at \$11.8 million. No fiscal impact upon the Commission is indicated at this time.

Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the release of a request for proposals on October 1, 1999, to award and distribute 1999-2000 funds.

Background Information

In January of 1999 staff brought to the Commission a request for resolution of two policy issues regarding the expansion of the Pre-Intern Program. These policy issues addressed distribution of increased funding and improvement of pre-intern services. Staff proposed and the Commission approved expansion of existing programs and addition of new programs as needs and capabilities dictate *and* the augmentation of local grants to collaboratively develop program resources and build capacity and infrastructure for the present and future of the program statewide. The augmentations approved totaled \$100,000.

Augmentation Awards

Staff released a request for proposals in March of 1999 offering grant augmentations to local participating agencies for developing services as follows:

Subject Matter Preparation	\$19,000
Peer Support	\$61,000
Administrative Training	\$20,000

Local Pre-intern programs could apply for any or all of the service augmentations.

Four agencies applied for subject matter preparation funds. Staff awarded the funds to Ventura County Office of Education based on a proposal to deliver a full range of subject matter preparation in concert with the California Subject Matter Projects of their region. The preparation was to take place in May and serve Ventura's pre-interns with a one-day showcase of the subjects to be covered, followed by mini-institutes in each academic area which pre-interns could attend as indicated by their needs. The Projects were to return to follow up with pre-interns in small workshops to review and reinforce content. This pilot would test a design that could be implemented in other regions by other project and agency collaborations.

Three agencies applied for peer support augmentations. A portion of the funds (\$25,000) was allocated to West Contra Costa Unified School District based on a proposal to complete a coach's training videotape, to work with WestEd to complete the training program, and to pilot that program upon its completion by fall 1999. The remaining \$34,000 was allocated to all of the local programs equally to cover the costs of attending "trainer of trainer" sessions for coaches.

Santa Cruz County Office of Education, Ontario/Montclair School District, Ventura County Office of Education, and Los Angeles County Office of Education applied jointly for an administrative training augmentation. Each was allocated \$5,000 based on a proposal to design and implement orientation and continued advising for pre-intern directors to take place during the summer and fall of 1999.

As a result of Paramount's merger with Long Beach Unified, \$2,000 was left over and awarded to four consultants through Ventura County Office of Education to define and produce guidelines for secondary introductory pedagogy for pre-interns. These consultants represent a partnership between CSU Dominguez Hills, Ventura County Office of Education and Long Beach Unified School District; two are Language Arts educators, one is a science educator, and one is a mathematics educator.

Program Developments Completed

The subject matter pilot proposed by Ventura County began in May 1999 as scheduled. The

program director reports that attendance and response indicate that it was received favorably, though some imbalance existed between the focus on pedagogy and subject matter given pre-intern priorities. While subject matter preparation is an excellent opportunity to model pedagogy, care must be made to keep the focus on content at the level which pre-interns need. Art and Science were a more natural fit than other subjects. Coincidentally, many Project presenters had scored for MSAT and aligned their presentations easily with the examination. Under a grant mandate to work with low performing schools, the Subject Matter Projects were able to provide some matching funds. Instruction was particularly strong in hands-on activities and application. The Project experience was described by participants as having created a more cohesive cohort and increased motivation for continuing participation. Ventura plans to make the following changes in future sessions: weaving MSAT preparation into Project presentations, more orientation of presenters to pre-intern needs, strengthening subject areas that are not yet aligned for pre-interns (social science, mathematics and physical education), building more regional partnerships between districts and the Projects.

Pre-intern program directors with Commission staff and WestEd Research have defined introductory pedagogy for pre-interns based on a year of experience and designed an aligned coaching guide. "Trainer of trainers" sessions were held in June and August 1999, attended by over 70 new coach trainers. Another session will be held in late September or early October. These training sessions cover a two day period and include a fully instructional binder and 48 minute training tape. These are materials available to any interested party for the basic costs of duplication.

The four appointed regional pre-intern consultants and Commission Staff designed a new director orientation and an accompanying program binder. In July all new program directors were inserviced by the regional consultants and Commission staff on the pre-intern program over a two day period. New directors were provided with all available materials and information necessary to implement a program. Additionally, they were assigned to a regional consultant to call upon as needed for advising.

At the July meeting of continuing directors, the pedagogy consultants presented a course outline and materials of survival pedagogy for secondary pre-interns. The design is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and presented in modular format. Directors were provided with a manual complete with sample lesson plans, classroom layouts, graphic organizers, and recommended resources. A similar outline for elementary pedagogy has been drafted by the Ventura County pre-intern staff in collaboration with California State University, Northridge.

Program Developments in Progress

Pilot subject matter projects continue in a number of local programs. For instance, the Bay Area Arts Project conducted an institute with the Oakland and the West Contra Costa pre-intern programs in August. In the early spring of 2000 Ontario/Montclair School District will host a complete subject matter review with Inland Empire Projects. Ventura County plans another showcase and mini institutes for the 1999-2000 school year. Additionally, Sylvan Learning Center sponsored a pilot with Long Beach Unified for a modular subject matter design that they plan to offer statewide for the 1999-2000 year. Staff continues to work with community colleges to develop subject matter programs for pre-interns. Tulare County Office of Education has pioneered some of this work with The College of the Sequoias.

Pre-intern programs statewide are training coaches with the new Pre-intern Coaching Guide. As programs use the guide they will collect data on its effectiveness which will be used to revise and improve the training in the spring of 2000. WestEd will steer the revision. Los Angeles Unified School District has been given special permission to pilot the use of CFASST for pre-interns. Staff will request data on the pilot cohort to compare with data on the coaching guide for additional information on pre-intern services.

Four continuing directors will attend the next new director meeting in September to mentor their new colleagues. In November the continuing directors will invite the new directors to join them for a meeting to discuss difficulties encountered during the current implementation and consider the changes for the next funding cycle. After that time the regional consultants will begin to hold regional meetings as needed. Staff will begin site visits of new programs in mid-October 1999 which will consist of interviews with pre-interns, coaches, and site administrators to collect data for the legislative report. Regional consultants and Commission staff will hold another new director orientation shortly after the announcement of grant awards for the next funding cycle. In this way the programs will continue to build an administrative structure statewide that is consistent and cohesive.

The pedagogy consultants will inservice new directors in secondary pedagogy at the September director's meeting. An outline for multiple subject pedagogy and correlated materials will also be presented. New directors will be invited to share ideas for survival pedagogy based on their available resources. The consultants will assist new directors to

align their plans with those of the continuing programs.

Program Developments Proposed

School districts have expressed a need for pre-intern programs in special education. Under recent changes to special education credentials, teachers obtain emergency permits without completing subject matter or teacher preparation. Districts indicate that these individuals need the support of all current pre-intern services as well as introductory special education pedagogy. Pre-intern programs could be prepared to institute professional development to speed these individuals toward certification as soon as legislation allows. The directors have already begun to consult with special education experts on what those basic pedagogy skills should be.

Program directors plan to develop a concise handbook for all pre-interns that informs them about the program—its purpose, goals, and services. They will begin to collaborate regionally on this project and meet collectively in the spring to merge their ideas. Staff will then create a final product to provide all programs. This project will reduce discrepancies in information from district to district and school to school across the state, ensuring that all pre-interns have equal access to information on program services.

Staff and local programs will work with IHEs on subject matter preparation for math, science, and English. This requires new collaborations with subject matter department faculty that will require substantial changes in the way that subject matter courses are delivered, for example greater use of video and the internet. Upper division coursework will generally be needed (unlike the multiple subject content) which will limit collaborations to four year institutions.

WestEd Research will make any necessary revisions to the Pre-intern Coaching Guide in spring 2000 based on evaluations of the guide from local programs after implementation. Such revisions will be completed in time for the next funding cycle. A comparison study will also be made through surveys with pre-interns following the pre-intern coaching guide and those following CFASST to measure effectiveness.

Funding Expansion

In January 1999, staff released a request for proposals for \$11.8 million dollars in funds approved for the 1998-99 fiscal year. Proposals were submitted by April 1, 1999. Upon Commission approval in June, staff notified 26 new programs of their acceptance to the Pre-intern Program. Seventeen programs were also notified of their approval to continue serving pre-interns for the 1999-2000 school year. Some of the continuing programs added single subjects. New programs were approved for multiple and/or single subjects, depending on their needs and resources. The local agencies have already received the first half of their funds to launch the programs in time for the new school year. Local pre-intern programs now include all of the highest users of emergency permits except Bakersfield City Elementary School District. Twenty-two of the new programs were awarded the full amount of grants they requested. The four who were granted less than they requested received amounts based on their previous emergency permit needs according to Commission data. A total of 5,800 pre-interns will be served in the fall 1999 semester. Though legislation requires no matching or in-kind funds from local education agencies, 29 of the 43 approved programs have committed considerable additional funds to their programs in budget areas such as administrative and clerical salaries, facilities, supplies, equipment, substitute funds, coaching stipends and texts.

Continued funding in the amount of \$11.8 million has been approved by the Legislature and the Governor for the 1999-2000 fiscal year. In an effort to disburse funds to local education agencies as soon as possible, staff requests permission from the Commission to issue a new request for proposals on October 1, 1999. This request could invite new programs to join and continuing programs to expand in spring 1999. New funding recommendations could be brought before the Commission for approval as early as January 2000, with funds disbursed by February 2000.

[| Back to the Top |](#)
[| Back to September 1999](#)
[Agenda |](#)
[| Return to "Agenda Archives" |](#)
[| Return to "About CTC" |](#)





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PERF-1

Committee: Performance Standards

Title: Update on the Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards

✓ Information

Prepared by: Mary Vixie Sandy, Consultant and Marie Schrup, Ed.D., Consultant
Professional Services Division

Update on the Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards

Professional Services Division
August 17, 1999

Executive Summary

The Commission's Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards (SB 2042) has been meeting since September, 1998. This agenda report provides (1) an update on the issues and topics that have been discussed by the Panel to date, and (2) an overview of the work in which the Panel will be engaged in the coming months.

Policy Question

What issues must be considered by the Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards in order to develop comprehensive standards for Level I and Level II Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credential Programs?

Fiscal Impact Summary

The costs associated with implementing SB 2042 were estimated to be incurred over two fiscal years, 1998-99 and 1999-2000. The costs are included in the agency's base budget for 1998-99 and 1999-2000.

Background

The Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards (SB 2042) has been meeting for almost one year, and is approaching the mid-point of its work. The Panel's broad charge is to develop standards for multiple and single subject credential programs that build on the recommendations of the SB 1422 Advisory Panel for the Review of Teaching Credential Requirements, and to oversee the development of a Teaching Performance Assessment. In ten meetings, the Panel has reviewed a host of documents that have implications for standards, and has begun to extract from this body of research important elements that they believe must be addressed in new standards. At the same time, the Panel has had numerous opportunities to interact with the Commission's Assessment Contractor, WestEd/MPR Associates to review and discuss the job analysis that will be conducted this Fall in preparation for the development of a Teaching Performance Assessment. This agenda report provides an update on the progress that has been made to date by the 2042 Panel with respect to both the standards and assessment development processes.

Standards for Teacher Preparation Programs

Much work has been done within California and throughout the nation on the development of new standards. Standards for students, standards for beginning teachers, standards for accomplished teachers, and standards for teacher educators have been published within the last five years. Many states have launched efforts in recent years to revise standards for teacher preparation and licensure as well. In order to provide the SB 2042 Panel with a comprehensive overview of what is necessary and what is possible to accomplish in new standards, Commission staff have brought numerous reports to the Panel for review and discussion. Chart 1 provides a partial list of reports and standards that have been reviewed by the Panel during the last year.

Chart 1

Standards Documents	Frameworks and Reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 1422 Final Report and Recommendations • California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) • Commission Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Multiple and Single Subject Credential Preparation Programs • CTC Education Specialist Standards • NCATE Standards for Elementary Teacher Preparation • Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) Standards and Principles • Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) Standards • Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) Standards • National Board for Professional Teaching Standards • K-12 Academic Content Standards <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mathematics Reading/Language Arts Science History/Social Science • National Council for the Social Sciences Standards • National Science Education Standards • Teacher Preparation Standards from other states 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading Language Arts Framework • History/Social Science Framework • Report of the AB 1264 Task Force on Parent Involvement • <i>California Teacher Preparation for Instruction in Critical Thinking: Research Findings and Policy Recommendations</i> • Recommendations of the SB 1422 Health Task Force • Recommendations of the SB 1422 "Mainstreaming" Task Force • <i>Creating Caring Relationships to Foster Academic Excellence: Recommendations for Reducing Violence in California Schools</i> • Proposed Strategic Plan from the Report <i>Toward a State of Esteem</i> • Final Report of the Computer Education Advisory Panel • <i>What States are Doing to Improve the Quality of Teaching: A Brief Review of Current Patterns and Trends</i> • (Partial list)

Throughout the review of current standards and research, the Panel has been considering the implications of this existing work on new standards for the preparation of California teachers. The panel has focused on ways in which they believe the Commission should change the format of standards for teacher preparation. A recurring concern about the Commission's existing standards has to do with the level of specificity. The Panel has tentatively developed a new format that they would like to use in drafting new standards. The Panel is calling for greater clarity, precision and specificity in standards. The Panel's belief is that standards should be descriptive enough to communicate clearly to sponsors of teacher preparation programs as well as accreditation teams about what should be included in programs. The Panel is considering the following format for new standards and has drafted standards to determine how these components might work.

Standard. Each new standard would include language that identifies a particular domain of teacher preparation and qualitative elements that would be used by an accreditation team to determine the extent to which a program sponsor is implementing an effective program. Each standard would include the following four elements:

Program Requirement. Following the standard language would

be specific program requirements that a program sponsor would be required to address for initial and continuing accreditation. An accreditation team would consider the extent to which the program requirements are addressed by the program and the level of quality and effectiveness with which they are implemented.

Candidate Outcome. Each standard would specify, when appropriate, the expected outcomes for candidates related to the implementation of the standard. This component of the standard would inform the overall determination of candidate competence within the context of the teaching performance assessment.

Program Indicators. Each standard would include specific indicators that would serve as evidence that a standard is met. The indicators would parallel the program requirements, and serve as a guide to accreditation teams as they consider both the extent to which a standard has been met and how well it has been met.

Candidate Outcome Indicators. Similar to the program indicators, this section of each standard would indicate the types of evidence that should be available to demonstrate that candidates are achieving the desired outcomes.

This tentative format is intended by the panel to be responsive to the curriculum reform movement in public schools. Students, teachers, schools and districts are going to be held to much higher standards of accountability in the future, and the Panel believes that new standards for teacher preparation programs should be responsive to these reforms.

Using the California Standards for the Teaching Profession, the SB 1422 Panel recommendations and the K-12 content standards as a base, the Panel has developed extensive lists of the content that they believe should be addressed in new standards. The Panel is in the process of organizing this content into categories and writing and revising standards. Given the structural changes to the credential enacted by SB 2042, the Panel expects new standards to include specific information for Level I preparation programs, leading to a Preliminary Teaching Credential, as well as specific standards for Level II preparation programs, leading to a Professional Clear Credential. Standards for Level II, pursuant to SB 2042, must be developed in collaboration with the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Panel has begun to explore this aspect of the standards development process. Commission staff expects to continue discussions with representatives of the Statewide BTSA Task Force during the Fall of 1999 regarding induction standards.

The Panel is also considering the SB 1422 Panel recommendation to establish separate standards for multiple and single subject credential programs, as well as variations in the standards for different types of programs (e.g., blended programs, internships, post-baccalaureate degree programs). These dimensions, as well as the structural (Level I, Level II) issues described above will impact the overall format of standards. The Panel expects, as a result of all of these changes, that new standards for teacher preparation will look significantly different than the Commission's current standards of quality and effectiveness for multiple and single subject credential programs. The Panel would welcome feedback from the Commission regarding the direction they are going with the format and structure of standards.

The Panel has set in motion a process to consider the issues related to the preparation of teachers who need to be responsive to the diverse backgrounds of all students in California. One of the recommendations of the SB 1422 Advisory Panel was to incorporate the current knowledge base and field experiences required for the Cross-cultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) Credential into the Level I and Level II Credential requirements for all teachers. The Commission adopted this and other related recommendations from the SB 1422 Panel and forwarded them to the 2042 panel to be addressed in the standards writing process. A Task Force has been established to present information to the Commission and the Panel about the linkages between language acquisition for those speak English as a first language and those who speak English as a second language and its relationship to reading and language arts. This is an important step in considering the development of new standards for teaching credentials that will include the authorization to teach students with limited English proficiency. During its September and October 1999 meetings, the Panel will review the State Board-adopted English Language Development Standards and other research and reports that focus on the competencies needed by teachers to teach California's diverse student population.

Progress on the Teaching Performance Assessment

In June 1999, the Commission selected a contractor (WestEd and MPR Associates) to conduct a job analysis of the knowledge, skills and abilities needed by new teachers in order for them to be effective in California's public schools. The job analysis will be used to establish the validity of the teaching performance assessment that will be developed pursuant to SB 2042. WestEd and MPR Associates have been working to develop a job analysis survey that will be conducted in October that summarizes the pedagogical knowledge, skills and abilities involved in teaching. Teachers, administrators and teacher educators will be asked to rate the importance (for the job of teaching) of each item on the survey, as well as the level of proficiency it is reasonable to expect a new teacher to demonstrate.

The SB 2042 Advisory Panel has spent considerable time during its June, July and August meetings working with the contractor to frame and formulate the job analysis survey. The Panel's primary interest has been to determine whether the survey represents a complete description of the elements of teaching. One of the more intellectually challenging aspects of this work has been to distinguish between what we expect teachers to know and be able to do now, from what we expect teachers to know and be able to do in the future. It is important that the teaching performance assessment be a valid and reliable instrument to assess teacher performance in the future. New state standards and policies will have a significant impact on the ways teachers teach in the future, and representing these changes in the job analysis survey has been a top priority for the Panel.

The contractor will use the survey results to develop preliminary Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs). The preliminary TPEs will include levels of proficiency that describe what we can reasonably expect a student teacher or intern to demonstrate during the teaching performance assessment. These preliminary TPEs will undergo an extensive validity study next year, and upon revision, will become the basis for the teaching performance assessment in the future. The Panel will use the preliminary TPEs to inform the new standards, particularly the "candidate outcomes" component of each standard.

Conclusion

The SB 2042 Advisory Panel has scheduled meetings through the rest of 1999, and will schedule additional meetings through June of 2000. Their work will result in draft standards for the Commission's consideration in May or June of 2000, at which time the Commission will be asked to authorize a field review. It is the hope and expectation of staff that new standards will be brought to the Commission for final adoption by December of 2000, at the same time final Teaching Performance Expectations are recommended for adoption. Staff will continue to provide updates to the Commission periodically throughout the standards development process.



[| Back to the Top |](#)
[| Back to September 1999](#)
[Agenda |](#)
[| Return to "Agenda Archives" |](#)
[| Return to "About CTC" |](#)





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-1

Committee: Fiscal Planning and Policy

Title: Update on the Governor's Budget for 1999-2000

✓ Information

Prepared by: John Walstrom, Analyst

Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

At the July 1999 Commission meeting, staff provided Commissioners with information on the status of the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget and its impact on the Commission. This information item provides an update on the Commission's 1999-2000 budget as signed by the Governor.

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

The activities associated with the preparation and presentation of this item are included in the baseline budget for the Fiscal and Business Services Section. Therefore, no funding augmentation is needed for this item.

SUMMARY

On June 29, 1999, Governor Davis signed the 1999 Budget Act into law. Some of the more salient new features of the Commission's budget are described as follows.

- The Commission received \$500,000 in additional expenditure authority to contract for an independent evaluation of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) System. The funding received is split equally from the General Fund (\$250,000) and the Teacher Credentials Fund (\$250,000).
- The Commission has been directed to use up to \$250,000 from the Teacher Credentials Fund to obtain a contractor to perform a comprehensive management study of the Commission's organizational structure and credential processing protocols. The contract is to be administered by the Legislative Analyst's Office pursuant to a selection process conducted collaboratively by the LAO, the Department of Finance, and the Commission. An update on the status of this effort can be found in FPPC-2.
- Consistent with the Legislature's previously enacted mandate, the Commission received \$75,000 for support of the Mathematics Initiative as provided by Assembly Bill 496 of 1998.
- The Governor's proposal to waive credential fees for first-time applicants has been approved along with a \$1.5 million General Fund appropriation to offset the resulting revenue loss from the fee waivers. This initiative has been implemented.
- The Federal Title II grant application (the Teacher Quality Enhancement Program), submitted in April 1999, has been approved by the U.S. Department of Education. The resulting grant award will increase the Commission's budget by \$3 million for each of the next three years. As a result, the Commission will be able to complete the development of the Teaching Performance Assessment, subcontract for assistance with subject matter preparation policy studies, and augment by \$1.78 million the level of local assistance funding for the Pre-Intern, Intern, and Mathematics Initiative Programs.

The following items were added to the Commission's budget as a result of Budget Change Proposals approved by the Commissioners and subsequently included in the 1999-2000 Governor's Budget:

- The Certification, Assignment, and Waivers Division received continued funding for 5.5 limited term positions for an additional year. These positions were originally established in 1997 pursuant to the Class Size Reduction Initiative.
- The Professional Practices Division's staffing has been augmented by two positions, at a cost of \$107,000, to address an increased volume of discipline case reviews.
- Three positions have been added to address the Commission's growing needs in the area of information technology.
- Two positions have been added to address administrative workload increases, one in the Executive Office and one in Business Services.
- The budget appropriation from the Test Development and Administration Account has been augmented by \$150,000 to fund the continuing costs of developing the Teaching Performance Assessment.

Staff is available to answer any questions the Commissioners may have.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to September 1999](#)
[Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-2

Committee: Fiscal Planning and Policy

Title: Update on the Management Study Mandated by the 1999 Budget Act

✓ Information

Prepared by: John Walstrom, Analyst

Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

The Commission's Budget as outlined in the Budget Act of 1999, contains a provision that would transfer up to \$250,000 to the Legislative Analyst for the purposes of contracting for a comprehensive management study of the Commission's organizational structure and credential processing protocols. This item is an update on the progress of this contract.

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

The activities associated with the preparation and presentation of this item are included in the baseline budget for the Fiscal and business Services Section. Therefore, no funding augmentation is needed for this item.

SUMMARY

The 1999 Budget Act directs the Legislative Analyst, in collaboration with the Department of Finance and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, to expend up to \$250,000 for a contracted management study of the Commission's organizational structure and credential processing protocols. The study is intended to provide the Governor and the Legislature with information that will validate the Commission's successful efforts to date and suggest potential areas for improvement. The management consultant's final report is due to the Governor and the Legislature by March 1, 2000.

Since the enactment of the 1999 Budget Act, Commission staff has met with staff of the Legislative Analyst's Office and the Department of Finance to discuss the process by which the contractor will be selected. Through a collaborative, three-agency effort, a solicitation document, similar to a traditional Request for Proposals, is being prepared and will soon be distributed to prospective contractors. Copies of the solicitation document will be distributed to Commissioners as soon it becomes available.

The contract is expected to be awarded by mid-October 1999. Although the funding source for this study is the Teacher Credentials Fund, the Budget Act provides for the contract to be awarded by the Legislative Analyst. Thus, the contract will not be subject to traditional State contract bidding requirements.

Staff is available to answer any questions the Commissioners may have.



| [Back to the Top](#) |
| [Back to September 1999](#)
[Agenda](#) |
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-3

Committee: Fiscal Planning and Policy

Title: Proposed 2000-2001 Budget Change Proposals

✓ Action

Prepared by: Karen Romo, Analyst
Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

Every summer the Commission is asked to consider Budget Change Proposals (BCPs) for inclusion in the Governor's proposed budget for the upcoming fiscal year. At the July Commission meeting, the Commission reviewed BCP concepts for fiscal year 2000-2001 and directed staff to develop the concepts into formal BCPs for action at the September Commission meeting. The fully developed BCPs include workload analyses, complete fiscal detail, and any extraordinary expenditure requests that are beyond standard operating costs.

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

The activities associated with the preparation and presentation of this item are included in the baseline budget for the Fiscal and Business Services Section. Therefore, no funding augmentation is needed for this item.

SUMMARY

The BCPs for fiscal year 2000-2001 request a total of 26.5 positions and \$3,699,000 in new expenditure authority. For fiscal year 1999-2000, the BCPs request 4.0 positions and \$948,000. For fiscal year 2000-2001, the BCPs request 22.5 positions and \$2,751,000. Of the total amount requested, \$2,399,000 is from the Teacher Credentials Fund and \$1,300,000 is from the Test Development and Administration Account.

The attached table summarizes the proposed 2000-2001 BCPs. Immediately following the table is a complete package of all of the proposed BCPs. Please note that the BCPs themselves are in divisional order while the table groups the BCPs by purpose.

Staff is available to answer any questions the Commissioners may have.

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001 BUDGET CHANGE PROPOSALS (BCPs)

Requesting Division/Office	Summary of Request	Estimated Costs		Number of Positions Requested
		407	408	
Staff Augmentations				
Certification, Assignment & Waivers*	Convert existing limited-term positions to permanent status effective July 1, 2000 to meet increased workload demands	\$ 275,000 (ongoing)		5.5
Certification, Assignment & Waivers*	Augment staff for a night shift in the Information Services Telephone Response Unit	94,000 (ongoing) 15,000 (one-time)		2.0
Professional Services	Augment staff to manage CCTC's ongoing responsibilities in the shared governance of the statewide BTSA program and to oversee BTSA program reviews and external assistance to conduct BTSA program reviews	390,000 (ongoing) 23,000 (one-time)		3.0
Professional Practices	Augment staff to address an increased caseload	146,000 (ongoing)		2.0

		15,000 (one-time)		
Human Resources and Internal Audits**	Augment staff to address the needs of the Internal Audits Unit • FY 1999-2000 • FY 2000-2001	140,000 (one-time) 256,000 (ongoing)		2.0 4.0
Governmental Relations	Augment staff to address increased workload • FY 1999-2000 • FY 2000-2001	83,000 (one-time) 147,000 (ongoing)		1.5 3.0
Executive	Augment staff to address increased workload • FY 1999-2000 • FY 2000-2001	25,000 (one-time) 45,000 (ongoing)		0.5 1.0
Customer Service				
Certification, Assignment & Waivers	Increase expenditure authority to cover costs associated with a toll-free number to improve the level of information service to our customers	\$108,000 (ongoing)		0.0
Certification, Assignment & Waivers	Increase expenditure authority to cover costs associated with accepting credit card payments for application and renewal fees	120,000 (ongoing)		0.0
Technology Investments				
Information Management Systems**	Augment staff and increase expenditure authority to cover costs associated with a database and application upgrade project	57,000 (ongoing) 295,000 (one-time)		1.0
Information Management Systems**	Augment staff and increase expenditure authority to cover costs associated with an agenda and web management project	72,000 (ongoing) 93,000 (one-time)		0.0
Test Validation				
Professional Services	Increase expenditure authority for contracted studies of CCTC's highest volume exams to ensure their continued validity on a five-year cycle: • Permanent increase in expenditure authority starting FY 1999-2000 • One-time increase in expenditure authority FY 1999-2000 • Additional one-time expenditure authority increase for FY 2000-2001		\$ 350,000 (ongoing) 350,000 (one-time) 600,000 (one-time)	0.0
	TOTAL FY 1999-2000	\$ 248,000	\$ 700,000	
	One-time	\$ 248,000	\$ 350,000	
	Ongoing	-0-	\$ 350,000	4.0
	TOTAL FY 2000-2001	\$ 2,151,000	\$ 600,000	
	One-time	\$ 441,000	\$ 600,000	22.5
	Ongoing	\$ 1,710,000	-0-	
GRAND TOTAL FOR 407 AND 408			\$3,699,000	
Total 407 Costs			2,399,000	
Total 408 Costs			1,300,000	



[| Back to the Top |](#)
[| Back to September 1999](#)
[Agenda |](#)
[| Return to "Agenda Archives" |](#)
[| Return to "About CTC" |](#)





California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: September 1-2, 1999

Agenda Item Number: PUB-1

Title: Proposed Addition of Sections 80048.3.1 and 80413.3 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to Experienced Out-of-State Credentialed Teachers

✓ Action

Prepared by: Yvonne Novelli, Program Analyst
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

PUBLIC HEARING

Sections 80048.3.1 and 80413.3 of Title 5 California Code of Regulations Pertaining to experienced out-of-state credentialed teachers

Introduction

The proposed additions of Sections 80048.3.1 and 80413.3, pertaining to experienced out-of-state credentialed teachers, are being presented for public hearing. Included in this item is the background of the proposed regulations, a brief discussion of the proposed changes and the financial impact. Also included are the responses to the notification of the public hearing and a copy of that notification distributed in coded correspondence #99-9915, dated July 16, 1999, that gives complete information regarding the proposal.

Background of the Proposed Regulations

AB1620 (Scott), which became effective on September 18, 1998, allows experienced, out-of-state trained teachers to qualify for California certification without completing many of the statutory requirements needed by individuals prepared in California or those inexperienced teachers from outside of California. It also establishes the requirements for the professional clear credentials for these individuals. The individuals affected by this legislation must verify a specific number of years of successful, full-time teaching experience and submit satisfactory, rigorous evaluation reports from prior employers. These proposed regulations were presented as an information item at the February 1999 Commission meeting and as an action item at the April 1999 Commission meeting.

Proposed Changes

The following is an overview of the proposed regulations that describes the needed requirements and define the statutory terms.

80413.3: Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials

80413.3(a):

This subsection pertains to individuals seeking the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential based on the following requirements. Additionally, those seeking the Single Subject Teaching Credential must have a degree major in the subject area requested.

1. Five years of full-time, out-of-state teaching experience in the subject of the credential sought.
2. Rigorous performance evaluations with a rating of satisfactory or better.
3. A valid, comparable teaching credential from another state.
4. A corresponding teacher preparation program from another state taken at a regionally

accredited institution of higher education and approved by that state's appropriate agency.

5. A baccalaureate or higher degree completed at a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
6. Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST).

To obtain the professional clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential, these individuals must complete 150 clock hours of staff development, college course work or other related activities that address one or more of the six standards found in the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. In the proposed regulations, individuals must complete this requirement in California while holding the AB1620 Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential.

80413.3(b)

The requirements for the three-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are comparable to those just discussed for the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential except three years of full-time, out-of-state teaching experience are needed rather than the five years. The three-year preliminary credentials will only be available at the request of an employing school district that has either an approved Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program or approved alternative program. The credential will be restricted to the requesting employer and will require that the district state that they intend to enroll the individual into an appropriate program. Completion of the beginning teacher program is required for renewal to the professional clear credential.

80413.3(c)

This subsection defines 1) majors for the Single Subject Teaching Credential, 2) full-time teaching experience, and 3) rigorous performance evaluations.

80413.3(d)

AB1620 does not allow individuals who have a Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential issued through reciprocity, established in Education Code §44274, to obtain a comparable credential based on experience. This proposed subsection reflects this stipulation.

80413.3(e)

Some individuals in California currently hold preliminary credentials and would qualify under AB1620. The proposed regulations allow these individuals to re-apply under the AB1620 statutes if they also submit satisfactory or better rigorous performance evaluations from their California teaching experience. This also allows the individuals at least three years to complete the professional growth requirements.

80048.3.1: Education Specialist Instruction Credential

80048.3.1(a)

The proposed requirements for the five-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential (Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/ Severe Disabilities, etc.) are the same as those for the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential mentioned in 80413.3(a), with several exceptions. The training, out-of-state certification and experience must be in the disability area of the California credential sought. Also, as with those seeking the preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential through the more traditional method, individuals must verify an offer of California employment so they can complete the induction requirements for the professional clear Level II. If individuals meet all requirements except California employment, they may request a Certificate of Eligibility.

80048.3.1(b)

Under this proposal, individuals who obtain the preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential based on these regulations will need to complete the current requirements for the professional clear Level II.

80048.3.1(c)

This subsection defines full-time teaching experience and rigorous performance evaluations. These are the same definitions found in the proposed 80413.3(c) for the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials.

80048.3.1(d)

As with the proposed Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials regulations, Education Code §44274, established in AB1620, will not allow an individual who has obtained a preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential based on

reciprocity to apply under this regulation.

80048.3.1(e)

Under this proposed subsection, an individual who holds a preliminary Specialist Instruction Credential in Special Education (Learning Handicapped, Severely Handicapped, etc.) and satisfies the AB1620 requirements may apply for a five-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential under these regulations. If they have California experience, they will need to submit the most recent rigorous performance evaluation from their California employer.

Financial Impact

AB1620 has a positive economic impact on individuals who meet the criteria and a lesser negative impact on colleges and universities, agencies that administer examinations, public school employers and the Commission. The regulations that clarify the criteria should not have an economic impact on any entity other than a minor short-term cost to the Commission related to holding a public hearing.

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Mailing List and Responses

Mailing List

Commission Members on the Commission on Teacher Credentialing
California County Superintendents of Schools
Credential Analysts at the California County Superintendent of Schools' Offices
Superintendents of Selected California School Districts
Deans of Education at the California Institutions of Higher Education with
Commission-
Approved Programs
Credential Analysts at the California Institutions of Higher Education with
Commission-
Approved Programs
Presidents of Select Professional Educational Associations

This was also placed on the Internet at "<http://www.ctc.ca.gov>".

Tally of Responses

In Support	In Opposition
3 organizational opinions	0 organizational opinion
1 personal opinion	1 personal opinion

Responses Representing Organizational Opinions in Support

- Ceres Unified School District: Sallie C. Carter, Assistant Superintendent
- Somerset Educational Services, NPS: Mary Ann Salem, Director of Student Services
- United Teachers of Los Angeles: Day Higuchi, President

Responses Representing Personal Opinions in Support

- Lorie Beal, Credential Analyst, Santa Barbara County Education Office

Responses Representing Personal Opinions in Opposition

- Keith Thompson, Faculty, College of Social Work, San Jose State University
Comment: "Rigorous performance evaluations" pages 4 and 6 is not evaluatable in present form. #1 - no measurable level of motivation is specified #2 - "high" standards is not measurable. #3 "deep" knowledge is not measurable. #4 "appropriate" is not measurable. W/o measurable standards there can be no "rigorous performance evaluations".

Commission Staff Response: Mr. Thompson's comment is regarding the criteria established for the rigorous performance evaluations. These evaluation areas are based on the standards found in the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. An example of the wording is the second criteria: *The ability to establish and maintain high standards for student behavior*. In response to Mr. Thompson's comment, the rigorous performance evaluations will be completed by school administrators and will reflect their trained, professional judgment.

Staff Recommendation



Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division
(916) 445-7254 Web Site: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov>
E-Mail: credentials@ctc.ca.gov

OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
(916) 445-0184

99-9915

DATE: July 16, 1999

TO: All Individuals and Groups Interested in the Activities of the Commission on
Teacher Credentialing

FROM: Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director

SUBJECT: Proposed Addition of Sections 80048.3.1 and 80413.3 of Title 5, California
Code of Regulations, Pertaining to Experienced Out-of-State Credentialed
Teachers

Notice of Public Hearing is Hereby Given:

In accordance with Commission policy, proposed Title 5 Regulations are being distributed prior to the public hearing. A copy of the proposed regulations is attached. The added text is underlined. The public hearing is scheduled on:

September 2, 1999
1:30 pm
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814

Statement of Reasons

AB1620, which became effective on September 18, 1998, allows experienced, out-of-state trained teachers to qualify for California certification without completing many of the statutory requirements needed by individuals prepared in California or those inexperienced teachers from outside of California. Those qualifying for the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials based on Education Code §44274.2 and §44274.4 are exempt from the following requirements:

- methods of developing English language skills, including reading,
- provisions and principles of the U.S. Constitution,
- subject matter competence,
- fifth year of study,
- health education,
- special education, and
- computer education

Those qualifying for the Education Specialist Instruction Credentials based on Education Code §44274.2 are exempt from the following requirements:

- methods of developing English language skills, including reading,
- provisions and principles of the U.S. Constitution,
- subject matter competence,
- non-special education pedagogy, and
- supervised field experience in general education

Proposed Additions of §80413.3 and §80048.3.1

AB1620 allows the Commission to grant preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials and Education Specialist Instruction Credentials to individuals who are trained in

another state and have a specified number of years of successful, out-of-state teaching experience. It also establishes the requirements for the professional clear credentials for these individuals. The following is an overview of the proposed regulations that describe the requirements needed and clarify the definitions used for these credentials.

80413.3: Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials

80413.3(a):

This subsection pertains to individuals seeking the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential based on the following requirements. Additionally, those seeking the Single Subject Teaching Credential must have a degree major in the subject area requested.

1. Five years of full-time, out-of-state teaching experience in the subject of the credential sought.
2. Rigorous performance evaluations with a rating of satisfactory or better.
3. A valid, comparable teaching credential from another state.
4. A corresponding teacher preparation program from another state taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and approved by that state's appropriate agency.
5. A baccalaureate or higher degree completed at a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
6. Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST).

To obtain the professional clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential, these individuals must complete 150 clock hours of staff development, college course work or other related activities that address one or more of the six standards found in the *California Standards for the Teaching Profession*. In the proposed regulations, individuals must complete this requirement in California while holding the AB1620 preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential.

80413.3(b)

The requirements for the three-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are comparable to those just discussed for the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential except three years of full-time, out-of-state teaching experience are needed rather than the five years. Because these individuals must complete either an approved Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program or an approved alternative program of beginning teacher induction as the renewal requirement for the professional clear credential, these three-year preliminary credentials will only be available at the request of an employing school district that has either program. The credential will be restricted to the requesting employer and will require that the district state that they intend to enroll the individual into an appropriate program.

80413.3(c)

This subsection defines 1) majors for the Single Subject Teaching Credential, 2) full-time teaching experience, and 3) rigorous performance evaluations.

Majors for the Single Subject Teaching Credential: AB1620 requires that individuals applying for the Single Subject Teaching Credential have a degree major in the requested subject area. Because the subject areas listed on the credential are limited to those few established in statute, the proposed regulations identify comparable degree majors. Also, the degree majors listed are limited to those with similar content because it is the only verification of the individual's subject matter competency.

Full-Time Teaching Experience: The proposed regulation clarifies that the teaching experience must be obtained from out-of-state public schools while holding that state's valid, comparable teaching credential. The experience can be gained in several states but not from outside of the United States. Full-time experience is defined as a minimum of four hours a day on a daily basis, unless the minimum statutory attendance requirement for the students served is less, and for at least 75% of the school year. The four-hour daily increment is based on the statutory student-attendance requirements for grades 4-12. The "75% of the school year" has been traditionally used to include teachers hired late by districts that underestimated the number of teachers needed at the school year. The proposed regulation also describes the type of verification letter needed.

Rigorous Performance Evaluations: The proposed regulations require submission of evaluations for at least two years of the out-of-state teaching experience, with at least one

evaluation within the last two years. The proposal also defines the four areas that need to be included in the evaluation and allows submission of a supplemental evaluation letter if these specific areas are not covered in the formal evaluations. The needed areas are the following:

1. The use of teaching strategies that motivates all students to engage in the learning process.
2. The ability to establish and maintain high standards for student behavior.
3. A demonstration of deep knowledge of the subject being taught and the use of appropriate instructional strategies that promote student understanding.
4. An ability to plan and implement a sequence of appropriate instructional activities.

80413.3(d)

AB1620 does not allow individuals who have a Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential issued through reciprocity, established in Education Code §44274, to obtain a comparable credential based on experience. This proposed subsection reflects this stipulation.

80413.3(e)

Some individuals in California currently hold preliminary credentials and would qualify under AB1620. The proposed regulations allow these individuals to re-apply under the AB1620 statutes if they also submit satisfactory or better rigorous performance evaluations from their California teaching experience. This also allows the individuals at least three years to complete the professional growth requirements.

80048.3.1: Education Specialist Instruction Credential

80048.3.1(a)

The proposed requirements for the five-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential (Mild/Moderate Disabilities, Moderate/ Severe Disabilities, etc.) are the same as those for the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential mentioned in 80413.3(a), with several exceptions. The training, out-of-state certification and experience must be in the disability area of the California credential sought. Also, as with those seeking the preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential through the more traditional method, individuals must verify an offer of California employment so they can complete the induction requirements for the professional clear Level II. If individuals meet all requirements except California employment, they may request a Certificate of Eligibility.

80048.3.1(b)

Under this proposal, individuals who obtain the preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential based on these regulations will need to complete the current requirements for the professional clear Level II.

80048.3.1(c)

This subsection defines full-time teaching experience and rigorous performance evaluations. These are the same definitions found in the proposed 80413.3(c) for the Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials.

80048.3.1(d)

As with the proposed Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials regulations, Education Code §44274, established in AB1620, will not allow an individual who has obtained a preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential based on reciprocity to apply under this regulation.

80048.3.1(e)

Under this proposed subsection, an individual who holds a preliminary Specialist Instruction Credential in Special Education (Learning Handicapped, Severely Handicapped, etc.) and satisfies the AB1620 requirements may apply for a five-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential under these regulations. If they have California experience, they will need to submit the most recent rigorous performance evaluation from their California employer.

Documents Relied Upon in Preparing Regulations

- California Standards for the Teaching Profession
- Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs

Documents Incorporated by Reference

None.

Written Comment Period

Any interested person, or his or her authorized representative, may submit written comments on the proposed actions. The written comment period closes at 5:00 p.m. on September 1, 1999.

Any written comments received 14 days prior to the public hearing will be reproduced by the Commission's staff for each Commissioner as a courtesy to the person submitting the comments and will be included in the written agenda prepared for and presented to the full Commission at the hearing.

Submission of Written Comments

A response form is attached for your use when submitting written comments to the Commission. Please send it to the Commission, attention Executive Office, at 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814, so it is received at least one day prior to the date of the public hearing.

Public Hearing

Oral comments on the proposed action will be taken at the public hearing. We would appreciate 14 days advance notice in order to schedule sufficient time on the agenda for all speakers. Please contact Yvonne Novelli at (916) 445-5865 regarding this.

Any person wishing to submit written comments at the public hearing may do so. It is requested, but not required, that persons submitting such comments provide fifty copies to be distributed to the Commissioners and interested members of the public. All written statements submitted at the hearing will, however, be given full consideration regardless of the number of copies submitted.

Modification of Proposed Actions

If the Commission proposes to modify the actions hereby proposed, the modifications (other than non-substantial or solely grammatical modifications) will be made available for public comment for at least 15 days before they are adopted.

Contact Person/Further Information

Inquiries concerning the proposed action may be directed to Yvonne Novelli, at (916) 445-5865. Upon request, a copy of the express terms of the proposed action and a copy of the initial statement of reasons will be made available. In addition, all the information on which this proposal is based is available for inspection and copying.

DIVISION VIII OF TITLE 5 CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS

Proposed Addition of Sections 80048.3.1 and 80413.3 Pertaining to Experienced Out-of-State Credentialed Teachers

INITIAL PROPOSED REGULATIONS

80413.3 Specific Requirements for Preliminary and Professional Clear Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials for Experienced Out-of-State Credentialed Teachers

- (a) The following pertains to individuals who have five years of appropriate teaching experience in a state other than California.
 - (1) The minimum requirements for the five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are all of the following, (A) through (G).
 - (A) Five years of full-time teaching experience in the subject of the credential sought and in a state other than California.

- (B) Rigorous performance evaluations.
 - (C) A valid teaching credential from another state, with a comparable authorization to the credential sought.
 - (D) Completion of a teacher preparation program, including student teaching, taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and appropriate to the credential sought. The program must be approved by the appropriate state agency in the state where the program was completed.
 - (E) A baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (F) In the case of an applicant for a five-year preliminary Single Subject Teaching Credential, completion of an academic major in the subject area of the credential sought.
 - (G) Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) described in Education Code §44252. A one-year nonrenewable Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential may be issued to an applicant who has not passed the CBEST and has satisfied subsections (a)(1)(A) through (a)(1)(F) above and Title 5 §80071.4(c).
- (2) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are both of the following:
- (A) A five-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential issued pursuant to subdivision (a)(1), and
 - (B) Completion of 150 clock hours of activities addressing one or more of the following six standards. This may be satisfied by staff development, college course work or other activities related to the standards. When applying for the professional clear credential, a written list of the activities including a justification stating how each of the activities relates to the standard must be attached. An individual at the central office of a California school district or county office of education, or at a California school site who is responsible for curriculum and instruction in the authorization of the teacher's credential must sign the written justification agreeing that the activities relate to the standard(s) as stated. The individual must complete this requirement in California while holding the Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential issued pursuant to subdivision (a)(1).
 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.
- (b) The following pertains to individuals who have three years of appropriate teaching experience in a state other than California.
- (1) The minimum requirements for the three-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are all of the following, (A) through (H).
- (A) Three years of full-time teaching experience in the subject of the credential sought and in a state other than California.
 - (B) Rigorous performance evaluations.
 - (C) A valid teaching credential from another state, with a comparable authorization to the credential sought.
 - (D) Completion of a teacher preparation program, including student teaching, taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and appropriate to the credential sought. The program must be approved by the appropriate state agency in the state where the program was completed.
 - (E) A baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (F) In the case of an applicant for a three-year preliminary Single Subject Teaching Credential, completion of an academic major in the subject area of the credential sought.
 - (G) An offer of employment from a California school district, county office of education or school operating under the direction of a California state agency

that has one of the approved programs listed in (b)(2)(B) and a statement by the employer verifying intention to enroll the individual into the program. The document will be restricted to the requesting employer.

- (H) Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) described in Education Code §44252. A one-year nonrenewable Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential may be issued to an applicant who has not passed the CBEST and has satisfied subsections (b)(1)(A) through (b)(1)(G) above and Title 5 §80071.4(c).
- (2) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential are both of the following:
- (A) A three-year preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential issued pursuant to subdivision (b)(1), and
 - (B) Completion of either of the following:
 - 1. A program of beginning teacher support and assessment established pursuant to Education Code, Article 4.5 (commencing with §44279.1) of Chapter 2 of Part 25, or
 - 2. An alternative program of beginning teacher induction that the commission determines, in collaboration with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, meets state standards for teacher induction.
- (c) The following definitions apply to terms used in this section.
- (1) Majors for the Single Subject Teaching Credential: Applicants for the Single Subject Teaching Credential must have a major in the fields identified below or in a closely related subject acceptable to the Commission.
- (A) Agriculture: agribusiness, animal science, crop science, dairy science, natural resources management, horticulture, or soil science.
 - (B) Art: art history or studio art.
 - (C) Business: accountancy, business administration, finance or marketing.
 - (D) English: composition or literature.
 - (E) Foreign Language: French, German, Spanish, or another language other than English.
 - (F) Health Science: health science or public health.
 - (G) Home Economics: foods, nutrition, child development, interior design, or clothing.
 - (H) Industrial and Technology Education: industrial technology.
 - (I) Mathematics: mathematics.
 - (J) Music: instrumental or vocal.
 - (K) Physical Education: kinesiology or physical education.
 - (L) Science: Biological Sciences: biology, marine biology, anatomy, or botany.
 - (M) Science: Chemistry: chemistry or biochemistry.
 - (N) Science: Geoscience: astronomy, earth science, ecology, or geology.
 - (O) Science: Physics: physics.
 - (P) Social Science: geography, government, political science, or history. An applicant with a major in one of the disciplines of anthropology, economics, psychology or sociology may receive the credential in social science if he or she also has a minor in geography, government, political science, or history. A minor is defined as 20 semester units obtained within the degree.
- (2) Full-Time Teaching Experience: This is defined as teaching a minimum of 4 hours a day, unless the minimum statutory attendance requirement for the students served is less. Experience must be on a daily basis and for at least 75% of the school year. Experience may be accrued in increments of a minimum of one semester. No part-time or combination of teaching with other school employment will be accepted. All experience must be gained in public schools in states other than California while serving on that state's valid teaching credential that is comparable to the authorization sought. Experience may be gained in more than one state other than California. This experience must be verified on the official letterhead of the district or districts by the superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of personnel, or director of human resources in which the teacher was employed. Experience from outside of the United States will not be

considered.

(3) Rigorous Performance Evaluations:

(A) The teaching effectiveness areas on the performance evaluations must include, but are not be limited to, all of the areas, 1. through 4., below. If these areas are not included in the evaluations, the individual may submit a supplemental letter, on district letterhead, signed by the individual's principal or personnel officer in the district in which the evaluations took place. If an evaluation or supplemental letter cannot be obtained that includes all of the four areas, then the individual would not qualify under this section. Verification of the authenticity of the evaluation letters must be given in writing by a personnel officer in the district in which the evaluations took place.

1. The use of teaching strategies that motivates all students to engage in the learning process.
2. The ability to establish and maintain high standards for student behavior.
3. A demonstration of deep knowledge of the subject being taught and the use of appropriate instructional strategies that promote student understanding.
4. An ability to plan and implement a sequence of appropriate instructional activities.

(B) Evaluations of the teacher's performance for at least two of the years of teaching experience from a state other than California must be submitted with at least one evaluation within the last two years of the experience.

(C) Evaluation ratings must be satisfactory or better.

(d) An individual who has previously been issued a California Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential based on Education Code §44274 is not eligible for a credential issued under this section.

(e) An individual who has previously been issued a California Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential, based on other than Education Code §44274, is eligible for a credential issued under this section provided that the following (1) and (2) are met.

- (1) Verification of all provisions of (a)(1) or (b)(1), and
- (2) If the individual has California public school teaching experience in the authorization of the credential sought, submission of the most recent rigorous performance evaluation.
- (3) If qualifying under (a)(1), the credential will be valid either five years from the issuance date of the original preliminary credential or three years from the date of application under (a)(1), which ever expires later.
- (4) If qualifying under (b)(1), the credential will be valid three years from the date of application.

NOTE: Authority Cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44274, 44274.2, 44274.4, 44279.1 and 44252, Education Code

80048.3.1 Specific Requirements for Preliminary Level I and Professional Clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential for Experienced Out-of-State Credentialed Teachers

- (a) The minimum requirements for the five-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential are all of the following, (1) through (7).
- (1) Five years of full-time teaching experience in the disability area of the credential sought and in a state other than California.
 - (2) Rigorous performance evaluations.
 - (3) A valid special education teaching credential from another state, with a comparable authorization to the credential sought.
 - (4) Completion of a teacher preparation program, including student teaching, taken at a regionally accredited institution of higher education and appropriate to the disability area of the credential sought. The program must be approved by the appropriate state agency in the state where the program was completed.
 - (5) A baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
 - (6) An offer of employment as specified in 80048.3(a)(8). An individual who has

completed all other requirements (1) through (7) but does not have an offer of employment may apply for a Certificate of Eligibility as specified in 80048.3(a)(9).

- (7) Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) administered pursuant to Education Code §44252. A one-year nonrenewable Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential may be issued to an applicant who has not passed the CBEST and has satisfied subsections (a)(1) through (a)(6) above and Title 5 §80071.4(c).
- (b) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential are both of the following:
 - (1) A five-year preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential issued pursuant to subdivision (a)(1), and
 - (2) Completion of all requirements for the professional clear Level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential, as specified in Title 5 §80048.4.
- (c) The following definitions apply to terms used in this section.
 - (1) Full-Time Teaching Experience: This is defined as teaching a minimum of 4 hours a day, unless the minimum statutory attendance requirement for the students served is less. Experience must be on a daily basis and for at least 75% of the school year. Experience may be accrued in increments of a minimum of one semester. No part-time or combination of teaching with other school employment will be accepted. All experience must be gained in public schools in states other than California while serving on that state's valid teaching credential that is comparable to the authorization sought. Experience may be gained in more than one state other than California. This experience must be verified on the official letterhead of the district or districts by the superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of personnel, or director of human resources in which the teacher was employed. Experience from outside of the United States will not be considered.
 - 2) Rigorous Performance Evaluations:
 - (A) The teaching effectiveness areas on the performance evaluations must include, but are not be limited to, all of the areas, 1. through 4., below. If these areas are not included in the evaluations, the individual may submit a supplemental letter, on district letterhead, signed by the individual's principal or personnel officer in the district in which the evaluations took place. If an evaluation or supplemental letter cannot be obtained that includes all of the four areas, then the individual would not qualify under this section. Verification of the authenticity of the evaluation letters must be given in writing by a personnel officer in the district in which the evaluations took place.
 1. The use of teaching strategies that motivates all students to engage in the learning process.
 2. The ability to establish and maintain high standards for student behavior.
 3. A demonstration of deep knowledge of the subject being taught and the use of appropriate instructional strategies that promote student understanding.
 4. An ability to plan and implement a sequence of appropriate instructional activities.
 - (B) Evaluations of the teacher's performance for at least two of the years of teaching experience from a state other than California must be submitted with at least one evaluation within the last two years of the experience.
 - (C) Evaluation ratings must be satisfactory or better.
- (d) An individual who has previously been issued a preliminary Level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential based on Education Code §44274 is not eligible for a credential issued under this section.
- (e) An individual who has previously been issued a California preliminary Specialist Instruction Credential in Special Education is eligible for a credential issued under this section provided the following (1) and (2) are met.
 - (1) Verification of all provisions of (a), and
 - (2) If the individual has California public school teaching experience in the authorization of the credential sought, submission of the most recent rigorous performance evaluation.
- (3) The credential will be valid five years from the date of application.

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Box 944270
Sacramento, California 94244-2700
(916) 445-7254 Web Site: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov>
E-Mail: credentials@ctc.ca.gov



Attn.: Sam Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director

Title: Experienced Out-of-State Credentialed Teachers

(AB1620)

Section Nos.: 80048.3.1 and 80413.3

Response to the Attached Title 5 Regulations

So that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing can more clearly estimate the general field response to the attached Title 5 regulations, please return this response form to the Commission, attention Executive Office, at the above address by 5:00 pm on September 1, 1999, in order that the material can be presented at the September 2, 1999 public hearing.

1. **Yes**, I agree with the proposed Title 5 regulations. Please count me in favor of these regulations.
2. **No**, I do not agree with the proposed Title 5 Regulations for the following reasons: (If additional space is needed, please continue on another sheet.)
3. Personal opinion of the undersigned, and/or
4. Organizational opinion representing: _____
(Circle One) School District, County Schools, College, University, Professional Organization, Other
5. I shall be at the public hearing, place my name on the list for making a presentation to the Commission.
6. No, I will not make a presentation to the Commission at the public hearing.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____ Phone: _____

Employer/Organization: _____

Mailing Address: _____

route to *ym*



- | [Back to the Top](#) |
- | [Back to September 1999](#)
- | [Agenda](#) |
- | [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
- | [Return to "About CTC"](#) |

