



[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](#)

[Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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

Wednesday • April 12, 2000 • Fresno Room • Holiday Inn Capitol Plaza • 300 J Street • Sacramento, CA 95814

Thursday • April 13, 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, April 12, 2000
Fresno Room
Holiday Inn Capitol Plaza
300 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95815

1. **Joint Meeting Between The California State Board of Education & The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing** **3:00 p.m.**

Introduction of Members
 Presentation by Interim Secretary for Education, Sue Burr
 Presentation of Issues by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
 Presentation of Issues by the California State Board of Education
 Discussion of Future Areas of Collaboration
 Adjournment

THURSDAY, April 13, 2000
Commission Offices
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814

1. **Appeals and Waivers (Committee Chair Harvey)** **8:00 a.m.**

- A&W-1** Approval of the Minutes
 - A&W-2** Reconsideration of Waiver Requests
 - A&W-3** Waivers: Consent Calendar
 - A&W-4** Waivers: Conditions Calendar
 - A&W-5** Waivers: Denial Calendar
 - A&W-6** Precedential Decisions
-

2. General Session (Chair Norton)

**10:00
a.m.**

The Commission will immediately convene into Closed Session

Closed Session (Chair Norton)

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

3. Reconvene General Session (Chair Norton)

1:00 p.m.

- GS-1** Roll Call
 - GS-2** Pledge of Allegiance
 - GS-3** Approval of the March 2000 Minutes
 - GS-4** Approval of Proposed 2001 Meeting Dates
 - GS-5** Approval of the April Agenda
 - GS-6** Approval of the April Consent Calendar
 - GS-7** Annual Calendar of Events
 - GS-8** Chair's Report
 - GS-9** Executive Director's Report
 - GS-10** Report on Monthly State Board Meeting
-

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



PERF-1

Recommended Award of a Contract for Administration of and Revisions to the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

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



FPPC-1

Analysis of and Proposed Action Plan in Response to the Management Study Mandated by the 1999 Budget Act



FPPC-2

Proposed 2000-2001 May Revision Budget Change Proposals



FPPC-3

Update Regarding Contract for Assistance with Strategic and Information Technology Plan and Action Plan

6. Legislative Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Veneman)



LEG-1 Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission



LEG-2 Consent Calendar for Bills of Interest to the Commission



LEG-3 Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission

7. Public Hearing

1:30 p.m.



**Public
Hearing**

Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Regulation, Section 80430.2 Pertaining to Credentials Issued on the Basis of Reciprocity

8. Reconvene General Session (Chair Norton)

GS-11 Report of the Appeals and Waivers Committee

GS-12 Report of Closed Session Items

GS-13 Commissioners Reports

GS-14 Audience Presentations

GS-15 Old Business: Quarterly Agenda for April, May & June 2000

GS-16 New Business

GS-17 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

May 3-4, 2000

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

1900 Capitol Avenue

Sacramento, CA 95814





[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)
[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](#)

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 13, 2000

Agenda Item Number: PERF-1

Title: Recommended Award of a Contract for Administration of and Revisions to the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

✓ Action

Prepared by: Mark McLean, Program Analyst
Professional Services Division

Summary of an Agenda Report

Recommended Award of a Contract for Administration of and Revisions to the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

Professional Services Division

March 22, 2000

Overview of this Report

This report describes the process used to identify a contractor to administer the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations, and make revisions to Tests 1-3 of those examinations based upon revised specifications approved by the Commission in May 1999.

The CLAD/BCLAD examinations have been administered by National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) since 1995. The NES contract to administer the exams expires on June 30, 2000. In February 2000, following approval by the Commission, staff released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a contractor to administer the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations through June 2003 and revise CLAD/BCLAD Tests 1, 2, and 3. The report recommends that a contract be awarded to NES as a result of a competitive bidding process.

[Part 1](#) of this report provides background information about the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations. [Part 2](#) summarizes the procedures that were used to solicit proposals from

potential contractors. [Part 3](#) describes the process that was implemented to evaluate the proposal that was received and the results of that process. [Part 4](#) summarizes the major features of the plan for administering and revising the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations proposed by NES.

Relationship to the Commission's Strategic Goals and Objectives

Goal One: Promote educational excellence in California schools.

Objective One: Develop candidate and program standards.

Objective Two: Develop and administer teacher assessments.

Financial Impact Statement

The costs of administering the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations and revising Tests 1-3 will be paid for through examinee fees pursuant to Education Code Section 44253.8.

Recommendation

Based on the evaluation of the proposal that was received in response to the Commission's Request for Proposals (RFP) *Proposals for the Administration of and Revisions to the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations*, and based on the consensus advice of the Proposal Review Team, the staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract as described on the next page and summarized in [Part 4](#) on pages 14-16. The information provided on the following page is included as part of the recommendation as requested by the Department of General Services.

Recommended Contract

- Contract Number TCC-9040
- Contractor National Evaluation Systems, Inc.
- Contracting Period Upon approval by the Department of General Services, until June 30, 2003
- Purpose of Contract To administer the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations, and make revisions to Tests 1-3 of those examinations
- Method of Procurement Request for Proposals
- Total Contract Amount \$1,930,801
- Source of Funding Examinee fees

Recommended Award of a Contract for Administration of and Revisions to the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

Professional Services Division

Overview of this Report

This four-part report describes the process used to identify a contractor to administer the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations, and make revisions to Tests 1-3 of those examinations. The report recommends that a contract be awarded to National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) as a result of a competitive bidding process. [Part 1](#) of this report provides background information about the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations. [Part 2](#) summarizes the procedures that were used to solicit proposals from potential contractors. [Part 3](#) describes the process that was implemented to evaluate the proposal that was received and the results of that process. [Part 4](#) summarizes the major features of the plan for administering and revising the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations proposed by NES.

Part 1

Background Information

California 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. Education Code 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 NES contract expires on June 30, 2000. At its January 2000 meeting, the Commission approved releasing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a contractor to administer the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations through June 2003 and revise CLAD/BCLAD Tests 1, 2, and 3.

The CLAD/BCLAD Examinations

Description of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations

The CLAD/BCLAD Examinations include six separate tests. Passage of the first three tests is one way to satisfy one of the requirements for a CLAD Certificate. Passage of all six tests is one way to satisfy one of the requirements for a BCLAD Certificate. Each test, which assesses knowledge and skills in a particular domain, is briefly described below. The specific knowledge/skill areas assessed on each test are provided in [Appendix A](#).

Test 1: Language Structure and First- and Second-Language Development. This test covers first- and second-language development, universals and differences in language structure and use, and the structure and use of the English language. Test 1 is in English and consists of 50 multiple-choice questions.

Test 2: Methodology of Bilingual, English-Language Development, and Content Instruction. This test covers theories and methods of (a) bilingual education needed by all teachers of English language learners, (b) instruction for English-language development (ELD), and (c) specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE). Methods of language and content-area assessment are also covered. Test 2 is in English and includes 50 multiple-choice questions and one essay.

Test 3: Culture and Cultural Diversity. This test covers the nature and content of culture, crosscultural contact and interaction, cultural diversity in California and the United States, and issues related to the provision of culturally responsive pedagogy, such as classroom organization and interactions, curriculum, instructional strategies, and the roles of families and community resources. Test 3 is in English, does not focus on any specific cultural group, and includes 40 multiple-choice questions and one essay.

Test 4: Methodology for Primary-Language Instruction. This test covers instructional delivery and assessment in a bilingual classroom and the evaluation and use of primary-language materials. Test 4 is in English, does not focus on any specific language, and consists of 40 multiple-choice questions.

Test 5: The Culture of Emphasis. There are multiple versions of Test 5, each focusing on a specific culture (the culture of emphasis). Versions of Test 5 are available for Armenian, Chinese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Latino, Punjabi, and Vietnamese. Each Test 5 covers the origins and characteristics of the culture of emphasis, that is, the commonalities of the culture of emphasis in its home country or countries. Topics include major historical periods and events, values and beliefs, communication systems, demography, family structure, and the arts. This test also covers the experiences in the United States and California of the people of the culture of emphasis, including topics such as major historical periods, demography, migration and immigration, cultural contributions, and intragroup and intergroup relations. Each Test 5 is in English and consists of 50 multiple-choice questions.

Test 6: The Language of Emphasis. There are multiple versions of Test 6, each focusing on a specific language (the language of emphasis). Each Test 6 consists of four separate components. For the Listening Component, examinees listen to oral language samples in the language of emphasis and answer 21 multiple-choice questions about the samples. For the Reading Component, examinees read passages in the language of emphasis and answer 26 multiple-choice questions about the passages. For the Speaking Component, examinees respond orally in the language of emphasis to three speaking assignments presented in English and read aloud two passages in the language of emphasis. For the Writing Component, examinees write an essay in the language of emphasis in response to a writing assignment presented in English and translate a passage from English into the language of emphasis. All four components of Test 6 are available for Armenian, Cantonese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Punjabi, Spanish, and Vietnamese.

Administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Exams

The CLAD/BCLAD Examinations are currently administered at eleven sites throughout California three times per testing year (July 1-June 30): October, February, and June. All tests are available in October and June; all tests except Test 6s for languages other than Spanish are available in February. Standard administration dates are on Saturdays; alternative administration dates for examinees who cannot test on Saturdays for religious reasons are on Sundays.

Table 1 below provides the number of CLAD/BCLAD Examinations administered per year from 1995-96 through 1998-99. There were three administration dates in each of those years. In 1995-96, Tests 1-4 and Tests 5 and 6 for Spanish, Khmer, and Korean were available to examinees on all three administration dates; Tests 5 and 6 for Armenian, Cantonese, Filipino, Hmong, Mandarin, Punjabi, and Vietnamese were available on two administration dates. In the remaining three years, Tests 1-4, all Test 5s, and Test 6 for Spanish were available on all three dates; Test 6s for languages other than Spanish were available on two dates.

Table 1

Number of CLAD/BCLAD Examinations Administered Per Year¹

Test	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
Test 1	5,496	7,544	5,954	4,594
Test 2	5,072	6,895	5,534	4,325
Test 3	5,365	7,642	5,951	4,899
Test 4	1,610	1,603	1,302	696
Test 5:				
Latino	1,286	1,288	1,178	680
Other ²	122	107	92	56
Test 6:				

Spanish	Listening	1,555	1,445	1,270	875
	Reading	1,087	1,206	1,103	789
	Speaking	1,492	1,618	1,470	986
	Writing	1,628	1,585	1,316	939
Other ³	Listening	111	102	81	57
	Reading	106	102	76	57
	Speaking	112	108	81	59
	Writing	105	102	77	58

¹These numbers are the sum of the number of examinees on each administration date in the year. Because an examinee could take more than one exam on a date, and an examinee could take an exam on more than one date in the year, these numbers represent the numbers of examinations administered in a year, not the number of individual examinees in the year.

²Other Test 5 cultures include Armenian, Chinese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Punjabi, and Vietnamese.

³Other Test 6 languages include Armenian, Cantonese, Filipino, Hmong, Khmer, Korean, Mandarin, Punjabi, and Vietnamese.

Currently, on an administration date, the CLAD/BCLAD tests are administered throughout the testing day, which begins at approximately 7:30 a.m. and ends at approximately 6:30 p.m. At each test site there are three back-to-back test sessions, each includes (a) approximately 30 minutes for sign-in, seating, distribution of materials, and directions, and (b) approximately three hours of actual testing time. Tests 1-5 and the Test 6 Reading and Writing Components are administered during these sessions. In addition, the Test 6 Listening Components (approximately one hour long) and Speaking Components (approximately 30 minutes long) are administered throughout the day.

With the exception of the Test 6 Listening and Speaking Components, which are administered via audiotape, no test has a time limit. Examinees take from one to three tests in a test session. In each test session, there is more than enough time to complete the maximum number of tests that can be taken in that session. Within a testing session, examinees can spend as much or as little time as they like on a test, and can select which test to complete first, second, etc.

Recent Revisions to CLAD/BCLAD Specifications

In February 1995, the Commission adopted the *Knowledge and Skill Areas for Assessment on the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations*. The Commission-adopted knowledge and skill areas currently serve as the content specifications for the exams. They are attached as [Appendix A](#). In May 1999, on the basis of advice from staff and a CLAD Task Force, the Commission adopted revised specifications for Tests 1, 2, and 3. These are provided in [Appendix B](#).

The revisions to the specifications for Tests 1, 2, and 3 require revisions to the tests themselves (e.g., item revision, item deletion, new item development). This work has not been done, and will be an important early effort by the contractor.

Part 2

Summary of the Proposal Solicitation Process

This part of the report summarizes the contents and distribution of the *Request for Proposals for the Administration of and Revisions to the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations*. [Part 3](#) describes the proposal review process and results.

The Request for Proposals

On February 1st of this year, the Executive Director released the *Request for Proposals for the Administration of and Revisions to the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examination*. The Request for Proposals (RFP) asked bidders to provide detailed plans for administering the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations and revising

Tests 1-3, and evidence of their capacity to perform effectively. The RFP included the following sections.

Key Information for Prospective Bidders

Prospective bidders were encouraged to submit a Notice of Intent to Bid (included in the RFP) and any substantive questions they had about the RFP or the anticipated contract. They were informed that any questions received would be answered in writing and sent to all firms that submitted an intent to bid. Bidders were also informed of the number of proposal copies that were to be submitted and the deadline for submission (March 6, 2000).

RFP Part 1: Summary and Background Information

Part 1 of the RFP provided a summary of the RFP and background information about the context in which the requested work will take place. The CLAD/BCLAD Examinations and primary participants in the project (the Commission, the CLAD/BCLAD Advisory Panel, and the Commission's Project Officer) were described. Part 1 also included information regarding current administration practices and details of recent revisions to the CLAD/BCLAD test specifications.

RFP Part 2: Scope of Work

Part 2 of the RFP described the scope of the services and products required by the Commission. Part 2A described the scope of work associated with the administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations. Part 2B discussed contractor responsibilities related to revisions to CLAD/BCLAD Tests 1-3. Each of these two parts is summarized below.

Part 2A: Administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations

The responsibilities of the contractor in each of the following areas related to the administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations through June 30, 2003, were described:

- Security
- Program Communications and Materials Production
- Test Registration and Registration Bulletins
- Test Administration
- Scoring and Score Reporting

As a result of the implementation of Proposition 227, alternative options for obtaining authorizations to serve limited English proficient students through Senate Bill 1969, and other factors, the volume for the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations administered has decreased in recent years. Commission staff recognized that lower volumes of exam administrations could lead to higher test fees for examinees. For this reason the RFP requested that, if the proposed fees were higher than the current fees, bidders propose necessary modifications to the administration of the exams that would keep the fees in line with current fees as much as possible.

The RFP also noted that the Commission is considering selected modifications to the CLAD/BCLAD program and asked bidders to describe how they would implement the modifications and propose the impact on test fees. The four modifications under consideration are:

1. allowing examinees the option to take Tests 1, 2, and 3 spread out over three testing sessions rather than taking two tests in one session and the third in another as is current practice;
2. adding a test site(s) in the Humboldt and/or Sonoma areas as requested by directors of Bilingual Teacher Training Programs (BTTP) in northern California;
3. shortening the time it takes to report scores to examinees (currently 35 business days) by five business days; and
4. reducing the annual number of administrations of Test 6 for languages other than Spanish from the current two to one.

Part 2B: Revisions to CLAD/BCLAD Tests 1-3

The major responsibilities of the contractor related to revisions to CLAD/BCLAD Tests 1-3 will include drafting new multiple-choice items and revising essay assignments, facilitating

the review of the new and revised items by the CLAD/BCLAD Advisory Panel and the Commission's Bias Review Committee, finalizing and field-testing the multiple-choice items on operational forms, and creating and equating new test forms by incorporating new multiple-choice items that perform satisfactorily on the field test into operational test forms.

RFP Part 3: Contractual Information

This section of the RFP discussed various matters related to the anticipated contract. Issues addressed included (a) the length of the contract, (b) ownership of the assessment materials, (c) financial arrangements, (d) transition at the conclusion of the contract, (e) priority hiring considerations, and (f) other contract provisions.

RFP Part 4: Disabled-Veteran Business Enterprise Participation Requirements and Small Business Preference

Part 4 of the RFP notified potential bidders that, to be considered for award of a contract, they had to either (a) meet or exceed the state's participation goals for disabled-veteran-owned business enterprises (DVBES) or (b) make and document a good faith effort to do so. An appendix of the RFP included information about the participation goals, requirements for documenting a good faith effort, and required forms. In addition, the RFP described the availability of and the qualification requirements for a small business preference.

RFP Part 5: Proposal Requirements

This part of the RFP informed potential bidders about the submission of proposals (i.e., number of copies, due date and time, and where proposals should be delivered), and about proposal organization and contents. The information that a bidder was to include in a proposal related to each element of the scope of work was specified. In addition, potential bidders were told to include a detailed description of how the work would be accomplished, a project schedule, a project budget and proposed examinee fees, a description of their corporate capability to carry out the contract, and technical information, including required state forms related to nondiscrimination and a drug-free workplace.

RFP Part 6: The Proposal Review Process and Selection of a Contractor

The final section of the RFP described the proposal review process and provided information about (a) the announcement of a recommended contractor prior to Commission action and (b) protest procedures. This section included the proposal evaluation criteria on which each proposal would be evaluated. Part I of the proposal evaluation criteria included the compliance requirements that had to be met in order for a proposal to proceed beyond the first stage of the proposal review process. Part II of the proposal evaluation criteria included the criteria to be used in evaluating the quality of proposals during the subsequent stages of the process. (Proposal Evaluation Criteria Parts I and II are included in this report as Appendices C and D, respectively.)

RFP Appendices

The following appendices were included in the RFP:

- A: Notice of Intent to Bid
- B: *Knowledge and Skill Areas Assessed on the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations*
- C: *Revised Knowledge and Skill Areas Assessed on Tests 1-3 of the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations*
- D: Contract Provisions
- E: *State Contracting Resource Packet* and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Participation Summary Form (STD 840)
- F: Nondiscrimination Compliance Statement (STD 19)
- G: Drug-Free Workplace Certification (STD 21)

Release and Distribution of the RFP

On February 1, 2000, the RFP was mailed to 57 potential bidders across the nation. In the

distribution process, the Executive Director mailed the RFP to every firm and every individual who has either (a) done assessment work in the field of teacher certification of which Commission staff is aware, or (b) expressed an interest in receiving RFPs from the Commission. In addition, the RFP was advertised on the Electronic California State Contracts Register (ECSCR).

The RFP indicated that proposals were due at the Commission office by 10:00 a.m. on March 6, 2000. Potential bidders were encouraged to submit a Notice of Intent to Bid and substantive questions about the RFP or contract to the Commission. (Potential bidders were informed that submission of a Notice of Intent to Bid did not obligate a potential bidder to submit a proposal, nor did lack of a Notice of Intent to Bid proscribe a potential bidder from submitting a proposal.) A Notice of Intent to Bid and substantive questions were received from one firm, which subsequently submitted a proposal.

Proposals Received in Response to the RFP

In response to the RFP, one proposal was delivered to the Commission. The proposal was received from National Evaluation Systems, Inc., (NES) of Amherst, Massachusetts.

After 10:00 a.m., March 6, the proposal review process began, as described below.

Part 3

The Proposal Review Process and Results

The proposal submitted in response to the RFP was reviewed in three stages as described in the RFP and below. The proposal review process was conducted according to guidelines established in the *State Contracting Manual* for conducting competitive bidding procedures. A five-member Proposal Review Team participated in the evaluation and scoring of the proposal.

The Proposal Review Team

The Proposal Review Team was comprised of individuals with various areas of expertise so each team member's unique perceptions would complement those of other team members. No team member was expected to be an "expert" in all areas to be evaluated, nor was the outcome of the proposal review process unduly influenced by any one person or point of view. For this proposal review, all of the individuals on the team were Commission staff in the Examinations and Research Unit of the Professional Services Division. Those five are listed below:

- Darya Callihan, Assistant Consultant
- Bob Carlson, Administrator
- Linda Hooper, Assistant Consultant
- Mark McLean, Program Analyst
- Diane Tanaka, Assistant Consultant

The primary responsibility of the Proposal Review Team was to evaluate the extent to which the bidder met the criteria established for performance of the services described in the RFP. The team completed a fair and comprehensive evaluation of the bidder's plan to provide the needed services.

The Proposal Review Process

Proposal Review Stage 1

The first stage of the review focused on the compliance of the bidder with the legal and format requirements specified in the RFP as "Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part I." These criteria are provided in [Appendix C](#). To be considered responsive to the RFP, the proposal had to conform to these requirements. Staff reviewed the NES proposal and determined that it met the requirements.

Proposal Review Stage 2

The second stage of the proposal review process consisted of independent reviews of the proposal by members of the Proposal Review Team. This portion of the review was based on the "Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part II" specified in the RFP and reproduced in

[Appendix D](#). This stage began on March 6, 2000, with an orientation and training meeting of the Proposal Review Team. Team members came to this meeting having read the RFP and the substantive questions (with staff responses) submitted by prospective bidders. At the orientation and training meeting, the following topics were addressed:

- Overview of the RFP
- Overview of the Proposal Review Process
- Description of Stage 2 of the Proposal Review Process
- Discussion of the Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Team members received a written overview of the proposal review process, a written description of Stage 2, a table designed to encourage team members to use the full range of points available when assigning scores to a proposal, and a copy of the NES proposal. In addition, team members were given and trained to use a Proposal Review Documentation Form. For each evaluation criterion in [Appendix D](#), the Proposal Review Documentation Form had space for recording an initial score and any notes, questions, or concerns a team member might have about the bidder's response. Following the March 6 orientation and training meeting, Proposal Review Team members independently read and awarded initial scores to the proposal.

Proposal Review Stage 3

Stage 3 of the proposal review process took place in Sacramento on March 9, 2000. The Proposal Review Team met to share and discuss the results of their independent reading and initial scoring of the NES proposal. At the meeting, each team member reported his or her initial score for the proposal. This was followed by a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. Following the team's discussion, each team member was given the opportunity to assign a second and final set of scores to the proposal. A team member's scores in the second set could be the same as or different from the initial scores assigned by that team member during Stage 2. Mean criterion scores were then computed across team members. The mean criterion scores were summed to yield a total score for the proposal.

Results of the Proposal Review Process

Working independently during Stage 2 of the proposal review process, each of the Proposal Review Team members carefully reviewed the NES proposal. Among the team members, the initial scores given to the NES proposal ranged from 168 to 207 out of a possible total of 220. Following the team discussion in Stage 3, the final scores ranged from 177 to 200 with a mean final total score of 185 (84%). The Proposal Review Team concluded unanimously to recommend that the Commission award the contract to NES.

The Proposal Review Team also discussed the additional proposals for modifications to the administration of the exams made by NES in response to the RFP requests which were described on [page 9](#) of this report. The following are the recommendations of the team for each of these five proposals:

Modification proposed by NES to keep examination fees as low as possible: Reduce the number of administrations per year from three to two and administer Test 6 for languages other than Spanish only once per year.

Recommendation: Accept this proposal.

Rationale/Comments: The exam fees for this option are approximately 15% lower for most of the examinations than the fees proposed for maintaining the current schedule. [Appendix E](#) provides a comparison of the fees proposed by NES for two administrations per year to three administrations per year. Considering the pattern of reduced numbers of individuals taking the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations, eliminating one administration per year will likely affect fewer candidates over time and will help to keep fees as low as possible given the available alternatives. Staff shared the fee options with the directors of Bilingual Teacher Training Programs (BTTP) who agreed that this is the best alternative for their teachers.

Modification #1: Allow examinees the option of taking Tests 1, 2, and 3 in three separate testing sessions rather than two sessions.

- Recommendation: Do not accept this proposal.
- Rationale/Comments: NES indicates that this would require an additional fee of \$6 for all registrants for those three tests. The team deems this as too costly and inequitable as it would only benefit those who choose this option.
- Modification #2: Add testing sites in the Humboldt and/or Sonoma areas.
- Recommendation: Accept this proposal for both sites.
- Rationale/Comments: The fixed cost of \$3200 per year for two administrations at both sites is reasonable, and will accommodate candidates in outlying northern California regions more easily. The anticipated individual cost per registration is less than \$1.
- Modification #3: Reduce the score reporting interval from 35 days to 30 days.
- Recommendation: Do not accept this proposal.
- Rationale/Comments: NES indicates that this would require an additional fee of \$18 per registrant. The team feels that the benefit derived from this service does not justify the cost.
- Modification #4: Reduce the annual number of administrations of Test 6 for languages other than Spanish from the current two to one.
- Recommendation: Accept this proposal.
- Rationale/Comments: This reduction in administrations in test 6 is incorporated in the NES proposed option to administer CLAD/BCLAD Examinations only twice per year as described above.

Part 4

Summary of the Proposed Contract with NES

Administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations

NES will continue to administer the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations through June 2003. This includes:

- assuring the security of the testing process and materials;
- producing all program communications and materials;
- producing annual registration bulletins;
- registering candidates;
- administering the 51 unique CLAD/BCLAD tests;
- providing alternative testing arrangements to candidates with verified disabilities;
- scoring and reporting scores to candidates, the Bilingual Teacher Training Programs, and the Commission; and
- producing reports.

NES will administer the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations two times per year at 13 test sites.

Test and Service Fees

The fees charged by NES fall into two categories: test fees and service fees. Test fees are the costs a candidate pays for each examination she or he wishes to take. The test fees are discussed in the Contract Costs section below.

Service fees are charges the candidate incurs for additional services needed beyond regular registration for the administration of the examinations. A list of the services available and the current fees for each is provided in Table 2 below. These fees will remain unchanged in the proposed new contract.

Table 2

Service Fees Charged by NES

Service	Fee
Changing a test date or test site after registering	\$15
Extra and replacement score reports	\$15

Rescoring by hand any multiple-choice test	\$30
Emergency registration fee	\$70
File correction	\$20
Processing fee if payment does not clear	\$20

NES will also continue to make study guides for the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations available to candidates. The current cost for each study guide is \$8.00. This cost will remain unchanged in the proposed new contract.

Revision of Tests 1 - 3

NES will revise the knowledge and skill areas of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations based upon the new content specifications adopted by the Commission. NES commits to developing 60 new usable multiple-choice items and revising approximately 10 essay items as necessary. NES will prepare materials for the Bias Review Committee and the CLAD/BCLAD Advisory Panel to conduct a review of new test items, and will facilitate a one-day meeting of each group for this purpose. Following the meetings, NES will incorporate the revisions into the test materials and conduct operational field testing of all new items. NES will review the field-test results to assess the characteristics and accuracy of each item, and will create and equate test forms using the new items that are approved for inclusion in the test item bank. Additionally, NES will make all necessary changes in scoring materials to ensure that they are entirely congruent with the revised knowledge/skill areas and any revised essay assignments. They indicate that the revisions will be operational for the February 2001 administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations. Once the revisions have been completed, NES will revise the study guides to reflect the changes. At the conclusion of the revision process, NES will prepare a summary report of the changes that have been made in the program.

Contract Costs

Administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations

Table 3 below shows the test fees NES will charge candidates under the contract for two administrations of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations per year. Because test fees are determined by the anticipated volume of examinations administered each year, Table 3 shows fees under four ranges of examination volumes. Based upon recent trends in the number of CLAD/BCLAD tests administered each year, staff estimates that the volume for 2000-2001 will fall in the range of 9,001-12,000 tests and may fall in the range of 6,001-9,000 in the following two years.

**Table 3
Test Fees for Ranges of Annual Numbers of Paid Examinations
For Test Administrations in February and June Only⁴**

TEST	3000-6000	6001-9000	9001-12000	12001-15000
Test 1	\$98	\$62	\$45	\$35
Test 2	\$168	\$105	\$75	\$60
Test 3	\$168	\$105	\$75	\$60
Test 4	\$98	\$62	\$45	\$35
Test 5	\$126	\$80	\$55	\$45
Test 6 - all four	\$175	\$175	\$145	\$110
Test 6 --Listening	\$98	\$62	\$45	\$35
Test 6 --Reading	\$98	\$62	\$45	\$35
Test 6 --Speaking	\$112	\$70	\$50	\$40
Test 6 --Writing	\$126	\$80	\$55	\$45

⁴ These fees are based upon the total number of paid examinations during the year rather

than the number of examinees because an examinee could register for more than one exam on a date and/or could register for an exam on more than one date in the year.

In addition to these test fees, examinees will continue to pay a registration processing fee to be determined at a later date. The fee, currently \$18, will pay for two new sites, revisions to Tests 1-3, as well as non-contract costs such as panels for validity studies and personnel.

NES states that, although the elimination of the October 2000 administration of the examination prevents them from field-testing items at that time, they would be able to field-test items at the February 2001 administration and count them as scorable items if the items' statistics are acceptable.

NES will add two new test sites in the Humboldt and Sonoma areas for administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations at fixed cost of \$3200 per year for both sites.

Revision of Tests 1-3

NES agreed to complete each of the activities required to revise Tests 1-3 according to the new specifications at a total cost of \$18,000 for the three-year contract as specified in the RFP.

Estimated Total Three-Year Contract Costs

Table 4 below shows the estimated total costs for the three-year contract. The contract costs include total examination fees, based upon estimated volumes of tests to be administered and fees proposed by NES, the cost of revising Tests 1-3, and the cost of adding two new test sites in northern California.

Table 4
Estimated Contract Costs

Activity	Costs
2000-2001 Administration	\$644,345
2001-2002 Administration	\$707,722
2002-2003 Administration	\$557,534
Revision of Tests 1-3	\$18,000
Adding Humboldt/Sonoma Sites	\$3,200
Total	\$1,930,801

Appendix A

Knowledge and Skill Areas Assessed on the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL AREAS ASSESSED ON THE (BILINGUAL) CROSSCULTURAL, LANGUAGE AND ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT (CLAD™/BCLAD™) EXAMINATIONS

TEST 1: LANGUAGE STRUCTURE AND FIRST- AND SECOND-LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1. The sound systems of language (phonology), word formation (morphology), and syntax.
2. Word meaning (semantics) and language in context.
3. Written discourse, oral discourse, and language variation.
4. Historical and current theories and models of language that have implications for second-language development and pedagogy.

5. **Pedagogical factors affecting first- and second-language development.**
Includes topics such as learning/acquisition (formal/informal), input/intake/output, natural order, and communicative competence.
6. **Affective factors affecting first- and second-language development.**
Includes topics such as motivation, attitudes, anxiety, and self-esteem.
7. **Cognitive factors affecting first- and second-language development.**
Includes topics such as cognitive/academic language proficiency, monitor, issues related to interlanguage, and types of bilingualism and their related cognitive effects.
8. **Sociocultural and political factors affecting first- and second-language development.**
Includes topics such as differential status of languages, value systems, dialects and standard languages, acculturation patterns, language environment, and language policy (e.g., official languages).

TEST 2: METHODOLOGY OF BILINGUAL, ENGLISH LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT, AND CONTENT INSTRUCTION

1. **Foundations of bilingual education.**
Includes topics such as historical development of bilingual education, legal evolution of bilingual education, and empowerment/deficit issues (e.g., underachievement, special education placement, retention/promotion, segregation, parent and community participation, and creating a positive affective environment that values cultural and linguistic diversity).
2. **Programs for limited-English-proficient students.**
Includes topics such as language components, class composition, exit criteria, program length, goals, and philosophy/assumptions of maintenance bilingual programs, transitional bilingual programs, structured immersion programs, ESL programs (with or without specially designed academic instruction delivered in English), and submersion programs (with or without ESL); program effectiveness; and placement of students in instructional settings/programs.

3. **Instructional strategies.**
Includes topics such as language management (use of L1 and L2); classroom organization (grouping, teacher- vs. student-centered activities, and dual language); and strategies for team teaching, peer tutoring, and working with paraprofessionals (planning time, articulation, and evaluation).
4. **Instructional delivery for both English language development and specially designed academic instruction delivered in English.**
Includes topics such as comprehensible input (contextualizing language; language modification without simplification; paraphrase and repetition; and use of media, realia, manipulatives, and other modalities), comprehension checks, appropriate questioning strategies (e.g., wait time, framing questions, and how students are selected to respond), treatment of errors, treatment of grammar, making learning strategies explicit for students (e.g., Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach [CALLA]), and selection of materials.
5. **Language and content area assessment.**
Includes topics such as purpose, methods, state mandates, limitations of assessment, and technical concepts.
6. **Instructional approaches with a focus on English language development: ESL methods.**
Includes topics such as Total Physical Response Approach, Natural Approach, Communicative Approach, content-based approach (content-based ESL), and less-effective methods and approaches.
7. **Instructional approaches with a focus on English language development: Listening and speaking.**
Includes topics such as discourse strategies (e.g., markers, organization, and tone) and strategies to maximize students' comprehensibility (clarification checks; pacing; alternate vocabulary, structure, and sounds; and making speech intelligible).
8. **Instructional approaches with a focus on English language development: Literacy.**
Includes topics such as integrated approaches (whole language/literature based), discourse strategies (e.g., genre, audience, and schema), transfer of L1 literacy (e.g., orthography, rhetorical structures, and discourse strategies), absence of L1 literacy, and instructional strategies (language experience, writing process, writers' workshop, phonics, and controlled composition/reading).
9. **Instructional approaches with a focus on content area instruction (specially designed academic instruction delivered in English): Goals.**
Includes topics such as providing comprehensible grade-level instruction in the whole curriculum and providing English language development.
10. **Instructional approaches with a focus on content area instruction (specially designed academic instruction delivered in English): Planning.**
Includes topics such as incorporation of students' background knowledge and experiences; use of an additive cultural approach in selecting, adapting, and sequencing materials; selection of activities and strategies that are appropriate to students' developing language abilities, including use of L1; selection of activities and strategies that allow students to demonstrate achievement in a variety of ways; selection and contextualization of key concepts and of language that encodes those concepts; and incorporation of primary-language resources.
11. **Instructional approaches with a focus on content area instruction (specially designed academic instruction delivered in English): Student-student and teacher-student interaction.**
Includes topics such as use of L1 and L2 and grouping for special purposes.

1. The nature of culture.

Includes topics such as definitions of culture, cultural relativism, cultural universalism, intragroup and intergroup differences, and the impact of geography on cultural forms and practices.

19

2. The content of culture.

Includes topics such as values, beliefs, and expectations; roles and status; family structure, function, and socialization; humanities and the arts; communication and communication systems; and learning styles and modalities (e.g., cooperation vs. competition, and individual vs. group).

3. Crosscultural contact and interactions.

Includes topics such as the process of cultural contact (e.g., assimilation, accommodation, and biculturalism), pluralism and multiculturalism, and the dynamics of prejudice.

4. Cultural diversity in the United States and California: Historical and contemporary perspectives.

Includes topics such as contributions of cultural diversity, relationships of superordination and subordination, and demography (nature and impact).

5. Cultural diversity in the United States and California: Migration and immigration.

Includes topics such as characteristics of migrants and immigrants (who, origins, and destinations), causes of migration and immigration (push/pull factors), immigration law and policy, legal status of immigrants (e.g., documented, undocumented, and refugee), and support networks available to migrants and immigrants (formal and informal).

6. Strategies for learning about diverse student cultures.

Includes topics such as techniques (e.g., observations, home visits, and interviews) and sources (e.g., students, parents, and community).

7. Providing culturally responsive instruction: Classroom organization and interactions.

Includes topics such as organizing instruction (e.g., grouping strategies and cooperative learning), teacher expectations and student performance, teacher-student interactions (e.g., learning and teaching styles), facilitating positive interactions among culturally diverse students, and managing conflict and culturally insensitive behavior.

8. Providing culturally responsive instruction: Curriculum and instructional strategies.

Includes topics such as culturally responsive curricula, promoting achievement for all students, using diversity to enhance instruction, and adapting instruction to meet diverse needs.

9. Providing culturally responsive instruction: Roles of families and community resources.

Includes topics such as communicating with parents/families, promoting parent/family involvement in learning, and using community resources to enhance instruction.

TEST 4: METHODOLOGY FOR PRIMARY-LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

1. Instructional delivery: Organizational strategies.

Includes topics such as content area instruction (preview-review, alternate day/week, and divided day) and language arts instruction (readiness, L1, and L2).

2. Language and content assessment in L1.

Includes topics such as use of assessment to guide instruction (assessment-instruction loop), formal and informal assessment, and learner self-assessment.

3. Use of L1 and L2: Transferring language and literacy skills.

Includes topics such as L1/L2 literacy, L1/L2 oral language, and primary-language support.

4. Use of L1 and L2: Culture and content.

Includes topics such as teaching content in L1/L2, and building on and using the learners' home and community culture.

5. Development of higher-order thinking skills in L1.

20

6. Evaluation and use of primary-language materials for instruction and assessment: Criteria for selection.

Includes topics such as applicability to California curriculum frameworks, generalizability to larger population with language and dialectal variations, potential bias (e.g., cultural, linguistic, and gender), and appropriateness/relevance to strengths and needs of learners (linguistic strengths and needs, cultural background, developmental strengths and needs, and cognitive-academic development).

7. Evaluation and use of primary-language materials for instruction and assessment: Augmenting existing resources.

Includes topics such as adaptation (e.g., exemplify, paraphrase, gloss, and amplify), supplementing with other resources (e.g., human, print, and technological), and developing materials.

TEST 5: THE CULTURE OF EMPHASIS

NOTE: Knowledge/skill areas 1–6 focus on the commonalities of the culture of emphasis in its home country or countries. This is in contrast to knowledge/skill areas 7–12, which focus on the experiences in the United States and

1. Major historical periods and events.

2. Values, beliefs, and expectations.

Includes topics such as social customs and mores; rites, rituals, and ceremonies; work and leisure systems; health and medicine; institutional influences (political, economic, legal, and religious); and educational systems (formal and informal).

3. Communication systems.

Includes topics such as greetings and saying good-bye, apologies, complimenting, naming and forms of address, agreeing and disagreeing, turn taking and overlapping, eye contact, and proxemics.

4. Demographics, roles, and status.

Includes topics such as race, gender, ethnicity, social class, age, occupation, and educational level.

5. Family structure, function, and socialization.

6. Humanities and the arts.

7. Major historical periods and events.

8. Historical and contemporary demography (nature and impact).

9. Migration and immigration.

Includes topics such as characteristics of migrants and immigrants (who, origins, and destinations), causes of migration and immigration (push/pull factors), immigration law and policy, legal status of immigrants (e.g., documented, undocumented, and refugee), and support networks available to migrants and immigrants (formal and informal).

10. Contributions.

Includes topics such as arts, humanities, political, legal, cultural, social, and economic.

11. Relationship between the culture of emphasis and the dominant culture.

Includes topics such as relative status (socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, linguistic, and educational), cultural conflicts, and mutual influence.

12. Relationships among different groups within the culture of emphasis.

Includes topics such as relative status (socioeconomic, racial, ethnic, linguistic, and educational) and cultural conflicts.

TEST 6: THE LANGUAGE OF EMPHASIS

NOTE: These knowledge/skill areas relate to the specific language (other than English; "the language of emphasis") of a bilingual teacher.

1. Listening: Identify the main idea of an oral language sample in which the main idea is either stated or implied.
2. Listening: Identify either the cause of a specified effect or an effect of a specified cause in an oral language sample in which the cause-and-effect relationship is either stated or implied.
3. Listening: Identify a detail (e.g., who, what, when, and where) stated in an oral language sample.
4. Reading: Identify the main idea of a written language sample in which the main idea is either stated or implied.
5. Reading: Identify either the cause of a specified effect or an effect of a specified cause in a written language sample in which the cause-and-effect relationship is either stated or implied.
6. Reading: Identify a detail (e.g., who, what, when, and where) stated in a written language sample.
7. Reading: Identify an outcome, a conclusion, or a generalization that is supported by information in a written language sample.
8. Speaking: Speak with clarity and appropriate syntax, pragmatics, and organization.
9. Speaking: Speak using a breadth of vocabulary that is appropriate for the audience.
10. Speaking: Speak intelligibly, with fluency, clear pronunciation, and appropriate intonation and pacing.
11. Speaking: Read orally intelligibly, with fluency, clear pronunciation, and appropriate intonation and pacing.
12. Writing: Create written communication in which a clear purpose is maintained that is consistent with the task and intended audience.
13. Writing: Create written communication that is unified and coherent.
14. Writing: Create written communication in which ideas are clearly expressed and supported by appropriate and adequate details.
15. Writing: Create written communication containing proper usage (e.g., agreement and tense formation), proper mechanics (spelling, capitalization, and punctuation), and appropriate word choice and sentence variety.
16. Writing: Translate a written passage from English, conveying the significant information contained in the English version and employing proper usage (e.g., agreement and tense formation), proper mechanics (spelling, capitalization, and punctuation), and appropriate word choice and sentence variety.

Appendix B

Revised Knowledge and Skill Areas Assessed on Tests 1-3 of the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

Test 1: Language Structure and First- and Second-Language Development

1. The sound systems of language (phonology), word formation (morphology), and syntax.

Includes topics such as the structure of English, and universals and differences among language

2. Word meaning (semantics) and language in context.

Includes topics such as semantic features and how context affects meaning.

3. Oral discourse, written discourse, and language variation.

Includes topics such as the relationship between oral and written discourse, and language variation both over time and within a language at a given time.

4. Theories and models of language, both historical and current, that have implications for second-language development and pedagogy.

Includes topics such as behaviorism, cognitivism, and constructivism.

5. Pedagogical factors affecting first- and second-language development.

Includes topics such as learning/acquisition (formal/informal), input/intake/output, natural order, monitor and communicative competence.

6. Affective factors affecting first- and second-language development.

Includes topics such as motivation, attitudes, anxiety, and self-esteem.

7. Cognitive factors affecting first- and second-language development.

Includes topics such as cognitive/academic language proficiency, zone of proximal development, issues related to interlanguage, and types of bilingualism/biliteracy and their related academic outcomes.

8. Sociocultural and political factors affecting first- and second-language development.

Includes topics such as dialects and standard languages, the implications of the differential status of languages and dialects, value systems, acculturation patterns, language environment, and language policy (e.g., official languages).

Test 2: Methodology of Bilingual, English Language Development, and Content Instruction

1. Foundations of bilingual education.

Includes topics such as the historical development and legal evolution of bilingual education, including empowerment/deficit issues (e.g., underachievement, special education placement, retention/promotion, segregation, parent and community participation, and creating a positive affective environment that values cultural and linguistic diversity).

2. Programs for first- and second-language development.

Includes topics such as philosophy/assumptions, goals, language components, class

composition, program length, and exit criteria of (a) bilingual/biliteracy programs for language minority and/or language majority students (maintenance programs, two-way dual language programs, heritage language programs, and immersion programs for language majority students), (b) English-based programs that include L1 instruction for language minority students (transitional/developmental bilingual programs) or L2 instruction for language majority students, and (c) English-only programs for language minority students (submersion, with or without ESL/ELD, and structured immersion); program effectiveness; and placement of students in instructional settings/programs.

3. Instructional strategies.

Includes topics such as language management (use of L1 and L2); classroom organization (grouping, teacher- vs. student-centered activities, and dual language); and strategies for team teaching, peer tutoring, and working with paraprofessionals (planning time, articulation, and evaluation).

4. Instructional delivery for both English language development (ELD) and specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE).

Includes topics such as comprehensible input (contextualizing language; language modification without simplification; paraphrase and repetition; and use of media, realia, manipulatives, and other modalities), comprehension checks, appropriate questioning strategies (e.g., wait time, framing questions, and how students are selected to respond), treatment of errors, treatment of grammar, making learning strategies explicit for students and selection of materials.

5. Language and content area assessment.

Includes topics such as purpose, methods, state mandates, limitations of assessment, reliability, and validity.

6. Instruction with a focus on English language development: ESL methods.

Includes topics such as Total Physical Response, Natural Approach, Communicative Approach, constructivist approaches, content-based approaches (e.g., content-based ESL), and less-effective methods and approaches.

7. Instruction with a focus on English language development: Listening and speaking.

Includes topics such as discourse strategies (e.g., markers, organization, and tone) and strategies to maximize students' comprehensibility (clarification checks; pacing; alternate vocabulary, structure, and sounds; and making speech intelligible).

8. Instruction with a focus on English language development: Literacy.

Includes topics such as comprehensive and integrated approaches to reading that include phonemic awareness, phonics, controlled reading/composition, and comprehension skills, and topics such as literature-rich instruction, language experience, writing as a process, writers' workshop, discourse strategies (e.g., genre, audience, and schema), transfer of L1 literacy (e.g., orthography, rhetorical structures, and discourse strategies), and absence of L1 literacy.

9. Instruction with a focus on content area instruction (specially designed academic instruction delivered in English): Goals.

Includes topics such as providing comprehensible grade-level instruction in all curricular areas (with emphasis on the core curriculum) and fostering English language development including the development of students' academic language.

10. Instruction with a focus on content area instruction (specially designed academic instruction delivered in English): Planning.

Includes topics such as incorporation of students' background knowledge and experiences; use of an additive cultural approach in selecting, adapting, and sequencing materials; selection of activities and strategies that are appropriate to students' developing language abilities, including use of L1; selection of activities and strategies that allow students to demonstrate achievement in a variety of ways; selection of activities and strategies for developing students' academic language; selection and contextualization of key concepts and of language that encodes those concepts; and incorporation of primary-language resources.

11. Instruction with a focus on content area instruction (specially designed academic instruction delivered in English): Grouping Students and Use of L1 and L2.

Includes topics such as the grouping of students for special purposes (empowerment, self-esteem, access to content, socialization, academic achievement, development of critical thinking skills, and language development) and the use of L1 and L2 (introduction of new concepts, allowing students to express meaning in a variety of

ways, and primary-language support).

Test 3: Culture and Cultural Diversity

NOTE: The knowledge/skill areas assessed on Test 3 do not focus on any specific cultural group.

1. The nature of culture.

Includes topics such as definitions of culture, and perspectives on concepts such as cultural relativism, cultural universalism, intragroup and intergroup differences, the impact of geography on cultural forms and practices, and cultural congruence.

2. The content of culture.

Includes topics such as values, beliefs, and expectations; roles and status; family structure, function, and socialization; humanities and the arts; and communication and communication systems.

3. Crosscultural contact and interactions.

Includes topics such as processes of cultural contact (e.g., assimilation, accommodation, and biculturalism), pluralism and multiculturalism, racism, the dynamics of prejudice, and the use of group generalizations without stereotyping.

4. Cultural diversity in the United States and California: Historical and contemporary perspectives.

Includes topics such as historical and contemporary relationships of cultural diversity to education (including issues of power and status) and demographic trends (nature and impact).

5. Cultural diversity in the United States and California: Migration and immigration.

Includes topics such as characteristics of migrants and immigrants (who, origins, and destinations), causes of migration and immigration (push/pull factors), immigration law and policy, legal status of immigrants (e.g., documented, undocumented, and refugee), support networks available to migrants and immigrants (formal and informal), and the relationships of immigrants to their nations of origin.

6. Strategies for learning about diverse student cultures and experiences.

Includes topics such as techniques (e.g., observations, home visits, interviews, and informal conversations) and sources (e.g., students, parents, community, and written and oral histories) for learning about students.

7. Providing culturally inclusive instruction: Classroom organization and interactions.

Includes culturally influenced dimensions of topics such as organizing instruction (e.g., grouping strategies and cooperative learning), teacher expectations and student performance, teacher-student interactions (e.g., learning and teaching styles), facilitating positive interactions among culturally diverse students, and addressing conflict and culturally insensitive behavior.

8. Providing culturally inclusive instruction: Curriculum and instructional strategies.

Includes culturally influenced dimensions of topics such as developing inclusive curricula, promoting achievement for all students, using diversity to enhance instruction, and adapting instruction to meet diverse needs.

9. Providing culturally inclusive instruction: Roles of families and community resources.

Includes culturally influenced dimensions of topics such as communicating with parents/families, promoting parent/family involvement in learning, and using community resources to enhance instruction.

Appendix C

Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part I

Yes No Proposal was received at or before 10:00 a.m. on March 6, 2000, at the offices
___ ___ of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Yes No Eight copies of the proposal were received.
___ ___

Yes No The cover page of the proposal clearly identifies the bidder, and one or more signatures indicate that the proposal is an authorized request for a contract with the Commission.
 ___ ___

Yes No The bidder either meets the goal for disabled-veteran business enterprise participation, or has documented a good faith effort to do so as described in the RFP.
 ___ ___

The proposal has the following required elements as described in Part 5 of the RFP:

Yes No A Cover Page
 ___ ___

Yes No A Table of Contents
 ___ ___

Yes No An Introduction
 ___ ___

Yes No Section 1:Statement of Work: Administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations
 ___ ___

Yes No Section 2:Statement of Work: Revision of Tests 1-3
 ___ ___

Yes No Section 3:Contract Costs
 ___ ___

Yes No Section 4:Corporate Capability
 ___ ___

Yes No Section 5:Technical Information
 ___ ___

Appendix D

Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part II

	Maximum Score
<p>(1) Administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations. The proposal provides sound, feasible, and complete plans for the administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations as described in Part 2A of the RFP. Sufficient detail is provided to know what the bidder will do. The proposal presents clear evidence that the bidder will provide high quality test administration products and services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security 10 • Program Communications and Materials Production 10 • Test Registration and Registration Bulletins 10 • Test Administration 25 • Scoring and Score Reportin 15 	70
<p>(2) Revision of Tests 1-3. The proposal provides a sound, feasible, and complete plan for the revision of Tests 1-3 as described in Part 2B of the RFP. Sufficient detail is provided to know what the bidder will do. The revision plan is appropriate and both technically and legally defensible. The proposal presents clear evidence that the bidder will provide high quality test development products and services.</p>	20
<p>(3) Corporate Capability. The proposal demonstrates that the bidder has sufficient and appropriate experience and resources to provide the required products and services with high quality. The bidder possesses expertise in</p>	25

all areas essential to the project. If subcontractors are proposed, they, too, have the experience, resources, and expertise to provide the products and services for which they would be responsible.

• Corporate experience	10	
• Corporate resources	15	
(4) Management and Staffing Plan. The proposal includes a sound, feasible plan to organize managers and staff members (including subcontractors, if proposed) to deliver the required products and services efficiently and with high quality. Key duties would be assigned to individuals with essential expertise, experience, and time to complete their responsibilities.		25
• Sound, feasible organizational plan	10	
• Qualifications and experience of key staff	15	
(5) Contract Costs. The proposed contract costs described in the proposal are reasonable in relation to the products and services to be provided and competitive in relation to the costs proposed by other bidders.		65
• Test fees	40	
• Service fees and Study Guide cost	15	
• Cost for revision of Tests 1-3	10	
(6) Presentation. The proposal is clearly written, to the point, and well-organized. Ideas are presented logically and all requested information is presented skillfully.		15
Maximum Possible Score		220

Appendix E

NES Proposed CLAD/BCLAD Exam Fees for Two and Three Administrations Per Year

Test Fees for Ranges of Annual Numbers of Paid Examinations For Two Administrations Per Year⁶

TEST	3000-6000	6001-9000	9001-12000	12001-15000
Test 1	\$98	\$62	\$45	\$35
Test 2	\$168	\$105	\$75	\$60
Test 3	\$168	\$105	\$75	\$60
Test 4	\$98	\$62	\$45	\$35
Test 5	\$126	\$80	\$55	\$45
Test 6 -- all four	\$175	\$175	\$145	\$110
Test 6 -- Listening	\$98	\$62	\$45	\$35
Test 6 -- Reading	\$98	\$62	\$45	\$35

Test 6 -- Speaking	\$112	\$70	\$50	\$40
Test 6 -- Writing	\$126	\$80	\$55	\$45

**Test Fees for Ranges of Annual Numbers of Paid Examinations
For Three Administrations Per Year⁵**

TEST	3000-6000	6001-9000	9001-12000	12001-15000
Test 1	\$112	\$70	\$52	\$40
Test 2	\$192	\$130	\$90	\$70
Test 3	\$192	\$130	\$90	\$70
Test 4	\$112	\$70	\$52	\$40
Test 5	\$144	\$90	\$65	\$52
Test 6 -- all four	\$175	\$175	\$175	\$175
Test 6 -- Listening	\$112	\$70	\$52	\$40
Test 6 -- Reading	\$112	\$70	\$52	\$40
Test 6 -- Speaking	\$128	\$80	\$58	\$46
Test 6 -- Writing	\$144	\$90	\$65	\$52

⁵These fees are based upon the total number of paid examinations during the year rather than the number of examinees because an examinee could register for more than one exam on a date and/or could register for an exam(s) on more than one date in the year.



[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)



[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](#)

[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 13, 2000

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-1

Title: Analysis of and Proposed Action Plan in Response to the Management Study Mandated by the 1999 Budget Act

- ✓ Action
- ✓ Information

Prepared by: Karen Romo, Analyst
Fiscal and Business 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.

SUMMARY

As directed by the Commissioners at the March 2000 meeting, staff is currently finalizing a complete analysis and proposed action plan in response to the management study. The completed report will be presented as an in-folder item at the April 2000 Commission meeting.



[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)



[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](#)

[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 13, 2000

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-2

Title: Proposed 2000-2001 May Revise Budget Change Proposals

✓ Action

Prepared by: John Wahlstrom, Analyst
Fiscal and Business Services

BACKGROUND

The Department of Finance (DOF) Budget Letter 00-01 allows state agencies to submit Spring Finance Letters (SFLs) for new proposals of critical importance that have arisen since the Fall Budget Change Proposal (BCP) process. In turn, these SFLs are then given to the Legislature for inclusion in the May Revise process.

At the time the SFLs were due to the DOF on February 14, 2000, recommendations on several of the Commission's Fall BCPs were being withheld pending the outcome of the MGT Management Study. With the March 1 release of the Management Study and an invitation by the Governor's Office to submit any other items of critical importance to the Commission, the withheld BCPs are now being reviewed. Additionally, staff is preparing to re-submit previously denied BCPs for reconsideration as well as new items titled May Revision Budget Change Proposals.

SUMMARY

The attached chart briefly summarizes the Commission's 2000-2001 proposed May Revision BCPs.

RECOMMENDATION

Details of each of the BCPs will be presented as in-folder items for the Commissioner's consideration.

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



[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)



[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](#)

[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 13, 2000

Agenda Item Number: FPPC-3

Title: Update Regarding Contract for Assistance with Strategic and Information Technology Plan and Action Plan.

✓ Information

Prepared by: Joseph R. Radding, Director
Information Technology and
Support Management Division

BACKGROUND

At the March 2000 Commission meeting, Commissioners authorized the Executive Director to retain the KPMG Consulting firm (KPMG) to assist the Commission in reexamining its overall strategic direction and its approach to doing business. In particular, KPMG was to be directed to (1) evaluate the potential for expanded use of information technology and other process improvements that would help the Commission to achieve its business goals as effectively and efficiently as possible, (2) develop an action plan and information technology strategic plan, and (3) facilitate any needed revisions to the Commission's Strategic Plan.

SUMMARY

Within one day of the Commission's action, the Executive Director contracted with KPMG for up to 800 hours of professional consulting services at a total cost of \$180,000 to perform the following key tasks:

- Complete project planning activities
- Conduct interviews to review mandates, stakeholders, and opportunities
- Review business operations and use of enabling technologies
- Review vision, mission and value statements
- Review current strategic issues
- Develop revised goals and objectives
- Prepare a draft strategic plan
- Develop implementation action plans
- Finalize the strategic plan and action plan

At the time that this agenda item was prepared, KPMG had completed its project planning activities (see attachment) and had proceeded to reviewing a myriad of background documents relating to the Commission's operations. In addition, KPMG has scheduled

interviews with a broad spectrum of Commission managers and other key staff to discuss in detail both information technology and business process issues.

Staff will continue to provide Commissioners with periodic status updates concerning the progress of this effort.








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

**State of California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Strategic and Information Technology Plan and Action Plan
Proposed Project Timeline**

Task Description	3/13	3/20	3/27	4/3	4/10	4/17	4/24	5/1	5/8	5/15	5/22	5/29	6/5	6/12	6/19	6/26
1. Project Planning Activities																
	▲															
2. Update Existing Feasibility Study Reports for Submission to Control Agencies							○									
			●													
3. Conduct Interviews to Review CTC Mandates, Stakeholders and Opportunities																
4. Review the CTC's Business Operations and Use of Enabling Technologies																
5. Review the CTC's Vision, Mission and Value Statements																
6. Review Strategic Issues Currently Confronting CTC																
7. Develop Revised CTC Goals and Objectives																
8. Prepare Draft Strategic and Information Technology Plan																
								●	□							
9. Develop																

Implementation Action Plans																	
10. Finalize the Strategic and Information Technology Plan																	
11. Perform Post-Implementation Review of Action Plan Efforts																	

PROJECT MILESTONES

-  Initiate Project - March 13, 2000
-  Progress Reports - First working day of each month
-  Revised Feasibility Study Reports - April 24, 2000
-  Draft Strategic and Information Technology Plan - May 8, 2000
-  Draft Action Plan - May 29, 2000
-  Final Strategic and Information Technology Plan and Action Plan - June 26, 2000
-  Post - Implementation Review - January 15, 2001



[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)



[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](#)

[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 13, 2000

Agenda Item Number: LEG-1

Title: Status of Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action

✓ Information

Prepared by: Rod Santiago
Legislative Liaison

BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING March 23, 2000

CCTC-Sponsored Bills

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
AB 309 -- Mazzone Would increase the cap on per intern expenditures in the alternative certification program	Sponsor (3/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 457 -- Scott Would add internet-based sex offenses to the list of specified mandatory revocation offenses	Sponsor (3/99)	Signed by the Governor -- Chaptered
AB 466 -- Mazzone Omnibus clean-up bill	Sponsor (3/99)	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	Sponsor (3/99)	Signed by the Governor -- Chaptered

AB 1067 -- Margett Would bring Education Code provisions related to lewd and lascivious Penal Code violations into conformity	Sponsor (4/99)	Signed by the Governor -- Chaptered
AB 1282 -- Jackson Would require CCTC to make improvements needed to enhance CBEST	Sponsor (4/99)	Signed by the Governor -- Chaptered
AB 2339 -- Mazzone, et. al. Would clean-up various provisions of the Education Code	Sponsor (2/00)	Introduced

SENATE BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
SB 151 - Haynes Would allow a person who meets prescribed requirements to qualify for a Professional Clear teaching credential	Seek Amendments (2/99) Oppose Unless Amended (4/99) Oppose (7/99)	Held in Assembly Appropriations Committee
SB 179 - Alpert Would require the Commission to ensure that expanded teacher internship programs are fully integrated and cooperatively taught (<i>Last amended 1/12/00</i>)	Support if Amended (2/99)	To Assembly
SB 395 -- Hughes Would remove the sunset date on SDAIE staff development training	Seek Amendments (4/99) Support (7/99)	Signed by the Governor -- Chaptered
SB 472 -- Poochigian Would require SDE and SBE to make a joint recommendation to the Legislature regarding implementation of mathematics institutes for teachers in grades 4, 5 and 6 <i>Last Amended 1/26/00</i>	Support (4/99)	To Assembly
SB 573 -- Alarcon Would state the intent of the Legislature to establish a pilot program that will enhance the retention rate of experienced teachers, enhance the opportunities for candidates to complete credentialing programs, and train teachers for more effective service in hard to staff schools. (<i>Last Amended 1/26/00</i>)	Watch (4/99) Support if Amended (5/99)	To Assembly
SB 1431 -- Haynes, et. al. Would remove the coursework option for credential candidates to meet subject matter competency	Oppose (3/00)	Introduced
SB 1527 -- Hughes Creates a new Alternative Teacher Intern Program	Oppose (3/00)	Introduced
SB 1564 -- Karnette, Burton, and Escutia Would modify the APLE program to increase the total loan assumption amount from \$11,000 to \$20,000 and require an applicant to maintain a GPA of 3.0 on a 4.0 scale.	Support (3/00)	Introduced

ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number - Author Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (date adopted)	Status
AB 1X - Villaraigosa and Strom-Martin Would establish the Peer Assistance and Review Program for Teachers	Seek Amendments (2/99) CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor -- Chaptered
AB 2X - Mazzone and Cunneen Would establish various programs related to reading and teacher recruitment	Support (2/99) Seek Amendments (3/99) CTC amendments adopted	Signed by the Governor -- Chaptered
AB 27X - Leach Would require CCTC to conduct a validity study of the CBEST	Oppose Unless Amended (2/99) Watch (3/99) CTC amendments adopted	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	Support (2/99)	Signed by the Governor -- Chaptered
AB 108 - Mazzone Subject Matter Projects	Support (2/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 192 -- Scott Would create the California Teacher Cadet Program	Support (3/99)	Vetoed by the Governor
AB 578 -- Honda Would require the SPI, in consultation with CCTC and IHEs, to develop training requirements for teachers to ensure sufficient training on domestic violence recognition	Watch (4/99)	Held in Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 609 -- Wildman Would allow school districts to use a braille instructional aide to provide braille instruction if the aide works under the direct supervision of a credentialed teacher who is enrolled in a program that will lead to a certificate to teach the visually impaired	Seek Amendments (3/00)	Senate Education Committee
AB 707 -- House Would set forth requirements for a services credential with a specialization in school psychology	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 752 -- Davis Would create two new single subject teaching credentials in dance and in theatre <i>Last amended 1/20/00</i>	Watch (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 877 -- Scott Would modify the APLE program to require that an applicant must have completed 30 semester units to participate in the program	Support (3/00)	Introduced
AB 899 -- Alquist Would make changes to the APLE program	Support (5/99)	Senate Education

related to allowing applicants to be enrolled on a half-time basis and redistribution of unused warrants (Last amended 1/3/00)		Committee
AB 908 -- Alquist Would require CCTC to adopt or revise standards to address gender equity	Seek Amendments (4/99)	Senate Appropriations Committee
AB 961 -- Steinberg Would create the Challenged School Teacher Attraction and Retention Act of 1999	Support (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1006 -- Ducheny Would establish a two-year pilot project to provide peer support and mentoring for school counselors	Support (4/99)	Senate Education Committee
AB 1059 -- Ducheny Would make various provisions in law related to CLAD training	Seek Amendments (4/99) Support (9/99)	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) Watch (9/99)	Signed by the Governor -- Chaptered
AB 1324 -- Zettel Would allow holders of Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credentials who have ten years of experience teaching in a mild/moderate classroom to continue in this assignment	Oppose unless amended (2/00) Watch (3/00) CTC amendments adopted	Senate Education Committee
AB 1529 -- Baldwin and Runner Would allow IHEs 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 purposes of California credentialing	Oppose (12/99)	Dropped by the author
AB 1900 -- Steinberg Would state legislative intent to appropriate funds to low performing schools for the purpose of hiring a full-time, on-site staff person to provide support for all beginning teachers	Watch (3/00)	Introduced
AB 1994 -- Baldwin Would allow IHEs located in California 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 purposes of California credentialing	Oppose (3/00)	Introduced



[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)



[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](#)

[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 13, 2000

Agenda Item Number: LEG-2

Title: Consent Calendar for Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action

✓ Information

Prepared by: Rod Santiago
Legislative Liaison

Legislative Committee Consent Calendar March 23, 2000

Staff is recommending a position of **WATCH** on the following bills. These bills are in placeholder form, language stating legislative intent, or findings and declarations. If there are future Commission-related amendments to these bills, staff will bring them back to the Commission for review and modification of its' position as necessary.

1. Senate Bill 1722 (Hayden)

This bill would state the Legislature's intent to create a program to assist immigrant professionals in entering the teaching workforce.

2. Senate Bill 1976 (Solis)

This bill would make technical, nonsubstantive changes in the findings and declarations of the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program.

3. Senate Bill 2039 (Alarcon)

This bill would declare that it is the Legislature's intent that the governing board of every applicable school is encouraged to make college guidance counseling available and accessible to all pupils beginning in grade 7.

4. Assembly Bill 2633 (Calderon)

This bill would make a technical, nonsubstantive change to the CLAD provision in law.

5. Assembly Bill 2674 (Bock)

This bill would make a technical nonsubstantive, change to a provision in law related to the University Intern Program.

6. Assembly Bill 2679 (Bock)

This bill would make technical, nonsubstantive changes to the provisions related to the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program.



[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)



[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](#)

[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 13, 2000

Agenda Item Number: LEG-3

Title: Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action

✓ Information

Prepared by: Rod Santiago
Legislative Liaison

Bill Number: Assembly Bill 2590

Author(s): Assemblymember Campbell

Sponsor: California State Commanders Veteran Council

Subject of Bill: Bonus for Enlisted Personnel of the United States Armed Forces to Enter the Teaching Profession

Date Introduced: February 25, 2000

Status in Leg. Process: Introduced

Current CTC Position: None

Recommended Position: Seek Amendments

Date of Analysis: March 15, 2000

Analyst(s): Maureen McMurray and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Current law requires a person to meet certain specified requirements to qualify for a Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential. The requirements for this credential include

completion of a teacher preparation program, CBEST, RICA (for the multiple subject credential), coursework in the teaching of reading, subject matter competence, and a program of beginning teacher induction.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

Troops to Teachers was a federally funded program sponsored by the Department of Defense to help individuals transition out of the military and into teaching. The Commission has acted as a referral and counseling service to the participants by providing them with information about requirements and options for obtaining California teaching credentials. Participants in the Troops to Teachers program must complete all credential requirements for a teaching credential. No requirement is postponed or waived.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

As drafted, this bill would allow the Commission to approve a school district request for the assignment of an individual who meets all of the following criteria:

1. The individual is an honorably discharged officer of the United States armed forces or is an enlisted person who retired with a rank of E-6 or higher.
2. The individual agrees to teach for four years and commits to taking eight classes toward obtaining a teaching credential within three years of beginning to teach.

An individual who meets the above criteria and is approved for a teaching assignment may have eighteen months from the date of beginning the teaching assignment to obtain a passing score on the CBEST.

An individual who is approved for a teaching assignment pursuant to this section is eligible for a one-time bonus payment of five thousand dollars, and the school district to which the individual is assigned is also eligible for a one-time bonus payment of five thousand dollars.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

The author's office has stated that the bill will be amended substantially. In the bill's current form, it is not known how many armed forces retirees would meet the criteria of the bill and how many districts would request an assignment as provided in the bill.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policies 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.

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

California State Commanders Veteran Council is the sponsor of the bill.

Suggested Amendments

The author and his staff have offered to work with the Commission to amend the bill. According to staff, the bill in its current form is a placeholder.:

Reason for Suggested Position

We have been in contact with the author's office and they are willing to work with us to substantially amend the bill. As currently drafted, this bill would allow individuals to enter the

classroom with no bachelor's degree, CBEST, subject matter competence or courses in pedagogy, methodology or classroom management. Substantial research now exists showing the direct and powerful correlation between teacher preparation and student achievement.

In order for teachers to be successful, it is very important that they know *what* to teach, *how* to teach and *who* their students are. Teachers need to know how to help students learn. Without pedagogical training appropriate to the subject and age level of the student, there may be little assurance of teacher competence to assist students to meet state performance standards, or prepare for the new high school exit exam.



[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)



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

[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)
[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](#)

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Meeting of: April 13, 2000

Agenda Item Number: PUB-1

Title: Proposed Amendment to Title 5 Regulation, §80430.2, Pertaining to Credentials Issued on the Basis of Reciprocity

✓ Action

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

PUBLIC HEARING

Section 80430.2 of Title 5

California Code of Regulations

Pertaining to Credentials Issued on the Basis of Reciprocity

March 14, 2000

Introduction

The proposed amendments to Section 80430.2, pertaining to credentials issued on the basis of reciprocity, are being presented for public hearing. Included in this item is the background of the proposed regulations, a brief discussion of the proposed changes and the financial impact. Also included are the responses to the notification of the public hearing and a copy of that notification distributed in Coded-Correspondence #00-0008, dated February 18, 2000.

Background of the Proposed Regulations

At its January 2000 meeting, the Commission adopted emergency regulations to allow the immediate implementation of AB 1620. The Office of Administrative Law approved this on January 19, 2000. At its February 2000 meeting, the Commission approved staff's request to call for a public hearing to permanently adopt the regulations under the normal procedures of the Office of Administrative Law, since the emergency regulations are only effective until May 18, 2000.

Proposed Changes

Education Code §44274 requires the Commission to evaluate other state's teacher preparation standards to determine equivalency to those found here. It also requires the Commission to issue a comparable California credential to those individuals who have received the equivalent preparation. The following briefly reviews the proposed amendments. For more detailed information, see the attached Coded-Correspondence #00-0008, dated February 18, 2000.

§80430.2(a)

This proposed sub-section clarifies that the Commission will review three areas to determine if the teacher preparation standards of the other states are "comparable and equivalent" to those in California. Those areas are 1) comparable accreditation standards and procedures, 2) comparable multiple subject, single subject or special education program standards or requirements, and 3) comparable subject matter programs.

§80430.2(b)

Proposed subsection (b) requires all applicants applying under reciprocity to verify professional fitness and to pass the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST).

§80430.2(c)

Noted in this proposed sub-section are the types of California credentials available for individuals with comparable "reciprocity" programs. Also, the timeframe for considering out-of-state programs comparable is clarified.

§80430.2(d)

This proposed sub-section addresses the renewal requirements for those issued the five-year preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials.

§80430.2(e)

The renewal requirements for those issued the preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential are noted in this proposed sub-section.

§80430.2(f)

A number of individuals that meet the "comparability" requirements have already obtained a California credential under the traditional methods. This proposed sub-section allows these individuals to request a "comparable" credential that is valid for at least three years. Note: In the underlined portion of this section, "that pertains *too* teachers" should read "that pertains *to* teachers".

Financial Impact

Education Code §44274 requires the Commission to issue a comparable California credential to those individuals who have received the equivalent preparation, and the Commission cannot require individuals to complete any course or examination requirement that it has determined to be comparable. Because of this, these proposed regulations do not have an impact on the cost or savings to either the institutions of higher education that offer teacher education programs or on the teacher testing companies. It also does not establish any mandated costs.

Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Mailing List and Responses

Mailing List

Commission Members on the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

California County Superintendents of Schools

Credential Analysts at the California County Superintendent of Schools' Offices

Superintendents of Selected California School Districts

Deans of Education at the California Institutions of Higher Education with Committee-Accredited Programs

Credential Analysts at the California Institutions of Higher Education with Committee-Accredited Programs

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

Tally of Responses

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

Responses Representing Organizational Opinions in Support

- Rim of the World Unified School District: Sharon Merrill, Personnel Director
- School District Human Resource Administrators of San Bernardino and San Diego Counties: Bruce Kitchen, CCTC/School District Liaison ([please see attached comments](#))
- Yucaipa-Calimesa Joint Unified School District: Stuart Nussbaum, Associate Superintendent of Human Resources

Responses Representing Personal Opinions in Support

- Sue Yakubik, Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources, Santee School District

Responses Representing Organizational Opinions in Opposition

- None.

Responses Representing Personal Opinions in Opposition

- None.

Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed regulations.

letterhead



OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
(916) 445-0184

00-0008

DATE: February 18, 2000

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

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

SUBJECT: Proposed Amendments to Section 80430.2 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to Credentials Issued on the Basis of Reciprocity

Notice of Public Hearing is Hereby Given:

In accordance with Commission policy, proposed Title 5 Regulations are being distributed

prior to the public hearing. A copy of the proposed regulations is attached. The added text is underlined, while the deleted text is lined-through. Note: The portion of the text that is not underlined was temporarily approved by the Office of Administrative Law on January 19, 2000, and is only effective until May 18, 2000.

The public hearing is scheduled on:

April 13, 2000
1:30 p. m.
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814

Statement of Reasons

Education Code §44274 requires the Commission to evaluate other state's teacher preparation standards to determine equivalency to those found here. It also requires the Commission to issue a comparable California credential to those individuals who have received the equivalent preparation. Proposed Title 5 §80430.2 will aid in implementing this Education Code.

§80430.2(a)

This proposed sub-section clarifies that the Commission will review three areas to determine if the teacher preparation standards of the other states are "comparable and equivalent" to those in California. Those areas are 1) comparable accreditation standards and procedures, 2) comparable multiple subject, single subject or special education program standards or requirements, and 3) comparable subject matter programs. The first area determines that a reciprocity state's teacher preparation program are only offered through institutions of higher education that meet similar accreditation provisions as those approved in California. The second area verifies that the teacher education program requirements are comparable to those with the Commission's Committee on Accreditation approval. To ensure that individuals have knowledge of the subject they will be teaching, the third area verifies that the reciprocal state's subject matter requirements are comparable to California: liberal studies for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and the specific subject for the Single Subject Teaching Credential.

§80430.2(b)

Proposed subsection (b) will require all applicants applying under reciprocity to verify teacher fitness, as required in Education Code §44274(d), and, by passing the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), demonstrate basic skills proficiency, as required in Education Code §44252.

§80430.2(c)

Noted in this proposed sub-section are the types of California credentials available for individuals with comparable "reciprocity" programs. Because the individuals applying under these regulations will be newly trained, inexperienced teachers, the Commission felt that it would be more appropriate to issue the five-year preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials and the preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential instead of the professional clear. By doing this, most individuals will be under the guidance of a California institution of higher education or other agency that will assist them to become better teachers. Also clarified is the timeframe for considering out-of-state programs reciprocal. Because teacher education programs through out the United States are continuously evolving, it was felt that accepting out-of-state programs completed more than three years prior to determining reciprocity might under-mine the equivalency determinations.

There have been three proposed amendments to the approved emergency regulations. They are the following:

1. The first clarifies that the regulation applies to documents with an issuance date of January 19, 2000, or later, rather than those applications submitted to the Commission on or after January 19, 2000. This change was made because it was not clear if the "submitted" date referred to was the date the application was mailed to the Commission, the date the Commission received the application, or the date an agency representing the Commission, such as a public school district, received the application.

2. To further clarify which teacher preparation programs would be honored under these regulations, the proposed regulations establish both a beginning and ending date for acceptance. Establishing the ending date of three years immediately following the date of Commission action will maintain the integrity of the comparability studies.
3. Regarding communication specialist programs, the panel has determined that there may be comparable programs in more than the area of Language, Speech and Hearing including Special Class Authorization for the Clinical or Rehabilitative Services Credential. Removing the specific area allows for more flexibility in determining comparability.

§80430.2(d)

To give better direction to individuals who have obtained a credential under this option, this proposed sub-section adds the renewal requirements for those obtaining the five-year preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials. Unless any of these requirements have been previously satisfied or cleared as part of the comparability study, the proposed regulations will require completion of 1) a fifth year of study or an approved induction program, 2) health education, 3) special education, and 4) advanced computer education.

§80430.2(e)

Also, to give better direction to individuals obtaining the preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential under this option, this proposed sub-section requires completion of the professional clear level II program, unless the requirements for the level II has been verified through the comparability study.

§80430.2(f)

A number of individuals trained in comparable states within the last three years have already applied for a California credential under the traditional methods. They may be held for requirements such as the United States Constitution; English language skills, including reading; Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA); and subject matter competence, that the proposed 80430.2 would waive. These individuals may obtain a "reciprocity" credential that is valid for at least three years under this proposed subsection. This option is allowed because the Commission does not wish to disenfranchise any eligible individual in light of the teacher shortage.

Documents Relied Upon in Preparing Regulations

- "Davis Issues 'Call to Arms' for Teachers" (January 5, 2000)
- "2000 State of the State Address"
- Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE). (July 1996). The Need for Teachers in California. University of California at Berkeley

Documents Incorporated by Reference

None.

Written Comment Period

Any interested person, or her or his authorized representative, may submit written comments on the proposed actions. The written comment period closes at 5:00 p.m. on April 12, 2000.

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

Submission of Written Comments

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

Public Hearing

Oral comments on the proposed action will be taken at the public hearing. We would

appreciate 14 days advance notice in order to schedule sufficient time on the agenda for all speakers. Please contact Yvonne Novelli at (916) 445-5865 regarding this.

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

Modification of Proposed Actions

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

Contact Person/Further Information

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

Attachments

Division VIII of Title 5 California Code of Regulations

Proposed Amendments to Section 80430.2 Pertaining to Reciprocity

§80430.2. Comparable and Equivalent Teacher Preparation; Reciprocity.

- (a) The phrase "teacher preparation standards that are at least comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California" as used in Education Code Section 44274 shall mean teacher preparation in a state that has 1) comparable accreditation standards and procedures, 2) comparable multiple subject, single subject or special education program standards or requirements, and 3) comparable subject matter programs, as determined by Commission action.
- (b) All applicants for a credential pursuant to Education Code Section 44274 shall meet the requirements for California teacher fitness pursuant to Education Code Sections 44339, 44340 and 44341, and demonstrate basic skills proficiency pursuant to Education Code Sections 44252 and 44252.5.
- (c) This section shall govern applications submitted to the Commission on or after documents with an issuance date of January 19, 2000, or later subject to Commission action approving comparability of state accreditation standards and procedures, comparable multiple subject, single subject, or special education program standards or requirements, and subject matter in one or more credential areas. Applicants who completed a teacher preparation program during the term of the reciprocity contract or within three years prior to or three years immediately following the date of Commission action, and who hold or are eligible for a credential in the state where the program was completed, shall be eligible, under this section, for the appropriate credential as follows:
 - (1) five-year preliminary Multiple Subject Teaching Credential, or
 - (2) five-year preliminary Single Subject Teaching Credential, or
 - (3) certificate of eligibility or preliminary level I Education Specialist Instruction Credential; , or
 - (4) professional clear Clinical or Rehabilitative Services Credential in Language, Speech and Hearing including Special Class Authorization.
- (d) The minimum requirements for the professional clear Multiple Subject Teaching Credential or Single Subject Teaching Credential for those eligible under subsection (c)(1) or (c)(2) are all of the requirements in Education Code Section 44259(c) unless

already completed per Education Code Section 44227(e) or approved under the comparability study established in Education Code Section 44274.

- (e) The minimum requirements for the professional clear level II Education Specialist Instruction Credential for those eligible under subsection (c)(3) are all of the requirements in Title 5 Section 80048.4 unless approved under the comparability study established in Education Code Section 44274.
- (d) An individual who has previously been issued a California Multiple Subject Teaching Credential, Single Subject Teaching Credential, Specialist Instruction Credential in Special Education, or Education Specialist Instruction Credential under another provision of the Education Code that pertains too teachers trained outside of California may be eligible for a credential under this section. The credential shall be issued for five years from the issuance date of the original preliminary or level I credential or for three years from the date of application, whichever is longer.

NOTE: Authority cited: Section 44225(q), Education Code. Reference: Sections 44225(d), 44252, 44252.5, 44274, 44339, 44340, and 44341, Education Code.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GRAY DAVIS, Governor

CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Box 944270

Sacramento, California 94244-2700

(916) 445-7254 Web Site: <http://www.ctc.ca.gov>

E-Mail: credentials@ctc.ca.gov



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

Title: Credentials Issued on the Basis of Reciprocity
Section No.: 80430.2

Response to the Attached Title 5 Regulations

So that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing can more clearly estimate the general field response to the attached Title 5 regulations, please return this response form to the Commission, attention Executive Office, at the above address by 5:00 pm on April 12, 2000, in order that the material can be presented at the April 13, 2000 public hearing.

- 1. **Yes**, I agree with the proposed Title 5 regulations. Please count me in favor of these regulations.
- 2. **No**, I do not agree with the proposed Title 5 Regulations for the following reasons: (If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of this sheet.)

- 3. Personal opinion of the undersigned. and/or
- 4. Organizational opinion representing: _____
(Circle One) School District, County Schools, College, University, Professional Organization, Other
- 5. I shall be at the public hearing, place my name on the list for making a presentation to the Commission.
- 6. No, I will not make a presentation to the Commission at the public hearing.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Printed Name: _____

Title: _____ Phone: _____

Employer/Organization: _____

Mailing Address: _____

route to y/n

SCHOOL DISTRICT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS *of* SAN BERNARDINO & SAN DIEGO COUNTIES

February 23, 2000

Dr. Sam Swofford, Executive Director
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814

SUBJECT: LETTER OF SUPPORT
TITLE 5 PROPOSED AMENDMENTS PERTAINING TO
CREDENTIALS ISSUED ON THE BASIS OF RECIPROCITY

Dear Dr. Swofford:

This letter is written on behalf of the school district personnel and human resource administrators in San Diego and San Bernardino Counties. This bi-county coalition strongly supports the proposed amendments to Section 80430.2 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, pertaining to teaching credentials issued on the basis of reciprocity.

The proposed amendment, scheduled for Public Hearing on April 13, 2000, is clearly written and conforms to the intent of AB 1620 (Scott). The intense work of the Commission staff, the AB 1620 Task Force and other experts recruited into this important project are to be commended. Establishing an open door for teachers trained in states whose standards are comparable and equivalent to California will be an important step forward in putting fully trained teachers in our classrooms.

The proposed amendment to Division VIII of Title 5 California Code of Regulations has our complete support.

Sincerely,



Bruce Kitchen
CCTC / School District Liaison



[Return to April 2000 Agenda](#) | [Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[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](#)