



[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

## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

January 5-6, 2000 • 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, January 5, 2000 Commission Office

1. **Appeals and Waivers (Committee Chair Harvey) 9:00 a.m.**
  - A&W-1 Approval of the Minutes
  - A&W-2 Consideration of Credential Appeals
  - A&W-3 Reconsideration of Waiver Denials
  - A&W-4 Waivers: Consent Calendar
  - A&W-5 Waivers: Conditions Calendar
  - A&W-6 Waivers: Denial Calendar

2. **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)

### THURSDAY, January 6, 2000 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 December 1999 Minutes
  - GS-4 Approval of the January Agenda
  - GS-5 Approval of the January 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 Veneman)**




 LEG-1 Update on Commission Legislative Concepts

-  **LEG-2** Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission
-  **LEG-3** Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission

**3. Preparation Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Sutro)**

-  **PREP-1** Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities
-  **PREP-2** Recommendations Related to the AB 1620 Reciprocity Study and Request to Adopt Emergency Regulations
-  **PREP-3** Proposed Contract for Early Childhood Pilot Study Implementation and Evaluation
-  **PREP-4** Report on Pre-Internship Program Progress and Expansion
-  **PREP-5** Approval of Plan to Issue 2000-2001 Pre-Internship and Teaching Internship Request for Proposals
-  **PREP-6** Proposal to Issue a Request for Proposals to Conduct an Independent Evaluation of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program



**4. Performance Standards Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Katzman)**

-  **PERF-1** Proposed Request for Proposals for the (Bilingual) Cross-cultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations
-  **PERF-2** Progress Report on the Work of the SB 2042 Advisory Panel
-  **PERF-3** Study Session: The California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST): A Progress Report

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

-  **FPPC-1** Update on the Management Study Mandated by the 1999 Budget Act

**6. Certificated Assignments Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Dauterive)**

-  **C&CA-1** AB 471 Report on Numbers of Classroom Teachers
-  **C&CA-2** Advanced Fingerprint Processing for Waiver Applications

**7. 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 January, February & March 2000
- 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**  
**February 2-3, 2000**  
**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**  
**1900 Capitol Avenue**  
**Sacramento, CA 95814**

---



[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:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** LEG-1

**Committee:** Legislative

**Title:** Update on Commission Legislative Concepts

- ✓ Information
- ✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Rod Santiago,  
Office of Governmental Relations

---

## Update on Commission Legislative Concepts

Staff will give a verbal update on the legislative concepts brought to the Commission's attention at the December 1999 meeting.

---



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** LEG-2

**Committee:** Legislative

**Title:** Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Rod Santiago,  
Office of Governmental Relations

**BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE  
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
December 20, 1999**

**CCTC-Sponsored Bills**

<b>Bill Number - Author Subject</b>	<b>Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)</b>	<b>Status</b>
AB 309 -- Mazzone Would increase the cap on per intern expenditures in the alternative certification program	<b>Sponsor (3/99)</b>	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 457 -- Scott Would add internet-based sex offenses to the list of specified mandatory revocation offenses	<b>Sponsor (3/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 466 -- Mazzone Omnibus clean-up bill	<b>Sponsor (3/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
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	<b>Sponsor (3/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 1067 -- Margrett Would bring Education Code provisions related to lewd and lascivious Penal Code violations into conformity	<b>Sponsor (4/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 1282 -- Jackson Would require CCTC to make improvements needed to enhance CBEST	<b>Sponsor (4/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered

**SENATE BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC**

<b>Bill Number - Author Subject</b>	<b>Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)</b>	<b>Status</b>
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) <b>Oppose (7/99)</b>	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee

SB 179 - Alpert Would establish model alternative teacher preparation programs	<b>Support if Amended (2/99)</b>	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	<b>Oppose (3/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
SB 395 -- Hughes Would remove the sunset date on SDAIE staff development training	Seek Amendments (4/99) <b>Support (7/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
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	<b>Support (4/99)</b>	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
SB 489 -- Solis Would make findings and declarations related to educational paraprofessionals	<b>Watch (4/99)</b>	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) <b>Support if Amended (5/99)</b>	Held in Senate Appropriations 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	<b>Oppose (4/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
SB 1061 -- Schiff Would waive the credential application fee for first-time specified credential applicants	<b>Support (4/99)</b>	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	<b>Watch (4/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee

#### ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

<b>Bill Number - Author Subject</b>	<b>Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)</b>	<b>Status</b>
AB 1X - Villaraigosa and Strom-Martin Would establish the Peer Assistance and Review Program for Teachers	<b>Seek Amendments (2/99)</b> CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 2X - Mazzoni and Cunneen Would establish various programs related to reading and teacher recruitment	Support (2/99) <b>Seek Amendments (3/99)</b> CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 6 - Calderon Establishes the California Teacher Academy Program	<b>Seek Amendments (2/99)</b> CTC amendments adopted	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 27X - Leach Would require CCTC to conduct a validity study of the CBEST	Oppose Unless Amended (2/99) CTC amendments adopted <b>Watch (3/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 31 - Reyes Extends APLE Program to applicants who agree to provide classroom instruction in school districts serving rural areas	<b>Support (2/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 108 - Mazzoni Subject Matter Projects	<b>Support (2/99)</b>	Held in Senate Appropriations

AB 192 -- Scott Would create the California Teacher Cadet Program	<b>Support (3/99)</b>	Committee Vetoed by the Governor
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	<b>Watch (4/99)</b>	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 615 -- Runner Would place specified categorical funding programs into block grant programs	Oppose Unless Amended (6/99) <b>Watch (9/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
AB 707 -- House Would set forth requirements for a services credential with a specialization in school psychology	<b>Seek Amendments (4/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
AB 752 -- Davis Would create two new single subject teaching credentials in dance and in theatre	<b>Watch (4/99)</b>	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 770 -- Honda Would create a Middle Grades Certificate Program	<b>Seek Amendments (4/99)</b>	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	<b>Support (5/99)</b>	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
AB 908 -- Alquist Would require CCTC to adopt or revise standards to address gender equity	<b>Seek Amendments (4/99)</b>	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	<b>Oppose Unless Amended (4/99)</b>	Assembly Education Committee
AB 961 -- Steinberg Would create the Challenged School Teacher Attraction and Retention Act of 1999	<b>Support (4/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
AB 1006 -- Ducheny Would establish a two-year pilot project to provide peer support and mentoring for school counselors	<b>Support (4/99)</b>	Senate Education Committee
AB 1059 -- Ducheny Would make various provisions in law related to CLAD training	Seek Amendments (4/99) <b>Support (9/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
AB 1242 -- Lempert Would require CCTC to issue a California Preliminary (CAP) Credential to persons meeting certain requirements	Seek Amendments (4/99) Oppose (6/99) <b>Watch (9/99)</b>	Signed by the Governor-- Chaptered
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) <b>Oppose (5/99)</b>	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) <b>Seek Amendments (5/99)</b>	Assembly Education Committee
AB 1529 -- Baldwin and Runner Would allow institutions of higher education who have received accreditation from any regional or national accrediting body recognized by the U.S. Department of Education to operate a teacher preparation program for	<b>Oppose (12/99)</b>	Assembly Education Committee



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |







## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** LEG-3

**Committee:** Legislative

**Title:** Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Information

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Rod Santiago,  
Office of Governmental Relations

---

## Bill Analysis California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Bill Number:** Assembly Bill 1324  
**Author(s):** Assemblymember Charlene Zettel  
**Sponsor:** Assemblymember Charlene Zettel  
**Subject of Bill:** Mild to Moderate Disabilities  
**Date Introduced:** February 26, 1999  
**Last Amended:** Proposed to be amended January 5, 2000  
**Status in Leg. Process:** Assembly Education Committee  
**Current CTC Position:** None  
**Recommended Position:** Oppose  
**Date of Analysis:** December 20, 1999  
**Analyst(s):** Rod Santiago and Linda Bond

### Summary of Current Law

Current law creates the services credential with a specialization in Clinical or Rehabilitative Services. The holder of this credential is authorized to provide clinical or rehabilitative services within the field or fields named on the credential. If the holder also holds a Special Class Authorization, then the holder is also authorized to teach handicapped children in a special class in which the primary disability is speech and language impaired.

Current law states that "In adopting the necessary rules and regulations establishing the requirements for the preparation of special education specialties, the commission shall ensure that teachers have sufficient knowledge of subject matter that is the core of the California public school curriculum and experience with nonspecial education pupils to the extent deemed appropriate by the commission." (Education Code §44265)

Current law further states that "The governing board of a school district shall employ for positions requiring certification qualifications, only persons who possess the qualifications

## Analysis of Bill Provisions

Assembly Bill 1324 would allow a teacher who does not hold a specialist credential to teach pupils with mild to moderate disabilities in a special day class setting to teach in a special day class setting if the teacher holds a clinical or rehabilitative services credential and meets the following criteria:

1. The teacher has been teaching in a special day class setting for a minimum of 10 years:
2. The special day class setting consists of pupils of mild to moderate disabilities.
3. The local school board or county office of education approves the assignment after assessing the competency and skills of the teacher to meet the needs of pupils with mild to moderate disabilities.

The bill would sunset this provision of law on January 10, 2010.

## Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

This bill would have little fiscal impact on the work of the Commission.

## Analysis of Relevant Legislative policies by the Commission

The following guidelines appear to apply to this measure:

- 1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.**
- 3. The Commission supports legislation which reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation which would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.**
- 4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.**
- 5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**
- 6. The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators, and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.**

## Organizational Positions on the Bill

None known at this time.

## Reasons for Suggested Position

AB 1324 would allow those who have been misassigned for ten years to continue in their assignment. This sets a precedent that goes against the work of the Commission. This bill would allow any Clinical or Rehabilitative Services Credential holder with or without a special class authorization to provide instruction in a classroom setting.

Currently, all Education Specialist credential holders are required to demonstrate subject matter competence. This bill would place no subject matter requirements on the service credential holders who would be allowed to teach mild to moderate disabilities students. This would be contrary to current law since the commission is required to ensure that teachers of special education pupils have sufficient knowledge of subject matter that is the core of the California public school curriculum.

Further, Title 5 regulations require all services and specialist credential holders to complete professional growth requirements. These requirements were put in place in May of 1994. The bill would allow holders of the Clinical or Rehabilitative Services Credentials who have held those credentials for 10 years to serve in the mild to moderate disabilities classroom, but would place no professional growth requirements on them. It is for these reasons that staff is suggesting a position of **Oppose**.

---



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-1

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities

✓ Action

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

---

## Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities

Professional Services Division  
December 20, 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.

### 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.

## 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.

### 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.

### Languages Other Than English

- San Diego State University - Latin

### Music

- Sonoma State University
- 



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-2

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** Recommendations Related to the AB 1620 Reciprocity Study and Request to Adopt Emergency Regulations

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Phil Fitch, Ed.D., Consultant , Darya Callihan, Assistant Consultant, and Sara Swan, Staff Services Analyst  
Professional Services Division

---

## Recommendations Related to the AB 1620 Reciprocity Study and Request to Adopt Emergency Regulations

**Professional Services Division  
December 20, 1999**

### Executive Summary

The periodic review of teacher preparation outside of California required by Section 1 of Assembly Bill 1620 is a multi-step process that includes a review of each state's accreditation procedures, elementary and secondary pedagogical standards, special education teacher preparation standards, and subject matter knowledge requirements in thirteen teaching credential areas. This agenda report provides Commissioners with a sixth report regarding the AB 1620 Reciprocity Study. Included are additional recommendations of comparability based on the decisions of the AB 1620 Task Force at its November 1999 meeting, and additional recommendations of state comparability in subject matter requirements for beginning teachers of English, mathematics, multiple subjects (elementary education), and social science. The specific state-by-state recommendations of state comparability in the four subject areas are limited to those states for which comparability in accreditation procedures and elementary and secondary pedagogical standards was established and approved by the Commission. This agenda report also includes a recommended modification in the methodology previously approved by the Commission for determining the comparability of subject matter preparation requirements.

### Fiscal Impact Summary

AB 1620 appropriated \$90,000 from the Teachers Credentials Fund for the 1998-99 fiscal year for expenditure by the Commission for the purpose of conducting a review to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that meet or exceed California standards. Staff believes that these funds are sufficient to complete the initial reciprocity study and to initiate reciprocity agreements, but will not be sufficient to cover the on-going activities necessary to maintain reciprocity agreements with other states. Future budget enhancements would be necessary if the process is to be ongoing.

### Recommendations

There are five recommendations in this agenda item. The AB 1620 Task Force recommends that the Commission approve the findings from its November meeting, that

two additional states are comparable in accreditation standards and three additional states are comparable in select areas of special education. Staff recommends that the Commission approve twenty-eight additional subject matter recommendations from the Phase I subjects (English, mathematics, multiple subjects, and social science). Staff recommends that the Commission approve a modification of the methodology of determining subject matter comparability based upon the initial results of the comparability studies. Staff also recommends that the Commission adopt emergency regulations to implement the provisions of AB 1620. Staff finally recommends that the Commission direct staff to initiate reciprocity negotiations with states deemed to be comparable.

## Background

For more than two decades the Commission has considered the issue of credential reciprocity. To this end it has participated in a variety of activities to interact with other states to develop agreements that might allow the Commission to accept candidates prepared by accredited out-of-state institutions approved by their state's department of education, commission or board. However, specific requirements in various states have created difficulties for teachers prepared in one state who seek certification in another state. Interstate agreements in past years have been limited in scope, and have ensured little, if any, credential reciprocity between the participating states. For instance, the Commission has signed with 39 other states as a member of the NASDTEC Interstate Compact. For many states this compact is primarily an agreement to work together and does not provide for specific reciprocal agreements for teacher credentialing and licensure. In fact, credential reciprocity has not been reachable in California under any prior or current interstate agreement.

In sponsoring AB 1620, the Commission has taken a major step in establishing reciprocity with other states. This legislation permits the Commission to enter into reciprocal agreements with those states that are determined to have comparable and equivalent teacher preparation standards to those required for teachers prepared in California. Education Code Section 44274 provides:

*(a) The commission shall conduct periodic reviews, beginning in 1998, to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California.*

*(b) When the commission determines, pursuant to subdivision (a), that the teacher preparation standards established by any state are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, the commission shall initiate negotiations with that state to provide reciprocity in teacher credentialing.*

AB 1620 established Sections 44274, 44274.2, 44274.4, and 44274.5, introducing several provisions related to the California certification of teachers prepared in other states. At its November 1998 meeting, staff presented a plan for implementing elements of the law that apply to teachers with three to five years of teaching experience. The Commissioners approved this plan, staff has implemented the plan, and the Commission is now able to grant credentials to those teachers who verify that they meet the requirements established for experienced teachers in these sections.

Section 1 of AB 1620 (EC§44274) requires the Commission to conduct periodic reviews, beginning in 1998, to determine whether any state has established teacher preparation standards that are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, and to initiate negotiations with these states to provide reciprocity in teacher credentialing. If this determination is made, Section 1 of the bill requires the Commission to issue an equivalent teaching credential, permit or certificate to an applicant holding or qualifying for a teaching credential, permit or certificate awarded by a state that has entered into a reciprocity agreement with the Commission. Section 1 of AB 1620 requires the Commission to grant an appropriate credential to any applicant from another state who has completed teacher preparation equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California, whether a reciprocity agreement with other states is pending completion or the other state has declined to enter into a reciprocity agreement with California.

During September and October 1998, members of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) reciprocity management team met to determine ways to obtain standards and procedural documents from other states and to determine the extent to which other states' standards and procedures were both comparable and equivalent. In November of that year, letters of request for information were sent to the other forty-nine states and the District of Columbia by the Executive Director. Letters were also sent to selected out-of-state universities that were identified by other state Departments of Education, Commissions or Professional Boards. To date material has been received from forty-six other states and from several out-of-state universities and colleges.

A nineteen-member Reciprocity Task Force was formed in November 1998 to identify procedures for determining equivalency and comparability of other states' standards, guidelines and procedures for preparing elementary, secondary and special education teachers. Task Force members were identified by Commission consultants who have responsibility for the special education panel, accreditation teams, and standard-setting panels. Individuals were identified who have extensive professional experience and expertise in the standards areas being analyzed and reviewed. The Commission's procedures, as stated in the Policy Manual, were followed to ensure gender, ethnic, racial and geographic balance in K-12 schools and in higher education. Most importantly, the individuals involved needed to have a professional reputation for being able to make holistic, qualitative professional judgments regarding the comparability of standards. The Task Force met nine times for two days in January, February, March, April, May, June, September, October, and November 1999 to develop and implement procedures for determining comparability. To date the Reciprocity Task Force has reviewed accreditation and program standards for forty-six (46) states.

A third component of the review of other states' teacher preparation requirements is the review of the subject matter (or content knowledge) requirements. The review of subject matter requirements commenced in March 1999, with the approval of a contract with Linda Wurzbach of Resources for Learning. Ms. Wurzbach is conducting the subject matter comparability studies in three phases: Phase I includes the English, mathematics, multiple subjects (elementary education), and social science credential areas; Phase II covers the subjects required for the four science credential areas: science: biological science, science: chemistry, science: geoscience, and science: physics; and Phase III comprises the art, French, music, physical education, and Spanish credential subject areas. In November 1999, Commission staff presented preliminary recommendations based on the completed subject matter analyses in English, mathematics, multiple subjects, and social science. In this report, further recommendations of comparability in these four subject areas are presented. Staff expect to present additional recommendations of comparability in the Phase I and Phase II subject areas in February 2000, and recommendations of Phase III comparability in subject matter requirements in March 2000.

## Recommendations

Following are five recommended actions for this agenda report.

1. That the Commission approve the findings of comparability in accreditation for Connecticut and Michigan, and comparability in select areas of special education for Florida, Michigan, and North Dakota.
2. That the Commission approve the recommendations of subject-matter comparability in four credential areas as follows:

**English:** Alabama, Arizona, Delaware, Illinois, Kansas, Rhode Island, and South Carolina

**Mathematics:** Colorado, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Virginia

**Multiple Subjects:** Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia

**Social Science:** Delaware, Illinois, Rhode Island, and South Carolina

3. That the Commission approve a modification in the previously adopted subject matter review methodology. Staff recommends that the Commission accept as comparable in



subject matter requirements those states with an 80 percent or higher match to California's subject matter requirements if both a program and an assessment are required by the state. States with an 85 percent or higher match based solely on program standards or requirements may be recommended for comparability upon further staff review. States determined to have a lower percentage match may be considered for future review by subject matter advisory panels.

4. That the Commission adopt emergency regulations in order to make provisions for applicants meeting the requirements of AB 1620 to obtain a California credential. (Proposed emergency regulations will be provided as an in-folder item.)
5. That the Commission direct staff to initiate reciprocity negotiations with states deemed to be comparable.

### AB 1620 Task Force Recommendations

At its November 18-19 meeting, the Task Force recommended that the Commission approve the following comparability recommendations related to accreditation standards and special education program standards (see Table 1).

**Table 1: Reciprocity Task Force Recommendations from November 1999**

State	Task Force Recommendation
<b>Connecticut</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program accreditation procedures and eight common standards were found to be comparable and equivalent.</li> </ul>
<b>Florida</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following special education credential areas were found to be comparable and equivalent for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, and Visual Impairments.</li> <li>• The following special education credential area was found to be comparable and equivalent for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing.</li> </ul>
<b>Michigan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program accreditation procedures and eight common standards were found to be comparable and equivalent.</li> <li>• The following special education credential areas were found to be comparable and equivalent for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, Early Childhood Special Ed, and Special Class Authorization.</li> <li>• The following special education credential area was found to be comparable and equivalent for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing.</li> </ul>
<b>North Dakota</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following special education credential areas were found to be comparable and equivalent for the Preliminary Level I Credential: Mild to Moderate, Moderate to Severe, Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Physical and Health Impairments, Visual Impairments, and Early Childhood Special Ed.</li> <li>• The following special education credential area was found to be comparable and equivalent for the clear credential: Language, Speech and Hearing.</li> </ul>

To date, forty-six (46) sets of other state standards have been reviewed by members of the Task Force. The Task Force has been unable to obtain information from four states. The Task Force expects to bring a final report in the three areas at the February 2000 Commission meeting. The following table provides the Commission with the status of the

Accreditation and Common Standards Team, the Elementary and Secondary Standards Team, and the Special Education Standards Team reviews:

**Table 2: AB 1620 Task Force Review Status as of December 1999**

<b>Accreditation and Common Standards Team</b>	
46 States Reviewed	37-Comparable
	6-Not Comparable
	3-Need More Information
	4-No Information
<b>Elementary and Secondary Standards Team</b>	
46 States Reviewed	20-Comparable
	7-Not Comparable
	19-Need More Information
	4-No Information
<b>Special Education Standards Team</b>	
46 States Reviewed	28-Comparable in Select Areas *
	10-Not Comparable
	8-Need More Information
	4-No Information

\* Includes four states recommended by the panel as comparable that required further review, and therefore were not adopted by the Commission in November 1999.

### **Subject Matter Comparability Recommendations**

As described in the March 1999 agenda report pertaining to AB 1620, Ms. Linda Wurzbach of Resources for Learning is conducting the comparability studies of the subject matter preparation requirements in other states in several phases. In February, Commission staff expect to present an agenda report that will provide additional recommendations of subject matter comparability in the Phase I subject areas (English, mathematics, multiple subjects, and social science), and the results of the Phase II comparability studies (the four science credential areas: science: biological science, science: chemistry, science: geosciences, and science: physics). In March, staff expect to present recommendations of comparability in the Phase III subject areas (art, music, physical education, French, and Spanish), and a comprehensive report of the subject matter comparability recommendations in all thirteen subject areas.

Upon further staff review of the subject matter research and relevant state documents (and in accordance with the information presented and discussed at the November Commission meeting), staff recommend increasing the acceptable percentage match required for a determination of subject matter comparability. Commission staff now believes the following approach for determining subject matter comparability is more appropriate given the nature of the research and the varied quality of documentation available from other states:

1. States with an 80 percent or higher match to California's subject matter requirements are considered comparable if the states require both subject matter program standards and an assessment (or assessments).
2. States with an 85 percent or higher match to California's subject matter requirements based solely on subject matter program standards may be considered comparable upon further staff review of the relevant state documents.
3. States with lower percentage matches may be considered for future review by subject matter advisory panels. Staff is still studying the feasibility of this option.

Table 3 on the following page should be considered as an interim report. It provides the new subject matter recommendations (in **boldface** type) for January action and subject

matter recommendations approved in November Commission action related to comparability in English, mathematics, multiple subjects, and social science. The basis for the recommendation for comparability with California's subject matter requirements is indicated. In cases where subject areas are left blank for particular states, further review is being completed and the subjects may yet be recommended as comparable.

All states listed in Table 3 have already been deemed comparable in accreditation procedures and in elementary and secondary pedagogical standards. Additional states will be recommended for subject matter comparability once a decision on the comparability of accreditation procedures and elementary and secondary pedagogical standards has been made by the AB 1620 Task Force. Additional subject area recommendations will be brought for Commission action at future meetings.

**Table 3: Subject Matter Comparability Recommendations: English, Mathematics, Multiple-Subjects, & Social Science**

(Subject matter Recommendations for November 1999 and January 2000)

States Already Approved as Comparable in Accreditation & Preparation Standards	Single Subject English	Single Subject Mathematics	Multiple Subjects	Single Subject Social Science
	Basis for Comparability	Basis for Comparability	Basis for Comparability	Basis for Comparability
Alabama	State Standards			
Arizona	State Standards			
Colorado	State Standards & Assessment	State Standards & Assessment	State Standards & Assessment	State Standards & Assessment
Delaware	NCATE Standards	NCATE Standards	NCATE Standards	NCATE Standards
Georgia	NCATE Standards & Assessments	NCATE Standards & Assessments	NCATE Standards & Assessments	NCATE Standards & Assessments
Illinois	NCATE Standards & Assessment	NCATE Standards & Assessment	NCATE Standards & Assessment	NCATE Standards & Assessment
Kansas	State Standards			
Maryland	NCATE Standards & Assessment	NCATE Standards & Assessment	NCATE Standards & Assessment	NCATE Standards & Assessment
Missouri	State Standards & Assessment	State Standards & Assessment		State Standards & Assessment
North Carolina	State Standards & Assessment	State Standards & Assessment		State Standards & Assessments
Rhode Island	NCATE Standards	NCATE Standards	NCATE Standards	NCATE Standards
South Carolina	NCATE Standards & Assessment	NCATE Standards & Assessment	NCATE Standards & Assessments	NCATE Standards & Assessment
Tennessee	State Standards & Assessment	State Standards & Assessment	State Standards & Assessments	State Standards & Assessment
Virginia	State Standards & Assessment	State Standards &	State Standards &	State Standards &

## Overview of Current Status of Comparability Studies

The following table provides an overview of the current status of the recommendations for states with comparability in accreditation, elementary and secondary preparation, and subject matter requirements in English, mathematics, multiple subjects, and social science. States with comparable subject matter requirements for which a determination of comparability in accreditation and/or elementary and secondary preparation standards have not yet been determined are also indicated.

**Table 4: Current Status of Comparability Studies**

States	English	Mathematics	Multiple Subjects	Social Science
<b>New States Recommended in January</b>	7	10	7	4
<b>States Approved in November</b>	7	1	2	7
<b>Total Recommended or Approved for Comparability</b>	14	11	9	11
<b>Possible Comparability Recommendations Pending Decision on Accreditation &amp;/or Preparation Standards</b>	21	15	9	15
<b>Potential Comparability Recommendations Based on Staff Review</b>	6	6	2	7

As of this Commission meeting, forty-five total recommendations of subject matter comparability have been made. Fourteen states have been recommended or approved as comparable in one or more subject areas. Nine states have been recommended or approved as comparable in all four subject matter areas.

## Next Steps

The AB 1620 Task Force will finish its review of accreditation standards and procedures and elementary and secondary pedagogical standards and requirements. The review of subject matter standards and requirements will be finished for the remainder of the states and for the additional subject areas. All of this should be completed within three months. Reciprocity agreements will be sought with those states deemed to be comparable. The initial steps toward reciprocity will be made as soon as the Commission determines comparable and equivalent state teacher preparation standards. Once the emergency regulations are approved, the Commission will be able to begin implementation of AB 1620.



[| Back to the Top |](#)  
[| Back to January 2000 Agenda |](#)  
[| Return to "Agenda Archives" |](#)  
[| Return to "About CTC" |](#)





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-3

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** Proposed Contract for Early Childhood Pilot Study Implementation and Evaluation

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Phyllis Jacobson, Ed.D., Consultant and Marilyn Fairgood, Consultant  
Professional Services Division

---

## Proposed Contract for Early Childhood Pilot Study Implementation and Evaluation

Professional Services Division  
December 20, 1999

### Executive Summary

The Commission previously approved in November, 1997, an Early Childhood Pilot Study involving the accreditation of California Community College and private preparation programs for persons preparing to obtain an Early Childhood Permit in accordance with the requirements of the Commission. The first phase of the study is presently underway. This item proposes the approval of a short-term contract for completing the implementation phase and conducting the evaluation phase of the study.

### Policy Issues to be Resolved

Does the Commission wish to authorize the Executive Director to enter into a short-term professional services contract that would help address staff's need to properly and efficiently carry out the Early Childhood Pilot Study within the Commission-approved timeframe?

### Fiscal Impact Statement

The Commission budget supports the cost of these activities. No augmentation of the budget will be needed for this contract.

### Recommendation

That the Commission authorize the Executive Director to enter into a short-term professional services contract for completing and evaluating the Early Childhood Pilot Study.

### Background

Because having a fully qualified teacher in every classroom is one of the most powerful elements in increasing learning and raising student performance, expanding the supply of teachers is pivotal in California's plan to improve education for all students. While much of the discussion about the teacher shortage has focused on K-12 programs, nowhere is the

teacher shortage more apparent than in child development centers for California's youngest students. The success of welfare reform and an increasing population has exacerbated the need for subsidized child development programs for children of parents entering the workforce. One of the greatest predictors of student success, especially the success of students coming from impoverished backgrounds, is participation in a high quality preschool program. Assuring that the instructors in that program are adequately prepared is of the utmost importance.

Since the 1960s the Commission on Teacher Credentialing has issued teaching and supervision permits for individuals working in state funded child development programs. Requirements for these permits have changed over the years in response to staffing needs and an increasing body of knowledge in the field of early childhood education. In the early 1990s, it became apparent that a reexamination of the requirements and the structure of the permits was in order. A 43% issuance of emergency instructional permits and a high number of supervision waivers granted by the Department of Education clearly indicated a staffing crisis. In 1992, Assembly Bill 2879 (Polanco) required the Commission and the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) to consult with members of the early childhood education field and coordinate a review of the preparation and licensing requirements for instructors and supervisors who work in state funded child care and development programs. In 1994, the Commission and the SPI sent a report to the Legislature outlining recommendations for restructuring Child Development Permits. The recommendations were the result of an extensive collaboration coordinated in part through the *Advancing Careers in Child Development: California's Plan* project &mdash; a privately funded project seeking to professionalize the field. The recommendations were designed to establish a career ladder through which professionals could choose to obtain increased preparation and training in order to assume broader, more complex responsibilities, to ease barriers, and to improve access to permits.

In a continued collaboration, the Commission, the SPI, and members of the *Advancing Careers Project* worked with professionals in the early childhood education field in focus groups throughout the state to develop a new permit matrix. The new Child Development Permit matrix was officially recognized through regulation on February 1, 1997. The new permit regulations provided a career ladder and optional pathways for meeting the requirements, thus providing flexibility and access to the permit. In establishing the career ladder and requiring professional development for permit renewal, the regulations aided in the recognition of early childhood education as a profession that encourages growth and commitment.

To further the pledge to increase access and ease barriers, the Commission and the SPI continued to work with a panel of experts to create a plan for accepting courses taken through non-regionally accredited programs and to approve WASC accredited preparation programs that would recommend candidates for permits to the Commission. The panel decided early in their discussion that quality in both endeavors should be based on standards of program quality and effectiveness. The panel developed an extensive set of *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs* that were approved by the Commission in late 1997 for use in the pilot study. The standards are the central point of the two-strand pilot study designed to examine both the acceptance of non-regionally accredited program coursework and full approval of regionally accredited programs for Child Development Permits.

<b>Two-Strand Pilot Study for Child Development Permit Program Approval</b>		
<b>Strand One Organizations</b>	<b>Characteristics Common to Both Strands</b>	<b>Strand Two WASC Accredited Institutions</b>
<p>Approval of course-work offered through non-regionally accredited training programs.</p> <p>These programs will be required to offer approved courses for at least six semester units or the equivalent.</p>	<p>Both strands are based on <i>Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Early Childhood Education Programs</i></p> <p>If the Commission elects to continue with both strands, participation in the approval process will</p>	<p>Approval of programs that offer course work at accredited institutions.</p> <p>The Commission has previously accepted course work from these institutions on a course-by-course basis.</p>

Candidates who take these courses will apply to the Commission on a direct application basis and may use no more than 12 alternative education units.	continue to be voluntary for both organizations and WASC accredited institutions.	A candidate who completes an approved program for a permit will be recommended by the institution. The Commission will issue the permit on the basis of that recommendation.
---	---	--

In April 1999, the Commission approved the Executive Director's nominations for the *ECE Program Review and Support Team*. Team members were selected through the continuing collaboration of the Commission and the SPI, Delaine Eastin, demonstrating mutual commitment to California's young children. The team members examined initial applications for the pilot study and chose participants based upon specific requirements and criteria that allowed for the representation of a variety of programs throughout the state.

The pilot study is being conducted over a two-year period in two phases. *Phase One* requires that all participants submit extensive narrative and documentation to show how their program meets the standards. Successful respondents will then offer coursework to candidates for the permit. The evaluation, *Phase Two*, takes place during the second year. Teams will conduct on-site evaluations of all programs and make recommendations to the Commission regarding ongoing implementation of the pilot study elements. Participants submitted program *self-study* documents in May, 1999. The Commission anticipates that *Phase Two* will be completed in November, 2000.

**Agencies and Institutions Participating in the Pilot Study**

<b>Agencies</b>	<b>Contact</b>
1. Montessori Teachers College - Sacramento 1123 D Street Sacramento, CA 95814	Norman Lorenz Administrator
2. San Francisco Bay Area Montessori Teacher Education Center 16292 Foothill Blvd. San Leandro, CA 94578-2105	Pamela Zell Rigg Administrator
3. Development Associates, Inc. 1475 North Broadway, Suite 200 Walnut Creek, CA 94596	Monica Scott Green
4. Montessori Western Teacher Training Program 6202 Cerulean Garden Grove, CA 92845-2711	Catherine Smythe Co-Director
5. California College for Health Sciences 222 West 24th Street National City, CA 91950	Lisa J. Davis

<b>Community Colleges</b>	<b>Contact</b>
1. American River College 4700 College Oak Drive Sacramento, CA 95841	Mary Jane McGuire-Fong Department Chair
2. Bakersfield College 1801 Panorama Drive Bakersfield, CA 93305	Cyndra Fees Coordinator
3. Grossmont College 8800 Grossmont College Drive El Cajon, CA 92020	Lorraine Martin Department Chair
4. Modesto Junior College 435 College Ave. Modesto, CA 95350	Sandy Bucknell Instructor
5. Mt. San Antonio College 1100 N. Grand Avenue	Kathy Watanabe Lead Teacher

Walnut, CA 91789

6. Moorpark College  
7075 Campus Road  
Moorpark, CA 93021

Linda Cravens  
Department Chair

### Colleges/Universities

### Contact

1. Pacific Oaks College  
5 Westmorland Place  
Pasadena, CA 91103

Dorothy Granger  
Department Chair

2. University of LaVerne  
1950 3rd Street  
LaVerne, CA 91750

Dr. Barbara Nicoll  
Department Chair

3. U. C. Riverside Extension  
1200 University Avenue  
Riverside, CA 92507-4596

Dr. Margi Wild  
Coordinator

## Rationale for the Proposed Contract

The Commission-approved accreditation process specified by the Pilot Study, including reviewing and responding to each of the eleven program application documents, conducting site visits to the eleven Pilot Sites, and evaluating both the overall effectiveness and the future staff workload implications of this pilot approval process, is both extensive and time-intensive. Staff workload, however, has dramatically increased due to additional staff responsibilities for recent expansions of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, the Title II State Grant program, and other Commission-approved efforts. Additional short-term assistance is needed in order to carry out the Early Childhood Pilot Study according to the Commission-approved plan and within the timeframe specified.

## Summary of the Terms of the Proposed Contract

### Purpose of the Contract

This contract is for the purpose of supervising and evaluating the implementation of the Commission's Pilot Study for the accreditation of Child Development Permit programs at selected California Community Colleges and alternative education coursework within private child development organizations. The contractor will be expected to make recommendations to the Commission regarding the future of the Child Development Permit accreditation process.

### Terms and Conditions

#### I. The Contractor will carry out the following responsibilities:

1. Take over administration of the Early Childhood pilot accreditation process already in progress.
2. In collaboration with appropriate CCTC staff, organize site visits to each of the Early Childhood Pilot Sites in the Spring as part of the overall accreditation process.
3. Participate in BIR training, and provide related BIR training to colleagues who will be participating in the site visits as described in item (2) above.
4. Design and carry out an evaluation of the Early Childhood Pilot process, including investigating the feasibility of sustaining this process at the Community College level and within private early childhood development programs.
5. Write and present an evaluation report concerning the Early Childhood Pilot process to the Commission, including recommendations about the future of this process.
6. Other duties as may be necessary to the successful completion of the task.

#### II. The Commission will carry out the following responsibilities:

1. Provide guidance from CCTC staff relative to the history and current operation of the Early Childhood Pilot process.



2. Provide access to all relevant materials and source documents, including each Pilot Site's accreditation documents.
3. Provide collaborative assistance from CCTC staff with respect to planning and organizing the site visits to each Pilot Site.
4. Provide clerical assistance as necessary for travel arrangements.
5. Assist the Contractor as necessary with State regulations and procedures relative to carrying out activities under this Contract.

### **Period of Validity of the Contract**

This contract will be valid for the period of January 17, 2000 through August 31, 2000, inclusive.

### **Supervision of the Contractor**

The Contractor will report to the Consultant for Early Childhood, but will work collaboratively with other CCTC staff as necessary.

### **Payment**

The Contractor will be paid \$55,000 for services rendered, plus the costs of travel for the Pilot site visits and to the Commission office.

The Contractor may invoice the Commission on a quarterly basis, and for the final one-quarter of the amount following the completion and presentation of the required Evaluation Report to the Commission.

Invoices shall be submitted to: Dr. Phyllis Jacobson, Professional Services Division, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to enter into a short-term professional services contract for completing and evaluating the Early Childhood Pilot Study.



[| Back to the Top |](#)  
[| Back to January 2000 Agenda |](#)  
[| Return to "Agenda Archives" |](#)  
[| Return to "About CTC" |](#)





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-4

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** Report on Pre-Internship Program Progress and Expansion

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Helen Hawley, Assistant Consultant  
Professional Services Division

---

## Report on Pre-Internship Grant Program Progress and Expansion

**Professional Services Division  
December 20, 1999**

### Executive Summary

The Pre-Internship Program has experienced dramatic and constant change since it was first launched in July 1998. Funding increased from \$2 million to \$11.8 million by the end of the first year. Eighteen programs grew to 43 programs. Multiple subject programs added single subjects in English, science and mathematics by second year. Midway through the second year, the legislature and governor acted to allow education specialist teachers to enter the Pre-Internship Program. The local programs developed appropriate professional development and support for a heretofore unserved population of teachers. This report covers the continuing progress of these developments.

**The first part** of this report describes the results of the request for proposals (RFP) issued in October 1999 to include special education in existing pre-intern programs. The RFP also invited new programs to apply for funds. Eighteen existing programs applied to add special education and eleven proposals for new programs were submitted.

**Part Two** of this report summarizes data collected about the first year of the Pre-Internship Program. The data indicate that the program is meeting its goal of retaining pre-interns with a high degree of success. Rates for subject matter completion are less consistent among local programs but are still encouraging overall. The data also reveal high percentages of ethnic minorities and males participating in the Program.

**Part Three** tracks the developmental changes to the Program for this fiscal year and projects the completion of any changes in progress at this time. These include program enhancements in the areas of subject matter and support as well as the additions of education specialist pedagogy, CLAD fundamentals, and technology prerequisites.

**Part Four** describes the need for an augmentation to strengthen regional support and partnerships. A previous augmentation of \$100,000 was used to set up four regional consultants to advise the original eighteen programs. The proposed augmentation of \$280,000 would add three more regional consultants and expand the capabilities of the regional clusters to do collaborative problem solving and development, following the intern model.

**Policy Issues to be Resolved by the Commission**

Should the Commission approve the continuing Pre-Internship Programs and new programs to include special education?

Should the Commission approve the use of carryover funds from 1998/99 to support regional clusters to build local program capacity collaboratively?

### Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

*Goal* To promote educational excellence in California schools.

*One:* Work with schools of education, the Department of Education, And school districts to assure quality teachers.

*Six:*

### Fiscal Impact Statement

In the State budget for 1998-99, Governor Wilson proposed to include an \$8 million augmentation for local assistance grants in the Pre-Intern Program. This augmentation would provide adequate resources for the Commission to award local assistance grants for program expansion as indicated in this report. No further augmentation of the local assistance grant budget would be needed to carry out the recommended options.

### Recommendation

1. That the Commission approve staff's recommendations for expansion of the Pre-Intern Program to include special education along with seven new programs out of 1998/99 carryover funds.
2. That the Commission also appropriate \$280,000 out of 1998/99 carryover funds to build program capacity regionally.

## Part One: 1999/2000 Expansion

### Background Information

The Pre-Intern program has now reached the midpoint of its second year in existence, having enjoyed a significant expansion. The state budget for 1997-98 allocated \$2 million for the support of pre-interns in the 1998-99 school year, with a projected increase to \$3.8 million for the following budget year. The Legislature expanded the 1998-99 pre-intern funding to \$11.8 million. These funds were distributed in July 1999, to augment existing programs and implement new programs, including adding or expanding a number of programs to serve individuals teaching in single subject assignments in mathematics, science, and English. In the past year the Commission has approved the implementation of 27 new pre-intern programs for a total of 43 programs throughout the state, which in total are funded to serve 5,800 pre-interns.

The 1999-00 state budget included an additional \$11.8 million in pre-intern program funding, allowing the Commission to release a request for proposals (RFP) to augment existing programs or establish additional new programs. Concurrently, the Commission received approval through AB 466 to offer pre-intern services to special education emergency teachers. The current request for proposals was released at an atypical point in the fiscal year to fund programs prepared to serve these teachers at the earliest point possible. Staff plans to release all future requests for pre-intern proposals consistent with the normal cycle, in the spring of each year. Agencies responding to the most recent RFP have submitted program proposals to develop new programs or expand existing programs to include multiple and single subjects and special education. This section of the report includes recommendations for the distribution of funds currently available to support pre-intern programs. Under Commission guidelines, the distribution of these funds is based upon:

- the quality of the programs,
- the ability to serve pre-interns as a special population,
- the sponsor's history with support programs, and
- and diverse circumstances of the sponsoring agencies, including geography, demography, need and size.

Each of the districts recommended for funding demonstrated through their proposals: 1) a substantial need for the Pre-Intern Program; 2) the resources and/or experience to provide the support system that pre-interns require; 3) an understanding of the unique situation in which Emergency Permit first year teachers find themselves; and, 4) evidence of the collaboration of all participants in the program. The response to the current Request for Proposals produced 11 new proposals and 22 proposed amendments to existing programs.

**Scoring and Selection Process**

The panel review of the pre-intern proposals was based on the same scoring process as that used for previous proposals. A point score assigned to each criterion for the program. The following scoring key was used to assign scores to each of the proposals.

<b>Issues</b>	
Demonstrated Need and Rationale for the Program	20
Quality of Preparation, Support and Assistance	20
Cost-Effectiveness and Budget	10
Collaboration With Administrators and Experienced Teachers	10
Collaboration With College/University	10
Content of Preparation Program	20
Role of Personnel, Including Experienced Teachers	10
Evaluation Plan	10
<b>Total Points</b>	<b>110</b>

Each new program proposal was read and scored by three panel members separately. Those proposals with disparate scores of more than 15 points received a fourth reading. The final scores became composite scores of the separate reading scores. Composite scores ranged from 34-85 points. Any questions or concerns about the proposed programs that arose during the readings were recorded and addressed to the sponsoring agencies for clarification. Only two proposals were not found to meet the quality guidelines (Saugus and Chino). Two others have been referred to join programs already in operation in their area (Merced City and Kern High School).

**Program Characteristics**

As programs vary in terms of local resources available to them and in the composition of pre-interns they are serving, there is some flexibility in appropriate program design. However, all programs share some basic characteristics. The programs must begin with a pre-service component of at least 40 hours followed by regular pedagogical reinforcement throughout the school year. This training focuses on lesson planning, classroom management and instructional strategies. Pre-interns preparation is aligned with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. In some cases the training is provided by the sponsoring local education agency and in some cases by a college or university. Occasionally, pre-interns enroll in the entry course into internship. In all cases the training is designed to be appropriate for teachers in their first stages of pedagogical development, advancing in sophistication as pre-interns attain a higher level of classroom experience and professional development. The addition of special education requires specialized pedagogy for education specialist teachers, in addition to their regular pedagogy.

The subject-matter component of all programs includes the development of an individualized instruction plan through an assessment of each pre-intern's subject-matter strengths and weaknesses. Transcript evaluations, self-assessments, and results of prior examinations (if applicable) contribute to the development of the individualized plan. In some cases pre-interns develop their subject-matter competence through courses offered by local colleges or universities. The Commission encourages programs to be creative in developing subject-matter training, such as workshop or seminar formats and site-based courses. Along with these subject-matter development components, programs generally provide training in test-taking strategies to assist pre-interns in meeting the subject-matter competence requirement.

Commission staff and program directors have also created a guide for pre-intern coaches that includes support training for both site administrators and coaches as a means to strengthen that partnership. The coaching guide reinforces the prerequisite pedagogy provided by the program and allows the pre-intern and coach to document and formatively assess the pre-intern's progress through the year. This instrument allows site administrators and coaches to hold pre-interns specifically responsible for what the program provides but emphasizes the inappropriateness of evaluating pre-interns by the same criteria as used for fully trained teachers. Included in the coaching process is an observation component and opportunities for pre-interns to reflect on program training topics and classroom concerns.

Along with the direct services provided to pre-interns, programs are required to submit information related to program evaluation to the Commission to assist in identifying program strengths and weaknesses and to undertake program remediation when appropriate. Program directors collaborate with Commission staff through regional and statewide director's meetings to share ideas, identify concerns, and strategize for program improvements.

### Recommended Funding Distribution

Staff received 11 new proposals and recommends the funding of 7. The following table indicates which new programs staff and the review panel recommend for funding.

**Table 1: New Pre-Intern Grant Proposals Recommended  
1999-2000 (Winter Cycle)**

Program		Requested		Recommended	
		Pre-Interns Served	Grant Award	Pre-Interns Served	Grant Award
1.	Fresno Unified School District	168	336,000	117	234,000
2.	Lancaster Elementary School District	41	82,000	41	82,000
3.	Solano County Office of Education	40	80,000	40	80,000
4.	Kern County Office of Education	45	90,000	100	200,000
5.	Northeastern California Partnership	40	80,000	40	80,000
6.	Antelope High School District	150	300,000	100	200,000
7.	Torrance Unified School District	75	150,000	75	150,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>559</b>	<b>1,118,000</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>1,026,000</b>

The continuing program December census reports indicate that these new programs can be funded out of carryover from the last funding cycle. Eighteen continuing programs answered this RFP with the request to add special education to their programs.

### Part Two: First Year Data

Surveys of pre-intern directors and visits to existing programs have provided substantial information about the program's success in meeting its goals. This section provides information about retention rates, subject-matter examination passing rates, and program demographics for the first year of the program.

### Retention

A primary focus of the Pre-Intern Program is to retain emergency permit holders who might otherwise leave the profession by providing them with an organized system of support. Pre-intern program directors provided first-year retention rates through the Pre-Intern Director's Survey, which the programs were required to return to the Commission by September 1, 1999. The following table provides the retention rate of the pre-intern programs that returned the surveys. Teachers who remained in the program for a second year or who transferred to another pre-intern program or higher-level teacher preparation program were included in the retention figures. The high retention rate reflected in this table supports the Commission's contention that new teachers receiving substantial, formal support are much more likely to remain in the field than new teachers for whom this support is not provided, as evidenced by the approximately 60% retention rate of first-year emergency permit teachers.

**Table 2: Percentage of Pre-Interns Retained in the Teaching Profession**

<b>Pre-Intern Program</b>	<b>Retention Rate</b>
San Joaquin Unified School District	99.0%
Ventura County Office of Education	97.1%
Santa Cruz County Office of Education	96.7%
Monterey County Office of Education	96.3%
Orange County Department of Education	90.8%
San Diego Unified School District	90.0%
Ontario-Montclair School District	88.7%
Oakland Unified School District	87.8%
Tulare County Office of Education	87.5%
Hawthorne School District	85.0%
Los Angeles County Office of Education	83.0%
Long Beach Unified School District	82.9%
Kings County Office of Education	82.5%
Alisal Unified School District	81.0%
West Contra Costa County Office of Education	73.0%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>88.9%</b>

**MSAT Passage Rates**

Support toward obtaining subject-matter competence is a key component of the pre-intern program. Program participants are often recruited based on the fact that they have previously struggled with this credential requirement and are most likely to benefit from program services. With this in mind, staff anticipated that passage rates on subject-matter examinations among this group might be lower than that of the entire population. As the Table 3 below indicates, first-year subject matter passing rates differed significantly between programs, ranging from 20% to 85%. These results may vary due to differences in program resources, and subject-matter preparation methods from the most successful programs are being modeled for developing programs. The participant selection process and available pool of applicants were also likely contributing factors. In some programs English is the second language for many of their pre-interns. However, note the elevated rates of passage in the four highlighted programs despite challenges presented in preparing this population of teachers in the first year of the program. For comparison, a review of MSAT test data taken from the *Annual Report on the Multiple Subjects Assessment for Teachers (MSAT) October 1992-June 1999* (CCTC, 1999) shows the overall first time passing rate for MSAT test-takers who consider English their best language as 64.6%. For those test takers who stated their best language as a language other than English, the passing rate is 23.0%.

**Table 3: MSAT Passage Rates**

<b>Pre-Intern Program</b>	<b>Subject Matter Passing Rate</b>
San Joaquin COE	85%
Santa Cruz COE	77%
Ventura COE	72%
San Diego USD	70%
Hawthorne SD	68%
Tulare COE	60%
Alisal USD	52%
Ontario-Montclair	51%
Monterey COE	48%
Orange CDE	47%
West Contra Costa	39%
Oakland USD	34%
Long Beach USD	33%
Los Angeles COE	29%
Kings COE	20%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>58.4%</b>

Staff and the most successful programs in this area are working with those with lower rates to improve overall percentages. All of those under 50% passage are employing new and additional methods of assisting their pre-interns in subject matter.

## Demographics

Program participants self-identified their ethnicity as indicated in Table 4:

**Table 4: Ethnic Distribution of Pre-Interns**

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Latino, Hispanic	33%
Caucasian	32%
African American	23%
Filipino	1%
Native American	1%
Southeast Asian	1%
Other, or no response	9%

Sixty-eight percent of program participants are from ethnic groups underrepresented in the teaching profession, compared with 22.4% of teachers statewide (CBEDS, CDOE, 1998.) The gender breakdown of program participants was 61% female, 39% male.

Other demographic data indicate that:

- pre-interns' ages are spread fairly evenly from 25 to 55 years of age, reflecting once again the diversity of this teaching population.
- 66% of pre-interns have completed some post-baccalaureate education.

Staff will be preparing a report for the Legislature in spring 2000, as required by the original pre-intern legislation. This report will be presented to the Commission for approval prior to its submission to the legislature. This report will include current information on the size and scope of the program, level of success in meeting program objectives, successes and challenges, and suggestions for further implementation of the program. Staff anticipates that this report will be completed in time to be presented at the July, 1999 Commission meeting.

### **Part Three: Program Enhancements**

Four new features of the pre-intern program are beginning implemented in a number of existing programs. First, individuals currently serving on education specialist emergency permits can now receive pre-intern support services. Also, those pre-interns serving in classrooms requiring a CLAD or BCLAD authorization will have components of CLAD/BCLAD training incorporated in their survival pedagogy. A third development is that the Commission has authorized additional funding for programs to develop systems of delivery of subject matter content preparation to pre-interns. Finally, staff is working with other educational agencies to develop for pre-interns a system by which they will attain the level of proficiency in the use of computer technology required by the Commission's new technology standards. These four new features are discussed in greater detail below.

#### **Education Specialist**

The Commission recently sponsored AB 466 (Mazzoni) which contained a measure to allow the Pre-Internship Program to include Education Specialist teachers. That bill was signed by the Governor on October 10, 1999 effective immediately. In a June 1999 agenda item the Commissioners approved the release of a request for proposals (RFP) to add special education to pre-intern programs. In anticipation of this new program enhancement, the current Pre-intern Program directors met in November and selected a work group comprised of regular and special education experts to explore the needs of pre-interns assigned to special education classrooms. That group met again on December 13, 1999 to develop a model for survival pedagogy that is appropriate for these teachers with a goal to provide an outline for local programs by February 2000. Their model would provide guidance for programs to begin to serve teachers dealing with students with special need, facilitating the implementation of AB 466.

In addition, the California Institute on Human Services at Sonoma State University and the California Department of Education has offered to assist the Pre-Intern Program in the implementation of education specialist programs through a Special Interest Grant (SIG). The SIG grant supports CalSTAT, a program that seeks to improve outcomes for children with disabilities by creating a unified education system. It is specifically mandated to work with teachers assigned to special education classrooms without an appropriate credential. Staff from all three agencies are currently investigating the best ways accomplish the goals of CalSTAT through the Pre-internship Program.

#### **Subject Matter and Support**

The June 1999 agenda item also requested and the Commissioners approved an augmentation of an additional \$100,000 to be awarded via RFP for continuing development in the areas of subject matter and support for pre-interns. That RFP was released in September 1999 with opportunities for local programs to:

- develop video projects for subject matter training,
- pilot and revise coach training which WestEd developed for pre-interns with the 1998/99 augmentation, and
- design content preparation in the areas of mathematics, science and English for single subject pre-interns.

The county offices of education of Ventura and Santa Cruz submitted proposals for this project. Commission staff awarded funds to Santa Cruz County Office of Education in partnership with the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project in the amount of \$20,000 to produce a videotape for MSAT preparation. Staff also awarded \$20,000 to Ventura County Office of Education to produce a training videotape for delivering subject matter content aligned with the MSAT. These projects will be completed and available to all local programs as public domain for the cost of reproduction by February 2000. Finally, staff awarded \$10,000 to



Yuba County Office of Education to pilot and act as the fiscal agent for the revision of the pre-intern coaching guide. Their project was completed at the end of October. It included training of trainers for new programs resulting in nearly 75 new trainers of coaches across the state. Funds were not awarded for the single subject matter content since only one proposal was received which cannot be approved until further information is received. Staff will release a new RFP for this project in January 2000.

## **CLAD/BCLAD**

During fall site visits to the 27 new programs, staff discovered that Department of Education requirements for language proficiency and accountability for teachers assigned to CLAD/BCLAD classrooms indicate that most pre-interns need to have preliminary professional development in CLAD/BCLAD. Though it would be best if pre-interns were not assigned to these classes, the reality is that it is often a necessity since pre-interns are primarily employed by hard-to-staff schools which usually serve a bilingual population. Pre-intern directors took up this issue also at their November meeting, resulting in a work group to determine with the guidance of the Department which aspects of CLAD/BCLAD are most essential for pre-interns to know. This work group consisting of CLAD/BCLAD specialists and Commission staff will meet in January 2000 to provide guidelines to local programs that will meet compliance review with the Department. The Department has indicated that pre-service preparation should include ELD, SDAIE, and cultural sensitivity. The work group plans to have be able to provide to local agencies and the Department the proposed guidelines by February 2000. The implication is that any future RFP for the Pre-Intern Program will require a limited infusion of CLAD to be accepted as meeting these assignment requirements by the Department.

## **Technology Prerequisites**

Under the new computer technology education standards, teacher candidates must have minimum proficiency levels with computer technology. The California Subject Matter Projects partnered with the Commission and the County Superintendents of Education Association to provide pre-interns with these prerequisite skills through a capacity building federal technology grant of over \$100,000. The pilot project will work with six county offices of education (Alameda, Santa Cruz, Kings, San Joaquin, Los Angeles, and Ventura) to facilitate their pre-intern programs with technology. The project goal is to improve the quality of services and provide pre-interns with the opportunity to use technology to develop their skills by such means as:

- engaging in chat rooms with other pre-interns,
- dialoguing with their coaches via email, and
- using the internet to research their subject matter content and plan lessons.

The Subject Matter Projects have also pledged to develop a resource data base through the grant for pre-interns to enhance their teaching knowledge and skills. The county pre-intern directors and the technology director will meet in January to develop implementation plans for each county tailored to their local program. These implementation plans will be used to write a proposal for continuation of technology assistance with a larger implementation grant for next year.

## **Part Four: Augmentation**

If the Commission acts to fund the seven new programs recommended by staff, local pre-intern programs will number 49. The size of the collective programs requires that smaller regional units be set up for solving their own local issues. In July 1999, the Commission approved an augmentation of \$20,000 to set up a network of regional consultants which has been invaluable to the growth of the program statewide. They have developed and administered a New Director Orientation for the more speedy and effective launching of new programs as well as continual advising and regional problem solving meetings. These monies were divided among four regions. With the addition of education specialists and more new programs, it seems prudent to strengthen these regional groups and to break them into smaller geographic units.

Staff is requesting that the Commission approve an augmentation of \$280,000 from the 1999/2000 funds to offer through an RFP for regional consultants to develop a stronger network that will see the programs through the next funding cycle by training more local administrators and developing and facilitating solutions to local pre-intern program

challenges. The augmentation would be divided among seven regional clusters to keep the groups small enough for effective dialogue and focus on local issues. Each cluster would receive \$40,000 for operations to collaboratively improve their programs. The monies would cover meeting and materials costs and small collaborative projects such as subcontracting development of curriculum for pre-interns to area colleges, universities or tutoring services.

---



- | [Back to the Top](#) |
- | [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |
- | [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
- | [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** PREP-5

**Committee:** Preparation Standards

**Title:** Approval of Plan to Issue 2000-2001 Pre-Internship and Teaching Internship Request for Proposals

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Michael McKibbin, Ph.D., Consultant and Helen Hawley, Assistant Consultant  
Professional Services Division

---

## Approval of Plan to Issue 2000-2001 Pre-Intern and Intern Request for Proposals

Professional Services Division  
December 20, 1999

### Executive Summary

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is responsible for issuing a Request for Proposals for Teaching Internship and Pre-Internship Programs. This year \$22.8 million (\$11.8 million Pre-Intern and \$11 million Intern) is available to districts and universities to help meet the shortage of qualified teachers in California's classrooms. This agenda report provides information on the Request for Proposal process and procedures that are proposed for the issuance of Pre-intern and Teaching Internship Grants.

### Fiscal Impact Summary

In the past six years the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing has distributed \$30 million in Teaching Internship Grants and in the last two years \$13.5 million in Pre-Internship Grants. These funds are Proposition 98 funds from the General Fund. The costs to administer the grant program are not included in the General Fund allocation; therefore, the administrative costs are borne by the base budget of the Professional Services Division.

### Recommendations

1. That the Commission authorize the Executive Director to issue the 2000-2001 Joint Pre-Internship and Teaching Internship Request for Proposals based on the procedures described in this agenda report.
2. That the Commission authorize the Executive Director to select grant recipients for the Internship and Pre-Internship programs.

The Commission establishes policy guidelines and operational plans for the award of Pre-Intern and Intern Grant funds, oversees the grant award process, and monitors the quality of funded programs for program participants. The purpose of this Agenda Item is to seek

approval for the proposed plan to issue a joint Request for Proposals (RFP) for the grant funding that is available for the 2000-2001 fiscal year.

In 1999, The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing issued the RFP's for the Pre-Intern and Intern Grant Programs simultaneously. This year the Commission staff proposes that the RFP's be issued jointly in a single RFP. While programs will continue to have an option to develop one program or the other, for those programs that are involved in both intern and pre-intern programs, the joint RFP will allow them to streamline their response by applying to one proposal.

## Background Information

### Enabling Legislation:

**Intern.** On October, 1993, Governor Wilson signed AB 1161 (Quackenbush). This statute requires the Executive Director of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to award grant funds to alternative certification programs that recruit, prepare and support intern teachers in California public schools (K-12).

AB 1161 defined alternative certification programs as *internship programs* in two categories. First, Education Code Section 44384 authorizes the Executive Director to award funds to *University Internship Programs* pursuant to the provisions of a 1967 statute. Second, 44384 authorizes the award of funds to *District Internship Programs* pursuant to a 1983 law. In AB 1161, lawmakers offered legislative and fiscal support for both kinds of *teaching internship programs*. In the enabling legislation, Education Code Section 44386 stipulates that grants will be allocated on a per capita basis (currently \$1,500), and the participants are required to match the grant amount, unless this would cause a hardship.

From 1993 to 1996, the State Budget included an appropriation of \$2 million from the General Fund for teaching internship programs. In February 1997, AB 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle) was passed and signed by the Governor. This bill, among other items, increased the size of teaching internship grants to \$6.5 million. The bill added to the list of areas of focus for the grants helping districts meet the needs for teachers caused by reducing class size. The Governor's Budget for fiscal years 1998-99 and 1999-2000 increased the Teaching Internship Grant Budget to \$11 million.

**Pre-Intern.** In October, 1997, Governor Wilson signed AB 351 (Scott), to establish the Pre-Internship Grant Program to prepare emergency teachers for completing a teaching intern or regular credential program. AB 351 (Scott) defines a Pre-Internship Program as providing emergency teachers with "early, focused, and intensive preparation in the subject matter that they are assigned to teach and development in classroom management, pupil discipline, and basic instruction methodologies," including assistance in progressing into a teacher internship program. The Pre-Internship Program is intended to eventually replace the emergency permit system.

The funding amount for the first year of the Pre-internship Grant Program was \$2 million. In 1998, the amount available was increased to \$11.8 million. The grants are issued on a per capita basis (currently \$2,000). Unlike the Internship Program, there is no local matching funds requirement.

### Statutory Purposes of Intern and Pre-Intern Programs

**Intern.** Intern statutes have recognized several purposes for internship programs for beginning teachers, which are summarized below.

- (1) The first purpose of internship programs is to expand the pool of qualified teachers by attracting persons who might not otherwise enter the classroom,, including career changers, meeting subject matter and other shortages such as special education teachers, teachers who are underrepresented in the teaching workforce.
- (2) While addressing these critical recruitment needs, the second purpose of teaching internships is to enable K-12 schools to respond immediately to pressing needs while providing professional preparation for interns that is as extensive and systematic as traditional programs, and that links education theory with classroom practice throughout each intern's preparation.

- (3) While addressing these recruitment *and* preparation needs, the third purpose of internships is to provide effective supervision and intensive support so each new intern's learning can be targeted to her/his needs, and so beginning teachers who are interns can extend, apply and refine what they learn about teaching in the course of their initial preparation.

**Pre-Intern.** The Pre-internship Program is designed to enable education agencies to provide the support and training necessary to assist teachers in the classroom on an emergency basis toward completion of teacher training so they can progress into a teaching internship as expeditiously as possible. The Pre-intern Program is guided by the following statutory purposes.

- (1) The program will provide each pre-intern with intensive preparation in the subjects they are assigned to teach.
- (2) While addressing the subject matter needs, programs will provide focused preparation in classroom management strategies, pupil discipline techniques, and basic instruction methodologies.
- (3) While addressing subject matter and curriculum needs, each program will provide a support network for each pre-intern.

### **Prior Actions by the Commission**

**Intern.** The Commission has sponsored five "cycles" of funded internship programs since the 1993-94 fiscal year. Each cycle has encompassed two fiscal years because many internship programs are two years long. The Commission has previously taken action to affirm grant awards for each funding cycle through 1999. In each of the five intern grant cycles the RFP has been distributed to all districts, county offices and Commission approved postsecondary institutions. It has also been sent to any agency or individual that requested the RFP.

In 1993-94, a total of 29 programs received Intern Grant Funding. In the first year three RFP's were issued before all of the funding was allocated. One of the RFP's was issued to carry out the Executive Order of the Governor to initiate the *California Aerospace and Defense Workers Corps*. The purpose of the Corps was to attract persons who were dislocated because of cutbacks in aerospace and defense industries into teaching. In 1995, based on the Commission-adopted plan, two new Requests for Proposals were distributed for a second cycle of programs. Programs that had previously received grants were invited to request "continuation grants." The Executive Director received twenty-three proposals for the second cycle of funding. Nineteen proposals were from sponsors that previously participated in the first cycle of funding. Seventeen of these "continuation proposals" requested augmented budgets so they could serve larger numbers of interns. On average, the 19 continuation proposals asked for 25 percent more dollars than the original requests. Overall, the 23 proposals requested more than \$500,000 than was available. Through a process of using unexpended funds from some of the continuing programs and reducing the requests of other programs, the grant awards were trimmed to \$2 million.

More than 2,600 interns were prepared in the first two cycles. These interns taught in 178 districts in 38 counties. More than 300 of these interns came to teaching after careers in the armed services or the aerospace industry. Two-thirds of the participants had a previous career before becoming a teacher.

Beginning in 1996, the Class Size Reduction Initiative substantially increased the demand for K-3 teachers. To help school districts meet this demand, the Commission took a series of policy actions. In one of these actions, the Commission adopted a plan to implement Assembly Bill 18 (Mazzoni, Pringle), which proposed to add \$4.5 million to the Commission's budget to expand internship programs for beginning teachers. The legislation specifically required expansion of internship programs to meet the needs of the Class Size Reduction Initiative.

More than 3,600 interns successfully completed their teaching assignment in the third cycle of grant programs. The majority of the interns continue to enter teaching after a career in another profession. Forty-five percent of the interns are from groups underrepresented in

the teaching force. One third of the elementary teachers are males. Twelve percent of the interns are teaching in departmentalized in secondary or middle schools; fourteen percent are serving in special education classrooms.

In June 1998, the Commission received the report on the Fourth Cycle RFP. Fifty-eight teaching internship projects were funded and prepared more than 4,300 intern teachers. In January, 1999 the Commission approved the plan for the 1999-2000 RFP. In June of 1999, the Executive Director approved the award of Teaching Internship Grant to 65 programs. These programs have pledged to prepare more than 7,900 teachers. These interns teach students in more than 420 school districts.

Every program that requested funds to recruit from aerospace, defense-related and military sources was funded. Every program that requested funds to fill mathematics and science teaching vacancies was funded. Programs served both urban areas and some of California's most remote areas. In addition to elementary and secondary teachers, grant recipients also included teachers in one California's greatest shortage areas, special education. All programs provided instructional, support and assessment services designed to assure that interns would be successful in very difficult teaching settings.

**Pre-Intern.** The first Pre-intern Program RFP was issued in March 1998. It was sent to every school district, county office of education and post-secondary institution. Eighteen programs were awarded grants serving 955 pre-interns. The first RFP for Pre-Internship programs was limited to multiple-subject emergency permit holders. The length of the grant program is one year. The source of the funds for the first RFP was Federal Goals 2000 funds.

In January 1999, a second RFP was issued. This RFP expanded the program into Single Subject areas of mathematics, science and English. \$11.8 million was available for the second RFP. The source of these funds was California's General Fund. Seventeen of the original programs were approved to continue, and twenty-seven new programs were added for a total of forty-four. There are currently 5,900 Pre-Interns being served in this program. In October 1999, additional legislation (AB 466, Mazzoni) expanded the Pre-Internship Program to include persons who were serving students on Special Education Emergency Permits. On October 20, 1999, the Commission issued an RFP to expand the Pre-Internship Program to Education Specialist teachers. The Commission will be acting during the January 2000 meeting on the results of this most recent RFP cycle.

### Funding Procedures

Because the funds for both programs are subject to Proposition 98 restrictions, only school districts and county offices of education are eligible to receive grant funds. Many of the funded programs were initiated and led by colleges and universities, however, in partnership with districts and counties. In several other cases, post-secondary institutions were active partners in programs initiated by districts and counties.

For each Pre-Intern and Intern RFP process staff has held Bidders' Conferences in northern and southern California. Meanwhile, the staff selected and trained a panel of professional educators to serve as program reviewers.

**Intern.** Education Code Sections 44380-44386 specify the criteria and procedures for implementing funding for alternative certification programs. The relevant statute requires the Executive Director of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to award grant funds to alternative certification programs that recruit, prepare and support intern teachers in California public schools (K-12). The enabling legislation stipulates that up to \$1500 per intern per year can be allocated for intern instruction, support and assessment. Participating local education agencies are required to provide similar in-kind (matching) contributions unless this would cause a hardship.

If the maximum of \$1500 per intern per year in grant funds or the requirement that this amount be matched in local funds would cause a hardship for school districts or county offices that would like to develop a program, then those agencies may provide a rationale for why the grant size per intern should be larger or why the local match should be reduced. For the purpose of the RFP, "hardship" is defined as a circumstance where the cap per intern or the local matching requirement would inhibit or curtail the agency from participating in or providing a quality preparation program for a group of interns. Hardship also means that other economic forces operating within the sponsoring agencies do not

allow local resources to be dedicated to this project.

Proposals are selected for funding based upon the following criteria, which are established by AB 1161, Quackenbush (Chapter 1147 of the Statutes of 1993):

- (a) Geographic distribution of grant recipients;
- (b) Demonstrated need for increasing number of certificated personnel;
- (c) The number of participants to be served by the proposed program;
- (d) The quality of the curriculum, instruction, support and assessment; and
- (e) Cost-effectiveness.

**Pre-Intern.** Pursuant to Education Code Sections 44300, 44305, 44307.5 and 4308, pre-intern funds may only be awarded to school districts and county offices of education. The statutes require the Commission to award grant funds to pre-intern programs to prepare emergency teachers to complete an intern or teacher preparation program. To coordinate with the Intern Program, staff recommends that the authority to approve recipients of pre-intern grants funds follow the same procedures as the Intern Program, i.e., the Executive Director approves the recipients. The enabling legislation stipulates that \$2000 per pre-intern be allocated for instruction and support. No matching funds are required in the interest of allowing all districts with a need to participate. Local agencies may contribute funds or use funds from other sources to augment their pre-intern programs.

Proposals are selected for funding based upon the following criteria, which are established by AB 351 (Scott):

- (a) Demonstrated need, as indicated by the percentage of teachers in the district who have not completed basic credential requirements;
- (b) The quality of the preparation, support, and assistance to be provided to pre-intern teachers;
- (c) Cost effectiveness, including the number of pre-interns to be served;
- (d) Collaboration between district administrators and experienced teachers with permanent status in the development plan;
- (e) District and college or university collaboration to ensure availability of courses needed by pre-intern teachers;
- (f) Pre-Intern preparation content, including lesson planning, classroom management and organization, and schedule for delivering the preparation, with a focus on beginning before or during the first semester of the pre-internship;
- (g) The role of personnel, including experienced teachers with permanent status, in the delivery of pre-intern preparation and support;
- (h) Inclusion of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession jointly developed by the Commission and the State Department of Education no later than the second year of employment in the program;
- (i) Program evaluation; and
- (j) Approval of the district plan by the governing board of the school district.

The fiscal agent and/or recipient of the funds must be a school district or county office of education. Districts and county offices are encouraged to form consortia with other education agencies and/or with businesses in the private sector. Consortia are a particularly good approach for small or geographically isolated districts that may not be able to develop a program based solely on their own human and fiscal resources.

Because funds are issued on a per capita (number of persons selected and prepared to be teachers) basis, programs that do not recruit the number of teachers that they proposed will be expected to carry over funds to subsequent years or redistribute funds to programs that have exceeded the number of teachers placed in classrooms. Government Code Section 16304 authorizes projects to spend allocated funds in the fiscal year encumbered

and two years after that year.

## Review Process for RFP's

In each review cycle for Pre-Internship and Internship programs, the Executive Director has selected and invited professional educators to review and evaluate the proposals that were received. Teams of reviewers include teachers and interns, district administrators, university educators, intern program coordinators, pre-intern program coordinators and Commission staff members. The funding criteria used by the evaluators examine the areas listed below.

### Funding Criteria for Internship Programs:

- Demonstrated Need and Rationale for the Program
- Description of Participants to be Served, and Recruitment Efforts, and Selection Processes
- Geographic Distribution of Proposals
- Quality of Curriculum in the Program, Including the Quality of Reading and Mathematics Instruction
- Quality of Instructional Staff in the Program,
- Quality of Support Provided
- Quality of Selection and Preparation of Support Providers
- Quality of Assessment of Each Intern's Performance
- Quality of Program Evaluation Plan
- Budget for the Proposed Program
- Cost-Effectiveness of the Proposed Program

### Funding Criteria for Pre-Internship Programs:

- District demonstrated need
- Preparation, support and assistance to be provided to pre-interns and the role of personnel, including experienced teachers, in pre-intern support and preparation
- Number of pre-interns proposed to be served and cost effectiveness analysis
- Collaboration between administrators and experienced teachers in development of the plan
- Collaboration between districts and colleges or universities on availability of courses needed by Pre-Interns
- Content of preparation program including lesson planning, classroom management and organization
- Evaluation of the program
- Approval of the plan by the governing board

Before proposals are evaluated, the Commission staff conducts a training session for the reviewers which includes an overview of the purposes of the Pre-intern and Intern programs, a detailed explanation and discussion of the funding criteria (listed above), and a collective review of two proposals to assure inter-rater reliability. At the end of the training day, each member is given three or four proposals and score sheets. One week later the reviewers reconvene. For the next two days they discuss and analyze the proposals that they have read and scored individually, and they reach a consensus score for each proposal. The reviewers provide a total score for the program, a funding ranking and recommendation, and a list of questions that the team would like to have answered about the proposed program, if any.

Programs that have previously received Internship grants are required to resubmit a response to the Request for Proposals every two years. It is anticipated that Pre-intern Programs will also go to a two-year funding cycle. Programs that are in the middle of the two-year cycle are allowed to request an augmentation to their grant if they find that the demand for interns is greater than they had originally predicted. The process for requesting the augmentation is simpler than responding to a full RFP. Program Directors submit a request outlining the circumstances that have caused them to need a budget augmentation. They describe any changes that they plan on making in their original proposal, they respond to any new requirements in the RFP, and submit a new proposed budget. These requests are reviewed by the Project Officers, and as appropriate, recommended to the Executive Director for funding.



Staff proposes that the joint RFP follow the same format as has been used for previous RFP's. As was the case in the 1999 cycle RFP's, the same amount of funding is available. Staff recommends that respondents address the funding criteria listed above. Staff proposes that the RFP be issued by January 18, 2000. The response to the RFP would be due on March 24, 2000. The same review procedures as used in earlier years would be used to evaluate these proposals. The Executive Director would announce grant awards on May 22, 2000.

---



- | [Back to the Top](#) |
- | [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |
- | [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |
- | [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** PERF-1

**Committee:** Performance Standards

**Title:** Proposed Request for Proposals for the (Bilingual) Cross-cultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Bob Carlson, Ph.D., Administrator  
Professional Services Division

## Summary of an Agenda Report

### Proposed Request for Proposals for the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

Professional Services Division  
December 17, 1999

#### Overview of this Report

The current CLAD/BCLAD Examination administration contract expires June 30, 2000. This report proposes the release of a Request for Proposals in January 2000 to secure a contractor for the continued administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Exams, the revision of the CLAD Exams, and a validity study of the exams in 2001-02.

#### Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

*Goal One:* To promote educational excellence in California schools.

*Objective One:* Develop candidate and program standards.

*Objective Two:* Develop and administer teacher assessments.

#### Fiscal Impact

The costs of preparing the proposed Request for Proposals and selecting a contractor can be supported by the agency's base budget. The costs of the contract would be supported by examination fees.

#### Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Proposals (RFP) to secure a contractor for:

- Administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations through June 2003;
- Revision of the CLAD Exams pursuant to the revised specifications adopted by the Commission in May 1999; and

- Implementation of the planned validity study of the exams in 2001-02.

## Background

Education Code Sections 44253.3 and 44253.4 require the Commission to issue certificates that authorize the provision of instruction to English Language Learners. These certificates are the Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD) Certificate and the Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) Certificate. Section 44253.5 requires the Commission to develop and administer examinations on which a teacher can demonstrate competence in the knowledge and skills necessary for effective teaching of English Language Learners.

In October 1994, as a result of a competitive bidding process, the Commission approved a contract with National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) for the development and administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations. The exams were administered for the first time in May 1995. The CLAD/BCLAD Exams, currently administered three times per testing year (July 1 - June 30) include the following tests:

- Test 1: Language Structure and First- and Second-Language Development  
Methodology of Bilingual, English Language Development, and Content Instruction
- Test 2: Culture and Cultural Diversity
- Test 3: Methodology for Primary-Language Instruction  
The Culture of Emphasis
- Test 4: The Language of Emphasis
- Test 5:
- Test 6:

There are multiple versions of Test 5, each focusing on a specific culture. Versions of Test 5 are available for Armenian, Chinese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Latino, Punjabi, and Vietnamese. There are also multiple versions of Test 6, each focusing on a specific language. Each Test 6 consists of a listening component, a reading component, a speaking component, and a writing component. Test 6s are available for Armenian, Cantonese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Punjabi, Spanish, and Vietnamese.

Teachers who pass Tests 1, 2, and 3 and meet a second-language requirement can earn CLAD Certificates, which authorize instruction to English Language Learners for English language development (ELD) and specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE). Teachers who pass Tests 1 through 6 can earn BCLAD Certificates, which authorize ELD and SDAIE, as well as instruction in the (non-English) language of emphasis (i.e., instruction for primary-language development, and academic instruction delivered in the primary language). CLAD and BCLAD Certificates are issued to qualified teachers by the Commission.

In July 1999, the Commission adopted a schedule for validity studies of all of the credential examinations currently used by the Commission. The schedule called for a validity study of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations in 2001-02. In October 1999, the Commission authorized the Executive Director to establish advisory panels to advise the Commission on the validity studies, the exam specifications, and the related program standards. This included a CLAD/BCLAD Advisory Panel.

Assembly Bill 1059 (Ducheny), signed by Governor Davis in October 1999, requires the Commission to continue offering an examination route for candidates to meet the requirements for teaching English Language Learners, and requires the Commission to provide for a validity study of the examinations.

The NES CLAD/BCLAD contract expires on June 30, 2000. The last administration under this contract is scheduled for June 17, 2000. If the current administration schedule continues under the next contract, the next administration would be in October 2000.

## The Proposed Request for Proposals

Staff proposes that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Proposals (RFP) to secure a contractor for:

- Administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations through June 2003;
- Revision of the CLAD Exams pursuant to the revised specifications adopted by the Commission in May 1999<sup>1</sup>; and
- Implementation of the planned validity study of the exams in 2001-02.

The following is a tentative schedule for the release of the RFP and the approval of a new contract in 2000:

January 6	Commission approves release of RFP
January 21	Release RFP
March 6	Proposal due date
March 6-23	Evaluate proposals and write April agenda report
April 13	Commission approves contract

As usual, contract costs would be recovered from examination fees. Bidders would be asked to propose fees sufficient to cover the contractor's costs of administering the exams, revising the CLAD Exams, and implementing the planned validity study. The Commission would add to those fees a sufficient amount to cover its program costs. It is expected that exam fees would be adopted by the Commission at the time the contract is approved.

<sup>1</sup>In May 1999 the Commission approved an amendment to the current contract for this work. The revisions have not begun, however, and therefore cannot be completed within the current contract. No funds will be expended in the current contract for this purpose.

### **Preliminary Plans for Revising the CLAD/BCLAD Exams on the Basis of the Validity Study**

The following is staff's preliminary thinking about the process and approximate timing of revising the CLAD/BCLAD Exams on the basis of the validity study. In early 2002, staff will present a plan for this work for the Commission's consideration and adoption.

The proposed contract would include the planned validity study of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations in 2001-02. Staff estimates that revised specifications for exams developed on the basis of the validity study would be presented to the Commission for consideration and adoption in September 2002. Prior to that time, in April 2002, the Commission would release an RFP for the development and administration of the revised exams. The contract would be awarded in July 2002, and the exam revisions would be completed by July 2003, at the time the administration contract discussed above expires. The new contract would call for the administration of the revised exams through June 2006.



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** PERF-2

**Committee:** Performance Standards

**Title:** Progress Report on the Work of the SB 2042 Advisory Panel

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Mary Vixie Sandy, Administrator and Marie Schrup, Consultant  
Professional Services Division

---

## Progress Report on the Work of the SB 2042 Advisory Panel

**Professional Services Division  
December 20, 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 sixteen months. 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. As of September 1999, when the Commission received its last update on this work, the Panel had reviewed a host of documents that have implications for standards, and begun extracting from this body of standards and research important elements that they believe must be addressed in new standards. During the same time period, the Panel had numerous opportunities to interact with the Commission's Assessment Contractor, WestEd/MPR Associates to review and discuss the job analysis currently underway in preparation for the development of a Teaching Performance Assessment. This agenda report provides an update on issues that have been discussed and the progress that has been made since the last update to the

## Standards for Teacher Preparation Programs

In September 1999, members of the Panel presented an update to the Commission in which they discussed some of the ways in which they believe the Commission should change the format of standards for teacher preparation. Panel members presented a tentative format for new standards that that would require greater clarity, precision and specificity in standards. Panel members described their intent to draft standards that would be descriptive enough to communicate clearly to sponsors of teacher preparation programs as well as accreditation teams about what should be included in programs. 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. Though there was no action taken by the Commission in September, Commissioners expressed interest in the approach being suggested by the Panel.

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. Toward that end, the SB 2042 Panel had the opportunity to meet with the Statewide BTSA Leadership Team during its December meeting in Riverside, California. The members of the BTSA leadership team are listed in below.

### BTSA Leadership Team

Cluster	Task Force Liaison	Cluster Consultant	Professional Development Leader
<b>Cluster 1</b> Northern/North Central	<b>Margaret Olebe</b> Commission on Teacher Credentialing	<b>Cindy Gappa</b> Tehama County Office of Education	<b>Pam Mullin</b> Sonoma County Office of Education
<b>Cluster 2</b> Bay Area/Central Coast	<b>Suzanne Tyson</b> Commission on Teacher Credentialing	<b>Adrienne Meckel</b> Monterey County Office of Education	<b>Liz Rusk</b> Contra Costa County Office of Education
<b>Cluster 3</b> Central Valley/Inland Empire	<b>Phil Fitch</b> Commission on Teacher Credentialing	<b>Tim Edge</b> Riverside County Office of Education	<b>Joan Ellis</b> Fresno County Office of Education
<b>Cluster 4</b> Los Angeles County	<b>Suzanne Riley</b> California Department of Education	<b>Gina Nolte</b> Glendale Unified School District	<b>Ron Chan</b> Lennox Elementary School District
<b>Cluster 5</b> Orange, San Diego, Imperial	<b>Amy Jackson</b> Commission on Teacher Credentialing	<b>Chris Reising</b> San Diego County Office of Education	<b>Theresa Ford</b> Downey Unified School District

At this first joint meeting of the SB 2042 Panel and the BTSA Leadership Team, the elements of SB 2042 were discussed at length. The specific provisions of SB 2042 that involve the BTSA program are listed below.

[Education Code Requirements for Earning a Professional Clear Teaching Credential:](#)

44259 (c) The minimum requirements for the professional clear multiple or single subject teaching credential shall include all of the following requirements:

- (1) Possession of a valid preliminary teaching credential, as prescribed in subdivision (b), possession of a valid equivalent credential or certificate, or completion of equivalent requirements as determined by the commission. A candidate who has satisfied the requirements of subdivision (b) for a preliminary credential, including completion of an accredited internship program of professional preparation, shall be determined by the commission to have fulfilled the requirements of paragraph (2) for beginning teacher induction if the accredited internship program has fulfilled induction standards and been approved as set forth in this subdivision.
- (2) Subject to the availability of funds in the annual Budget Act to provide statewide access to eligible beginning teachers, as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 44279.1, completion of a program of beginning teacher induction, including any of the following:
  - (A) A program of beginning teacher support and assessment approved by the commission and the Superintendent of Public Instruction pursuant to Section 44279.1, a provision of the Marian Bergeson Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment System.
  - (B) An alternative program of beginning teacher induction that is provided by one or more local education agencies and has been approved by the commission and the superintendent on the basis of initial review and periodic evaluations of the program in relation to appropriate standards of credential program quality and effectiveness that have been adopted by the commission, the superintendent, and the State Board of Education pursuant to this subdivision. The standards for alternative programs shall encourage innovation and experimentation in the continuous preparation and induction of beginning teachers. Any alternative program of beginning teacher induction that has met state standards pursuant to this subdivision may apply for state funding pursuant to Sections 44279.1 and 44279.2.
  - (C) An alternative program of beginning teacher induction that is sponsored by a regionally accredited college or university, in cooperation with one or more local school districts, that addresses the individual professional needs of beginning teachers and meets the commission's standards of induction. The commission shall ensure that preparation and induction programs that qualify candidates for professional credentials extend and refine each beginning teacher's professional skills in relation to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the standards of student performance adopted pursuant to Section 60605.
- (3) Preparation, in accordance with commission standards, that addresses the following:
  - (A) Study of health education, including study of nutrition, cardiopulmonary resuscitation, and the physiological and sociological effects of abuse of alcohol, narcotics, and drugs and the use of tobacco. Training in cardiopulmonary resuscitation shall also meet the standards established by the American Heart Association or the American Red Cross.
  - (B) Study and field experience in methods of delivering appropriate educational services to students with exceptional needs in regular education programs.
  - (C) Study, in accordance with the commission's standards of program quality and effectiveness, of advanced computer-based technology, including the uses of technology in educational settings.
- (4) The commission shall develop and implement standards of program quality that provide for the areas of study listed in subparagraphs (A) to (C), inclusive of paragraph (3), starting in professional preparation and continuing through induction.
- (5) Completion of an approved fifth-year program after completion of a baccalaureate degree at a regionally accredited institution, except that the commission shall eliminate this requirement for any candidate who has completed an induction program that has been approved for the professional clear credential pursuant to paragraph(2).

Questions that arose during the joint meeting of the Panel and the BTSA group included

the following:

1. In what ways might a beginning teacher induction program *required* for a professional clear credential look the same or different than an induction program that is *voluntary*, such as BTSA?
2. How will the Commission define "completion of an induction program"? How might the role of support providers and other BTSA staff change as induction becomes part of the licensing system?
3. Should content areas like health, mainstreaming and computer technology be addressed within the context of an induction program, or should they part of separate coursework that is completed outside the context of an induction program during the first five years of teaching?
4. How will the BTSA Leadership Team work with the SB 2042 Advisory Panel to develop standards for Level II preparation?

The initial exploration of these questions by both groups was positive. The Panel and BTSA Leadership team will work together throughout the winter and spring of 2000 to develop standards for Level II preparation, which will address some of the issues identified above.

## Conclusion

The SB 2042 Advisory Panel has scheduled meetings through December 2000. Their work will result in draft standards for the Commission's consideration August of 2000, at which time the Commission will be asked to authorize an extensive 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 or January 2001. Staff will continue to provide updates to the Commission periodically throughout the standards development process.



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |







# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** FPPC-1

**Committee:** Fiscal Planning & Policy

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

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Karen Romo, Staff Analyst  
Business and Fiscal Services

---

## BACKGROUND

The Commission's budget as contained in the 1999 Budget Act includes a provision that requires the transfer of up to \$250,000 to the Legislative Analyst's Office for the purpose of contracting for a comprehensive management study of the Commission's organizational structure and credential processing protocols. This item provides an update on the progress of this management study.

## SUMMARY

Since mid-October 1999 MGT of America (MGT), the contract vendor, has completed the first seven of the following nine tasks identified in the management study contract:

1. Initiate the project;
2. Develop a preliminary profile;
3. Solicit input from external and internal stakeholders;
4. Perform a management review;
5. Perform a review of the Commission's technology;
6. Evaluate the staffing levels;
7. Evaluate customer service;
8. Recommend a fee structure; and
9. Write the draft and final reports.

MGT has indicated that there are no anticipated delays in the completion of the remaining tasks identified in their original schedule.

In support of the management study, Commission staff members responded to MGT requests for documents, surveys, interviews, discussions, and meetings.

During November and December 1999, MGT held several focus groups with key Commission staff members from the Division of Professional Practices; Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division; and the Information Technology and Support Management Division to obtain input regarding the Commission's operations.

The current phase of the management study is designed to develop a credentialing fee structure. The last task of the management study will result in a draft report on MGT's findings and recommendations to the Legislative Analyst's Office, the Department of Finance and the Commission on February 16, 2000 with the final report due on February 29, 2000.

Staff will continue to provide Commissioners with periodic updates regarding the status of



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** C&CA-1

**Committee:** Certificated Assignments

**Title:** AB 471 Report on Numbers of Classroom Teachers

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Mark McLean, Staff Analyst  
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

---

## Report on the Number of Individuals Receiving California Certification

December 18, 1999

### Summary

Assembly Bill 471 was approved by the Governor in September of 1999. That legislation requires the Commission to report to the Legislature and the Governor on the number of teachers who received credentials, internships, permits and waivers in the previous fiscal year. This report is presented to the Commission for review and approval for submission to the Governor and Legislature.

### Fiscal Impact

Costs for printing and mailing of this report are estimated at \$25,000. Additionally staff overtime related to preparation of this report is estimated at \$1,600.

### Policy Issues to be Resolved

Shall the Commission approve this report for submission to the Governor and Legislature?

### Background

Assembly Bill 471 by Assemblyman Jack Scott, signed by the Governor in September of 1999, requires the Commission to report to the Governor and Legislature by January 10<sup>th</sup> of each year on the number of teachers who received credentials, internships, permits and waivers in the previous fiscal year. This legislation was enacted in response to the shortage of fully credentialed teachers in California as a way of making the legislature, public, institutions of higher education and employers aware of the number and type of credentials teachers are obtaining each year as well as the number and type of documents being issued to individuals who are not fully trained. The intent of the report is to assist employers in their efforts to recruit fully credentialed teachers and to encourage institutions of higher education and employers to develop or expand teacher preparation programs.

Education Code Section 44225.6 requires the Commission to report the following information:

1. The number of individuals recommended for credentials by institutions of higher education;
2. The number of individuals recommended by school districts operating district internship programs;
3. The number of individuals receiving an initial credential based on a program completed outside of California;
4. The number of individuals serving in a classroom on the basis of a university

internship, district internship, pre-internship, emergency permit or credential waiver by subject matter, county, and school district; and

5. The specific subjects and teaching areas in which there are a sufficient number of new holders of credentials to fill the positions currently held by individuals with emergency permits.

The regulations also require the Commission to make this report available to school districts and county offices of education to assist them in the recruitment of credentialed teachers.

### Recommendation

Staff recommends that this report be approved for distribution to the Governor and Legislature.

**Note:** Please [click here to view the report](#). Large file. Please allow sufficient time for downloading.



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |





# California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Meeting of:** January 5-6, 2000

**Agenda Item Number:** C&CA-2

**Committee:** Certificated Assignments

**Title:** Advanced Fingerprint Processing for Waiver Applications

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** Susan Browning, Staff Analyst  
Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

---

## Advanced Fingerprint Processing for Waiver Applications

December 17, 1999

### Summary

In February 1999 regulations regarding the personal fitness of individuals employed to work with students were revised in response to public concern for children's safety in the classroom. The practice is to complete all evaluation and Commission review prior to beginning the fingerprint clearance. Waiver requests with fingerprint cards attached must be received by the Commission in time to be reviewed at the *first* Commission meeting following the individual's first day of employment. Waiver requests for which the fingerprint process has already begun may be reviewed by the *third* Commission meeting following the individual's first day of employment. At the December meeting, the Appeals and Waivers Committee denied more than fifty waiver requests for which the only problem was that the employer missed the first-meeting deadline. If these employers had submitted the fingerprints separately, these waiver requests would have been placed on the consent calendar as having met all Commission criteria for an initial waiver. In this item staff is suggesting that the Commission separate fingerprint cards from waiver requests when they arrive at the Commission office to ensure that the cards are processed quickly through the California Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and not delayed by the waiver procedure.

### Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact as a result of this recommendation.

### Policy Issues to Be Resolved

Should Commission staff separate the fingerprint cards from waiver requests upon arrival at the Commission to ensure timely processing of the cards?

### Recommendation

That Commission staff remove the fingerprint cards from waiver requests and submit them to DOJ and FBI prior to evaluating waiver requests and preparing waiver information for the Commission agenda.

### Background

Effective 6-1-99, the Commission revised Title 5 Regulations Section 80125(b) and (c), shown below, to restrict the amount of time that an employing agency has to submit a waiver request.

(b) A waiver request should be submitted to the Commission prior to the applicant's

*beginning day of service. In those cases where an employing agency has an unanticipated need, the Commission will honor the beginning date of service listed on the waiver request as long as waiver requests for individuals who require a Commission fitness review be submitted in time to be reviewed by the Appeals and Waivers Committee at their first meeting following the date of service listed on the waiver request. Failure to meet the first meeting deadline will result in a staff recommendation that the Commission deny the waiver request.*

- (c) *In those cases where an employing agency has an unanticipated need and the waiver request is for an individual who has fingerprint clearance on file at the Commission, the Commission will honor the beginning date of service listed on the waiver request as long as the request is received in the Commission office for review by the Appeals and Waivers Committee by the waiver submission deadline for the third Commission meeting following the beginning date of service.*

Despite the efforts of staff to explain this change to employers through workshops, coded correspondence, and handbook updates, a number of employers claim to be unaware of the new deadlines concerning fingerprint card submission.

At its December 1999 meeting, the Appeals and Waivers Committee denied 51 waiver requests solely on the basis of late submission of a waiver request with fingerprint cards attached. The waiver requests had otherwise met the Commission's regulations and criteria to appear on the waivers consent calendar. By way of explanation for missing the deadline, employers cited problems with scheduling for board meetings, staff shortages, new personnel, and simply misunderstanding the new regulation.

The intent of the regulation change is to be sure that individuals for whom waivers are being requested have been reviewed by the DOJ and FBI as early in the process as possible. By removing the fingerprint cards from waiver requests as they arrive instead of waiting until the request has been approved by the Commission, the Commission will receive the results of the review 30 to 60 days earlier than the current process.

Removal of the fingerprint cards when the waiver request is received does not add workload for Commission staff, because the identical process is currently followed after the waiver is approved by the Commission. This might, in fact, save some time since the results of the fingerprint review could be on file before the waiver process is complete, saving the printing of a separate "fingerprints pending" letter and filing of the waiver request.



| [Back to the Top](#) |  
| [Back to January 2000 Agenda](#) |  
| [Return to "Agenda Archives"](#) |  
| [Return to "About CTC"](#) |

