



[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

March 7-8, 2001 • 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, March 7, 2001**  
*Commission Office*

**1. General Session 1:00 p.m.**

The Commission will immediately convene into Closed Session

**Closed Session (Chair Bersin)**

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

**2. Appeals and Waivers (Chair Madkins)**

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

---

1. **General Session (Chair Bersin)**

8:00  
a.m.

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

2. **Legislative Committee of the Whole (Chair Madkins)**



- LEG-1 Status of Legislation of Interest to the Commission
  - LEG-2 Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission  
(Note: In-folder items will be provided, if necessary.)
  - LEG-3 Proposed Amendments to the Commission's Proposal Clarifying  
the Education Code Sections Related to the Committee of  
Credentials  
(Note: In-folder items will be provided, if necessary.)
- 

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



- PREP-1 Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by  
Colleges and Universities



- PREP-2 Proposal to Award a Contract for Comparability Studies of  
Subject Matter Requirements and Credential Emphasis or  
Equivalent Programs in Other States



- PREP-3 Update on the Administrative Services Credential Forums and  
the Work of the Administrative Services Credential Task Force



- PREP-4 Progress Report on the Implementation of CFASST: Evaluation  
Report of the Field Review 1998-2000





- PREP-5 Overview of Draft Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for  
Professional Induction Programs
- 

4. **Fiscal Policy and Planning Committee of the Whole (Chair Boquiren)**



- FPPC-1 Overview of the Legislative Analyst's Review of the 2001-2002  
Governor's Budget


 **FPPC-2** Update Regarding Status of the Teacher Credentialing Service Improvement Project


 **FPPC-3** Proposed Revisions to Commission Policy Manual Pertaining to Contract Review


---

## 5. Performance Standards Committee of the Whole (Chair Johnson)

---

 **PERF-1** Recommended Award of a Contract for Administration, Validity Study, and Development of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA), and Proposed 2001-02 Test Fees

 **PERF-2** Proposed 2001-02 Test Fees for the Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT) and the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

 **PERF-3** Proposed Request for Proposals for Development of a New Teaching Performance Assessment for Preliminary Credential Candidates

---

## 6. Study Session

**SS-1** Overview of the Commission's Credentialing Reform Initiative (SB 2042)

---

## 7. Reconvene General Session (Chair Bersin)

---

**GS-10** Report of the Appeals and Waivers Committee

**GS-11** Report of Closed Session Items

**GS-12** Commissioners Reports

**GS-13** Audience Presentations

Old Business

**GS-14**

- Quarterly Agenda for March, April and May 2001

**GS-15** New Business

**GS-16** Adjournment

---

### **All Times Are Approximate and Are Provided for Convenience Only**

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

**The Order of Business May be Changed Without Notice**

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

### **Reasonable Accommodation for Any Individual with a Disability**

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

### **NEXT MEETING**

**April 12, 2001**

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing  
1900 Capitol Avenue**



[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 March 2001 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:**

March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

LEG-1

**Committee:**

Legislative

**Title:**

Status of Legislation of Interest to the Commission

✓ Information

**Prepared by:**

Dan Gonzales, Legislative Liaison  
Office of Governmental Relations

### BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING March 7, 2001

Bill Number -Author -Version Summary	Current CCTC Position - Version - (Date Adopted)	Status
<b>AB 75</b> - Steinberg - As introduced on 1/3/01  Would establish a new administrator support program to be administered by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This program would provide new administrators with one-on-one support and mentoring by experienced administrators.	Watch - Introduced version - (Feb 2001)	Assembly Committee on Education
<b>SB 57</b> -Scott -As introduced on 1/4/01  Would make numerous noncontroversial, technical and clarifying changes to the Education Code. Allows pre-interns the option of taking academic subject matter courses to renew their certificate or advance to the intern program.	Sponsor - Introduced version - (Dec. 2000)	Senate Committee on Education
<b>SB 79</b> - Murray - As introduced on 1/11/01  Would require the Commission to develop a plan that addresses the disproportionate number of teachers serving on emergency permits in low-performing schools in low-income communities. The plan is due by July 1, 2002 and includes a \$32,000 appropriation from the General Fund.	Watch - Introduced version - (Feb 2001)	Senate Committee on Education



[Return to March 2001 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 March 2001 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:**

March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PREP-1

**Committee:**

Preparation Standards

**Title:**

Approval of Subject Matter Preparation Programs Submitted by Colleges and Universities

✓ Action

**Prepared by:**

Helen Hawley, Assistant Consultant  
Professional Services Division

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

Professional Services Division

February 16, 2001

#### Executive Summary

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

#### Fiscal Impact Summary

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

#### Recommendation

That the Commission approve the subject matter preparation programs.

### Subject Matter Preparation Program Review Panel Recommendations

#### Background

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

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

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

### Recommendation

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

LOTE

- Sonoma State University (Spanish)



[Return to March 2001 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 March 2001 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:**

March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PREP-2

**Committee:**

Preparation Standards

**Title:**

Proposal to Award a Contract for Comparability Studies of Subject Matter Requirements and Credential Emphasis or Equivalent Programs in Other States

✓ Action

**Prepared by:**

Rod Santiago, Assistant Consultant, and  
Philip Fitch, Ed.D., Consultant  
Professional Services Division

### Proposal to Award a Contract for Comparability Studies of Subject Matter Requirements and Credential Emphasis or Equivalent Programs in Other States

Professional Services Division

February 16, 2001

#### Executive Summary

At its October 4-5, 2000 meeting, the Commission authorized the Executive Director to release a Request for Proposals (RFP) to secure a contractor to conduct a review of subject matter requirements in other states pursuant to AB 877 (Scott, 2000).

The Commission sponsored AB 877 to study those areas that were lacking in comparability in the initial comparability studies pursuant to AB 1620 (Scott, 1998), and to further streamline and facilitate the entry of qualified out-of-state teachers into the California teaching profession. Building on the initial comparability studies, AB 877 requires the Commission to contract for periodic reviews of the comparability of out-of-state requirements related to subject matter preparation, reading instruction, and credential emphasis or equivalent programs, commencing in 2001. These reviews will be updated every three years, commencing in 2004.

In addition to a review of subject matter requirements, the RFP calls for a review of credential emphasis or equivalent programs in other states pursuant to AB 877. The RFP also includes the development of a database of out-of-state teacher credential requirements in preparation for the next review cycle, commencing in 2004.

This agenda item summarizes the RFP process and recommends that the Commission enter into a contract with Educational Testing Services, Princeton, New Jersey, to conduct the review of subject matter requirements and credential emphasis or equivalent programs in other states, and to develop a database of out-of-state teacher credential requirements.

## Policy Issue to be Considered

Should the Commission issue a contract to Educational Testing Services, Princeton, New Jersey to conduct the review of the comparability of subject matter requirements in other states with those adopted by the Commission for the preparation of multiple subjects and single subject teachers.

## Fiscal Impact Statement

AB 877 appropriated \$350,000 from the General Fund for the purpose of conducting comparability studies of out-of-state teacher credential requirements.

## Recommendation

That the Commission award a contract to Educational Testing Services, Princeton, New Jersey to conduct the review of subject matter requirements and credential emphasis or equivalent programs in other states, and to develop a database of out-of-state teacher credential requirements.

## Issuance of RFP, Submission of Proposals, Review and Scoring of Proposals

Pursuant to Commission action in October 2000, a Request for Proposals to conduct comparability studies of out-of-state teacher credential requirements was released. The RFP was mailed to seventy-three potential bidders. The Commission received seven additional requests. A bidders conference was held at the Commission Office on January 8, 2001 with two potential bidders present at the conference. Six organizations submitted a Notice of Intent to Bid, which included the following: Adaptive Solutions Consulting, Sacramento, California; Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey; Macias Consulting Group, Sacramento, California; MediaCross, Inc., St. Louis, Missouri; Professional Examination Service, New York, New York; and Resources for Learning, Austin, Texas.

Copies of proposals, prepared in response to the RFP, were due in the Commission Office by 10:00 a.m., Friday, February 2. Five (5) proposals were submitted to the Commission by 10:00 a.m., Friday, February 2, 2001. They were:

- (1) Adaptive Solutions Consulting;
- (2) Resources for Learning
- (3) Educational Testing Services;
- (4) Pro Active Implementations, Inc.
- (5) Macias Consulting Group, Inc.

A seven-member review team was selected to review, score, and recommend the awarding of a contract. The review team met at the Commission Office on Friday, February 2 to obtain copies of the proposals, and to discuss the proposal review process. The review team met again on Thursday, February 8 having individually read and scored the proposals. Each member charted their individual scores for the five responses and then the team ranked the five proposals. A discussion ensued regarding the substance of each response in light of the individual elements of the RFP and the possible strengths and weaknesses of each proposal. It was the unanimous decision of the seven members of the review team to recommend Educational Testing Service to the Commission. The total cost submitted by ETS for the completion of all tasks required in the Commission approved RFP was \$299,149.

The scope of work and timeline for this contract are summarized in the next section of this report. Scoring criteria and background information on the enabling legislation appear in the appendices.

## Scope of Work for Contractor

This section describes the scope of work contained in the RFP. The scope of work includes three major tasks:

- IA: [Conduct a Comparability Study of Subject Matter Requirements in Other States](#)
- IB: [Conduct a Comparability Study of Credential Emphasis or Equivalent Programs in Other States](#)
- IC: [Develop a Database of Out-of-State Teacher Credential Requirements](#)

Each of these tasks is described below.

**Task IA:  
Conduct a Comparability Study of Subject Matter  
Requirements in Other States**

The contractor will conduct a review of subject matter requirements in forty-nine states and the District of Columbia. The study will focus on the subject area(s) in each state that were not determined to be comparable based on the Commission's previous review. The contractor will work with Commission staff to develop review criteria for determining the comparability of subject matter requirements in other states, which will be used for future reviews. The results of the review will be used to eliminate redundant California subject matter requirements for teachers who completed equivalent subject matter preparation in other states. The Commission expects that the implementation of the comparability study will involve three primary activities as follows:

- Develop criteria for review of subject matter requirements in other states
- Contact other states for subject matter requirements
- Summarize results in a report to the Commission

Each of these activities is outlined below.

**Activity IA1: Develop Criteria for Review of Subject Matter Requirements in Other States**

The contractor will work with Commission staff to develop criteria for the review of subject matter requirements in other states, which will be used for on-going review. The Commission will provide the contractor with copies of the initial comparability studies and review criteria, as well as California's standards and examination specifications. The review will be limited to those subject areas that were not determined to be comparable under the Commission's previous review. The criteria must include the use of subject matter program standards and examination specifications (if applicable) in other states. The contractor will assess the level of content on a percentage scale in each state's subject matter standards in comparison to California's standards. The analysis should also include content that is not included in California's standards. Determinations of comparability will be based on subject matter program standards or examinations, or both. The review will consist of thirteen subject areas, including multiple subjects (elementary education), and the single subject areas of art, English, French, mathematics, music, physical education, science (biological science), science (chemistry), science (geoscience), science (physics), social science, and Spanish. In consultation with Commission staff, the contractor will identify a minimum of two content experts in each subject area for the purpose of confirming the contractor's findings. The contractor will convene meetings of the content experts as often as needed. The Commission will make the final determinations of comparability based on the contractor's analysis.

**Activity IA2: Contact Other States for Subject Matter Requirements**

The contractor will contact all forty-nine states and the District of Columbia to obtain their subject matter program standards and examination specifications (if applicable) in the areas that require review. The Commission will provide the contractor with a list of contacts in each state, and materials used in the previous review if available. The contractor will also be provided with a chart of the Commission's findings, which indicates the area(s) to be reviewed in each state. The contractor will maintain a record of its contacts with other states. If a state is in the process of revising its subject matter program standards or examination specifications, the contractor will obtain their current materials for review. The contractor will indicate in its records when a state expects to revise its subject matter requirements.

**Activity IA3: Summarize Results in a Report to the Commission**

The contractor will summarize its findings in a written report. The report will include a description of the review criteria and an analysis of each state's standards and examination specifications (if applicable) by subject area. The contractor will cite the source documents used for each state in the report. The summary will include a chart that displays the contractor's findings in each state by percentage agreement. The contractor will include in the narrative the number of states that responded to its request for documents, and how many states are in the process of revising their subject matter standards and examination specifications. The report will meet the content and format requirements of the Project Officer. The contractor will provide an electronic version of the report in Microsoft Word 98 for Macintosh. The contractor will submit the report and the source documents by October 1, 2001. The Commission's staff will complete the report in final form for the Commission's consideration.

**Task IB:**  
**Conduct a Comparability Study of Credential Emphasis  
or Equivalent Programs in Other States**

Commencing in October 2001, the contractor will conduct a review of credential emphasis or equivalent programs in forty-nine states and the District of Columbia. The contractor will work with Commission staff to develop review criteria for determining the comparability of credential emphasis or equivalent programs in other states, which will be used for future reviews. The results of the review will be used to eliminate redundant California credential emphasis program requirements for teachers who completed equivalent preparation in other states. The Commission expects that the implementation of the comparability study will involve three primary activities as follows:

- Develop criteria for review of credential emphasis or equivalent programs in other states
- Contact other states for credential emphasis or equivalent program standards
- Summarize results in a report to the Commission

Each of these activities is outlined below.

**Activity IB1: Develop Criteria for Review of Credential Emphasis or Equivalent Programs in Other States**

The contractor will work with Commission staff to develop criteria for the review of credential emphasis or equivalent programs in other states, which will be used for on-going review. The study will include a review of credential emphasis or equivalent programs that prepare teachers to work with English language learners, and programs in Early Childhood Education and Middle Level Preparation. Priority will be given to the review of programs that prepare teachers to work with English language learners. The Commission will provide the contractor with copies of California's standards in these areas. The contractor will compare each state's standards to California's standards, and will make a qualitative judgement about the comparability of each standard. In consultation with Commission staff, the contractor will identify a minimum of two content experts in each emphasis area for the purpose of confirming the contractor's findings. The contractor will convene meetings of the content experts as often as needed. The Commission will make the final determinations of comparability based on the contractor's analysis.

**Activity IB2: Contact Other States for Credential Emphasis or Equivalent Program Standards**

The contractor will contact all forty-nine states and the District of Columbia to obtain their credential emphasis or equivalent program standards for the preparation of teachers who work with English language learners, and standards for Early Childhood Education and Middle Level Preparation. The Commission will provide the contractor with a list of contacts in each state. The contractor will maintain a record of its contacts with other states. If a state is in the process of revising its program standards, the contractor will obtain their current materials for review. The contractor will indicate in its records when a state expects to revise its program standards.

**Activity IB3: Summarize Results in a Report to the Commission**

The contractor will summarize its findings in a written report. The report will include a description of the review criteria and an analysis of each state's standards in the credential emphasis areas. The contractor will cite the source documents used for each state in the report. The summary will include a chart that displays the contractor's findings in each state. The contractor will include in the narrative the number of states that responded to its request for documents, and how many states are in the process of revising their program standards. The report will meet the content and format requirements of the Project Officer. The contractor will provide an electronic version of the report in Microsoft Word 98 for Macintosh. The contractor will submit the report and the source documents by April 1, 2002. The Commission's staff will complete the report in final form for the Commission's consideration.

**Task IC:**  
**Develop a Database of Out-of-State  
Teacher Credential Requirements**

Commencing in April 2002, the contractor will develop a database of out-of-state teacher credential requirements related to subject matter preparation, reading instruction, and credential emphasis or equivalent programs. The database will be used to track changes in state standards and to prepare for the next cycle of reviews, commencing in 2004. The Commission expects that the development of the database will involve two primary activities as follows:

- Survey other states to determine the status of their requirements
- Develop database of out-of-state teacher credential requirements

Each of these activities is outlined below.

### **Activity IC1: Survey Other States to Determine the Status of their Requirements**

The contractor will survey all forty-nine states and the District of Columbia on the status of their teacher credential requirements related to subject matter preparation, reading instruction, and credential emphasis or equivalent programs. The Commission will provide the contractor with copies of the standards in these three areas. The contractor will request that each state provide the following materials:

- subject matter program standards and examination specifications (if applicable) in multiple subjects (elementary education), the single subject areas of art, English, French, mathematics, music, physical education, science (biological science), science (chemistry), science (geoscience), science (physics), social science, and Spanish;
- program standards related to reading instruction; and
- credential emphasis or equivalent program standards for the preparation of teachers who work with English language learners, and standards for Early Childhood Education and Middle Level Preparation.

The contractor will write these documents to a CD for use on a Macintosh, for the purpose of accessing them electronically. The contractor will submit the CD and the documents received from each state by October 1, 2002. In addition, the contractor will provide a written summary of the survey results in Microsoft Word 98 for Macintosh by the same date.

### **Activity IC2: Develop Database of Out-of-State Teacher Credential Requirements**

The contractor will develop a database based on the results of the survey. The contractor will use File Maker Pro 5 for Macintosh. The database will contain a record for each state that provides contact information, document titles, the status of each state's standards in the above areas, and other relevant information. The contractor will indicate the areas reviewed for each state. The database will contain a field that will alert Commission staff to anticipated changes in state standards. The contractor will submit the database in electronic form by January 2, 2003.

### **Critical Project Dates**

October 1, 2001	Submit report on the results of the subject matter comparability study, and source documents.
April 1, 2002	Submit report on the results of the credential emphasis or equivalent programs comparability study, and source documents.
October 1, 2002	Submit CD, state documents, and summary of survey results.
January 2, 2003	Submit database.

Attached to this agenda are the following two appendices:

Appendix A: [Proposal Evaluation Criteria, Part I and Part II](#)

Appendix B: [Background information](#)

---

## **Appendix A**

### **Request for Proposals for Comparability Studies of Subject Matter Requirements and Credential Emphasis or Equivalent Programs in Other States, and Development of a Database of Out-of-State Teacher Credential Requirements**

#### **Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part I**

Proposal Sponsor: \_\_\_\_\_

## Compliance with Proposal Requirements

Commission staff will indicate whether or not each of the following criteria is met by checking "yes" or "no" in the appropriate space. ***Proposals lacking one or more of the following requirements will be rejected without further evaluation.***

- |              |             |  |
|--------------|-------------|--|
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Proposal was received at or before 10:00 a.m., February 2, 2001 at the office of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.   |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Ten complete copies of the proposal were received.   |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | The cover page of the proposal identifies the bidder and includes a statement, with an appropriate signature, that the proposal is an authorized request for a contract with the Commission. |

As described in Part Five of the RFP, the proposal has the following required elements each organized as required and with the required information.

- |              |             |  |
|--------------|-------------|--|
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | A Cover Page   |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | A Table of Contents  |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | An Introduction  |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 1: Comparability Studies and Development of a Database of Out-of-State Teacher Credential Requirements |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 2: Schedules   |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 3: Bidder Capability   |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 4: Project Costs and Small Business Preference   |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 5: Technical Information   |

### Request for Proposals for Comparability Studies of Subject Matter Requirements and Credential Emphasis or Equivalent Programs in Other States, and Development of a Database of Out-of-State Teacher Credential Requirements

#### Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part II Criteria for the Evaluation of Proposals

- |   | Maximum<br>Score |
|---|------------------|
| <p>(1) Plan for conducting comparability studies and developing a database of out-of-state teacher credentialing requirements. The proposal provides a feasible workplan to complete the scope of work outlined in Part Two of this RFP. Sufficient detail is provided to know what the bidder plans to do. The bidder clearly understands the key issues involved in the tasks to be performed. The proposal presents clear evidence that the bidder will provide high quality products and services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Task IA 60</li> <li>• Task IB 35</li> <li>• Task IC 35</li> </ul> | 130              |

(2) Project Schedule. The proposal includes a well-organized, properly sequenced, and feasible project schedule for completion of all three tasks and meets the critical project dates specified in Part Three of this RFP.	20
(3) Bidder Capability. The proposal demonstrates that the bidder has (a) experience and expertise in similar studies, and (b) sufficient resources to conduct the contracted tasks and provide the contracted products and services with high quality within the proposed timeline. The bidder possesses expertise in all areas essential to the project. If subcontractors are proposed, they also have the experience, resources, and expertise to provide the products and services for which they would be responsible. 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.	80
• Bidder experience	20
• Bidder resources	20
• Sound, feasible organizational plan	20
• Qualifications and experience of key staff	20
(4) Project Costs. The costs proposed by the bidder are reasonable in relation to the products and services to be provided, and competitive in relation to the costs proposed by other bidders.	110
(5) Presentation. The proposal is clearly written, to the point, and well-organized. Ideas are presented logically and all requested information is presented skillfully without redundancy.	20
<b>Maximum Possible Score</b>	<b>360</b>

---

## Appendix B

### Background Information

#### Previous Certification System for Out-of-State Teachers

For more than two decades the Commission has considered the issue of credential equivalence for teachers prepared in other states. For instance, the Commission has signed with 39 other states as a member of the NASDTEC (National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education) Interstate Contract. For many states, this contract primarily represents an agreement to work together and does not provide for specific reciprocal agreements in teacher credentialing and licensure.

Previously, elementary and secondary teachers from out of state received a two-year preliminary teaching credential if they held a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution, completed professional preparation, and passed the CBEST. (A one-year nonrenewable credential was available pending passage of the CBEST.) To renew their credential, they were required to verify reading methods, subject matter competence, and knowledge of the U.S. Constitution. In addition to these requirements, special education teachers were required to satisfy California requirements in regular education pedagogy and a supervised field experience program in regular education to renew their credential. Under the Interstate Contract, the Commission accepted the professional preparation program and waived the U.S. Constitution requirement.

With the passage of Assembly Bill 877, teachers prepared and credentialed in other states were eligible to receive a five-year preliminary teaching credential. They were authorized to teach in the classroom for five years, provided that they met any lacking California credential requirements

during that period according to a specified schedule.

## **Commission Activities to Streamline Certification of Out-of-State Teachers**

Sponsored by the Commission in 1998, AB 1620 (Chapter 547, Statutes of 1998) was designed to facilitate access for both experienced and recently prepared out-of-state teachers. With respect to experienced teachers, AB 1620 authorized the Commission to issue Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credentials to out-of-state trained teachers with a minimum of three or five years of experience who met specified criteria. Teachers with a minimum of three years of experience who provided evidence of rigorous performance evaluations with a rating of satisfactory or better, and passed the CBEST, received a three-year preliminary teaching credential. These teachers were required to complete an induction program, such as Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment, to obtain the professional clear teaching credential. Those with a minimum of five years of full-time teaching experience received a five-year preliminary teaching credential, and were required to complete 150 clock hours of professional development to obtain the professional clear teaching credential. Special education teachers with a minimum of five years of teaching experience were eligible for a Preliminary (Level I) Education Specialist Instruction Credential, based on evidence of rigorous performance evaluations with a rating of satisfactory or better, and passage of the CBEST. These teachers were required to complete the requirements for the Professional Clear (Level II) Education Specialist Instruction Credential.

In addition to the provisions pertaining to experienced out-of-state teachers, AB 1620 authorized the Commission to issue a comparable credential to an individual who completed a program in a state that has comparable standards to those of California. This provision was intended to address recently prepared out-of-state teachers. AB 1620 required the Commission to conduct periodic reviews to determine whether other states have established teacher preparation standards that are comparable and equivalent to teacher preparation standards in California. Once comparability was determined, the Commission was authorized to enter into reciprocal agreements with those states. The law also required the Commission to issue a comparable teaching credential to an applicant who completed a program in a state that has comparable standards, regardless of whether a reciprocity agreement had been established with California.

The initial comparability study consisted of a review of accreditation procedures, standards for the preparation of elementary, secondary, and special education teachers, and subject matter requirements in other states. The Commission began its review in November 1998 by requesting information from the other forty-nine states and the District of Columbia. The Reciprocity Task Force was formed to conduct the review of accreditation procedures and teacher preparation standards in other states. The review of subject matter requirements in other states was conducted by a contractor.

The subject matter comparability studies were conducted in three phases: Phase I included the English, mathematics, multiple subjects (elementary education), and social science credential areas; Phase II covered the subjects required for the four science credential areas: biological science, chemistry, geoscience, and physics; and Phase III comprised the art, French, music, physical education, and Spanish credential subject areas. The comparability studies were limited to those credential areas that were most commonly sought by out-of-state teachers.

As of May 2000, the Commission deemed thirty-seven states overall to be comparable in elementary, secondary or special education teacher preparation. The determinations of comparability between California and other states were based on accreditation procedures, elementary, secondary, and special education standards, and subject matter requirements. Individuals recently prepared in these states are currently eligible to receive a five-year preliminary teaching credential with passage of the CBEST.

Some states were not determined to be comparable based on the reviews, because they lacked comparability in one or more of the required areas, such as reading instruction (as a component of the teacher preparation program) or subject matter preparation. Individuals from these states were eligible to receive a two-year preliminary teaching credential under the traditional certification route, or a five-year preliminary teaching credential under AB 838. However, the latter required that any remaining certification requirements be completed on a specified schedule.

AB 877 (Chapter 703, Statutes of 2000) streamlines the credentialing system by requiring that all out-of-state prepared teachers receive a five-year preliminary teaching credential. Sponsored by the Commission as urgency legislation, AB 877 authorizes the Commission to study those areas that were lacking in comparability in the preliminary review, and to further streamline and facilitate the entry of qualified out-of-state teachers into the California teaching profession. Building on the AB 1620 comparability studies, AB 877 requires the Commission to contract for periodic reviews of the



comparability of out-of-state requirements related to subject matter preparation and reading instruction. In addition, AB 877 authorizes the Commission to determine the comparability of credential emphasis or equivalent programs in other states, including, but not limited to, those programs that prepare teachers to work with English language learners. The legislation requires that the reviews begin in 2001 and be updated every three years.

### **New Certification System for Out-of-State Teachers**

Under AB 877, out-of-state teachers will have two routes into the California teaching profession: one for individuals with three or more years of teaching experience; and one for those with less than three years of experience. Teachers with three or more years of experience can obtain a five-year Preliminary Multiple or Single Subject Teaching Credential, based on evidence of rigorous performance evaluations with a rating of satisfactory or better. Teachers with three or four years of experience will be required to complete an approved induction program to obtain the professional clear teaching credential. Teachers with five or more years of experience must complete 150 clock hours of professional development to obtain the professional clear teaching credential. Special education teachers with a minimum of three years of teaching experience are eligible for a five-year Preliminary (Level I) Education Specialist Instruction Credential, based on evidence of rigorous performance evaluations with a rating of satisfactory or better. These teachers are required to complete the requirements for the Professional Clear (Level II) Education Specialist Instruction Credential. All are required to pass the CBEST before or during the first year of the validity of the document to continue employment based on the credential.

Out-of-state prepared teachers who have less than three years of experience will receive a five-year preliminary teaching credential based on the following criteria: (1) the individual possesses a bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education; (2) completed a teacher preparation program at a regionally accredited institution of higher education; and (3) earned or qualified for a corresponding teaching credential based upon the teacher preparation program. These teachers must pass the CBEST before or during the first year of the validity of the document to continue employment based on the credential.

A teacher will have five years during the period of the credential to complete any remaining requirements leading to the professional clear credential, including subject matter verification, reading instruction, knowledge of the U.S. Constitution, computers, mainstreaming, and health education, and a fifth year program. Teachers have the option of completing an induction program in lieu of a fifth year program. In addition to these requirements (with the exception of mainstreaming and the fifth year program) special education teachers must satisfy the requirements in regular education pedagogy and supervised field experience in regular education, and the requirements for the Professional Clear (Level II) Education Specialist Instruction Credential.

AB 877 allows the Commission to eliminate redundant credential requirements if an individual has completed equivalent work out-of-state. Under the previous and new systems, all out-of-state teachers must submit fingerprint cards and meet the California requirements for teacher fitness.



[Return to March 2001 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 March 2001 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:**

March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PREP-3

**Committee:**

Preparation Standards

**Title:**

Update on the Administrative Services Credential Forums and the Work of the Administrative Services Credential Task Force

✓ Information

**Prepared by:**

Jan Jones Wadsworth, Ed.D., Consultant  
Professional Services Division

### Update on the Administrative Services Credential Forums and the Work of the Administrative Services Credential Task Force

#### Professional Services Division

February 16, 2001

#### Executive Summary

Ten years ago, the Commission initiated a multi-year study of administrator preparation that resulted in the adoption of *Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credential Programs*. These standards now govern all administrator preparation programs in California. In light of recent reforms, such as the increasing emphasis on strengthening accountability for student achievement, and the many other changes taking place in the public schools of California, the Commission decided in June, 2000 to review the current structure for the Administrative Services Credential and the standards for administrator preparation to ensure that they are up-to-date. The review will also study the alignment of the standards with the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. Following the review, a report with recommendations will be made to the Commission. As a preliminary step, the Commission approved the convening of a series of public forums to assist in defining issues to be considered and identification of problems to be studied. The Commission also approved the selection of a Task Force to assist in the review. This agenda report provides an update on the forums and a preliminary report on the work of the Administrative Services Credential Task Force.

#### Fiscal Impact Summary

The Commission's base budget includes resources to support the activities described in this agenda report. No augmentation of the budget is needed to carry out the activities of this review.

#### Policy Issues to be Resolved

Should the Commission modify the current structure of the Administrative Services Credential? Should the Commission make changes in the Administrative Services Credential Program Standards? Should the Commission align its standards for the Administrative Services Credential with national standards?

### Recommendation

That the Commission review the information presented in this agenda report. No action is recommended.

### Overview

The expertise of school administrators is essential for the reforms that have been initiated in California because school administrators have a direct influence on the quality of the teaching experience. In every improvement program, school administrators play a key role. The school administrator's interactions are crucial to the success of teachers and students. In the current era that emphasizes accountability, it is important to examine how school administrators are prepared and supported. It has been pointed out that the role of the school administrator has become more important during the last few years because administrator expertise is required to promote the continuous learning required by reforms.

Recognizing the fact that there are a number of new Commissioners who were not present when the Commission approved the review of the Administrative Services Credential, a slightly more detailed description is provided about the plan for the review along with an overview of the current credential structure and standards. The background information provides a description of the review of the structure of the Administrative Services Credential and the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credential Programs* approved by the Commission last June. A summary of the current credential structure and standards for the preparation of school administrators is then provided. This is followed by an update on the forums and a report on the initial three meetings of the Task Force.

### Background Information

In June of last year, the Commission approved a review of the structure of the Administrative Services Credential and the *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for the Administrative Services Credential Programs*. The student standards movement has been changing the context in which school administrators serve. Although the current preparation standards were adopted in 1995 and programs meeting these standards have only been developed and implemented in the past two to three years, it is time to examine them to make certain they are still up-to-date and appropriate. Major reform in the K-12 curriculum and implementation of the new statewide assessment system call for a focused review of the Commission's administrator preparation system. There are aspects of the current structure that may need to be adjusted in order to make the system work more effectively, in the context of other reform efforts.

The foundation provided by Commission-adopted preparation standards for the Administrative Services Credential has been a critical first step in building a system to improve administrator quality. The next task is to determine how well the standards are being implemented, and what kind of professional support California can and should provide in order to upgrade the skills of its administrators. If the current standards can be adjusted to foster continuous positive growth for administrators, the state will be more likely to address the growing shortage of administrators. Recruiting and retaining administrators are concerns in schools that serve the lowest achieving students. Administrators who are not supported in the way the standards are envisioned may be even less likely to take positions in places where they are needed the most. It is necessary at this time of standards-based educational reform that school administrators be provided with adequate preparation, time for reflection, and opportunities to discuss school improvement with colleagues.

In conducting the review, staff is utilizing the assistance of a Task Force broadly representative of the education community. A series of forums have been conducted throughout the state to gather information to guide the review. The Task Force is conducting monthly meetings to review the information gathered at the forums, analyze data collected, study the alignment of the Commission's standards with the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, develop recommendations about the credential structure, and recommend revisions, as necessary, of the Commission's preparation standards. A survey of candidates completing programs over the past three years and of a sample of employers will provide information about the adequacy of the content of current preparation programs and give a picture of performance expectations for

school principals and other administrators. All of these activities will contribute to the development of recommendations to the Commission.

The Task Force is also reviewing the alignment of the Commission's *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credential Programs* with ISLLC Standards and the California Standards for School Administrators, developed by a collaborative effort sponsored by the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) and the California School Leadership Academy (CSLA). If the standards are not in alignment, the Task Force will likely recommend that the Commission modify its standards to achieve alignment with the ISLLC Standards. This is an important activity that would enhance the usefulness of the California standards, especially in this time of interest in the portability of credentials across state lines.

### **Current Administrative Services Credential Structure**

Ten years ago, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing initiated a comprehensive, multi-year study of administrator preparation both within California and throughout the United States. The study was conducted by Commission staff under the guidance of an expert advisory panel of school district administrators, site principals, professors, representatives from professional organizations and state level agencies, including the California Department of Education.

The report of the study, titled *An Examination of the Preparation, Induction, and Professional Growth of School Administrators in California* included policy recommendations from the advisory panel. The recommendations included a proposal to retain the two-level structure for the Administrative Services Credential that had been established in the early 1980's, but to modify the structure to eliminate identified weaknesses and respond more effectively to the professional development needs of aspiring and practicing administrators. The Commission adopted the policy recommendations and sponsored legislation (SB 322, Morgan) to modify sections 44270 and 44270.1 of the Education Code. The bill was passed by the Legislature, signed by the Governor and became effective January 1, 1994. The legislation put into place the legal framework for the structural changes of this revised design for administrator preparation.

The Commission continued the approach it had initiated in the late 1980s to move toward standards for credential programs. Special effort was made to redesign the policies of administrator preparation programs away from narrowly defined guidelines and competencies to broad standards of program quality. The Commission asked the advisory panel to assist in the development of new program standards consistent with the legislation and the policy recommendations. The *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credential Programs* were adopted by the Commission in March of 1995.

Both public and private post-secondary institutions were required to revise and up-date their administrative credential programs to meet the new standards. Program proposals responding to the standards were reviewed by a panel of experts in school administration prior to being recommended for initial accreditation. All preparation institutions were required to complete the re-certification process by September 1, 1998. Once re-certified, the programs are reviewed on a regular basis through the Commission's on-site continuing accreditation process.

The most significant features of the revised standards were the changes made in the structure of Professional level program, the timeline for its completion and the provision for the inclusion of non-university activities in the Professional level program. The curriculum requirements for both levels were modified as a result of the study. Throughout both levels of the program there is an expectation of a high level of collaboration between preparing institutions and employing school districts.

### **Overview of the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and Preliminary Administrative Services Internship Credential (Tier I)**

The major thrust of the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (Tier I) Program is to prepare individuals to perform the responsibilities of entry-level administrative positions. The preparation standards include significant recognition of the diversity of California students and communities. Programs are required to provide an increased emphasis on the relationship between school, parents, and community. For admittance into the Tier I program, universities must consider the candidates' sensitivity to and related experiences with the needs of students, teachers, and other school personnel. Furthermore, universities must consider the candidates' sensitivity to diverse student populations found in California schools, particularly individuals with disabilities and those from diverse ethnic, cultural, and socio-economic backgrounds.

The preliminary level program requires that candidates be placed in appropriate field settings, under

the supervision of effective supervising administrators. This calls for a high level of collaboration between school districts and universities in the placement of candidates in field settings that provide positive models conducive to the development of the prospective administrator.

The Commission's standards also provide an internship option. Under this option, the candidate can be employed by the school district in an administrative position, but is also involved in a university preparation program providing the curriculum and field experience as part of an "on-the-job training" model. The internship program requires ongoing collaboration between the institution and the employing school district in all areas of program design, implementation and evaluation. The internship option does not currently allow districts to deliver the curriculum of the program.

At the conclusion of a university preparation program, the candidate is eligible to receive a Certificate of Eligibility for the Administrative Services Credential and is able to seek initial employment as an administrator. The Certificate signifies that the candidate has completed a preparation program and that the candidate is eligible for the Preliminary Level credential upon employment. Once employment as an administrator is achieved, a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential is issued and the "time-clock" for completion of the second level of administrative preparation begins.

## **Overview of the Professional Administrative Services Credential (Tier II)**

Upon being initially employed by a school district, the new administrator has five years to complete the professional credential (Tier II) program. During the first year of employment, a district representative, a university representative, and the new administrator cooperatively develop an individualized induction plan. The plan includes an initial assessment of the new administrator, the development of a targeted professional development program, a mentoring component, required university coursework, an individualized elective component, and a plan for final assessment. The elective component can include approved non-university activities or additional coursework. The induction plan and the mentoring component are intended to provide support and assistance for the newly employed administrator.

The Professional Administrative Services Credential requires at least two years of experience as an administrator and concludes with an assessment in which the administrator, the district representative and the university representative again verify that all of the standards and requirements have been met. Induction plans may vary from individual to individual because of different career planning interests. The intent of this flexibility is to allow for special interests of the administrative candidate and the needs of the employing school district. Once the Professional Administrative Services Credential is earned, the holder is required to complete 150 hours of professional development every five years.

## **Update on the Administrator Preparation Forums**

Concerns about the effectiveness of the current structure of the Administrative Services Credential led the Commission staff to schedule a series of public forums. Five forums were scheduled during the months of December, January and February (00-01). The forum sessions were organized in a manner to provide ample opportunities for interaction among participants. After an introductory activity to set the context for the discussion, participants had the opportunity to join with up to two different discussion groups, organized around the following topics for the morning:

- Structure of the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credentials
- Content of professional preparation programs for Administrative Services Credentials
- Induction/support for new administrators
- Alternative program options
- Recruitment /retention of site and district office administrative positions

The small groups were asked to discuss what is working well, what is not working well and make suggestions for improvement. Each group then prepared a written summary of the discussion and reported to the entire group prior to lunch. The notes of the group discussions are being summarized for use of the Task Force. That information will also be made available to the Commission. In the afternoon session, for those participants able to stay, the total group decided how they preferred to conduct the discussions. At all of the forums, the afternoon groups were smaller and the participants elected to have large group discussions across the same five topics, rather than continued small group discussions. Participants were also invited to submit additional written comments to the Task Force, if they felt so inclined.

Forums were scheduled as follows:

Date	Location	Approximate Attendance
December 13	Sacramento	25
January 17	Fresno	35
January 23	San Diego	40
February 2	Fullerton	70
February 27	Union City	(Scheduled after agenda deadline)

Overall the discussions were conducted on a very professional level. Participants were thoughtful with their comments and many times the discussions became very animated. There was a balance of viewpoints presented by representatives of post-secondary institutions and K-12 districts. Although there was not total agreement on the topics considered, there was a consistency of viewpoints expressed from one location to another. There are some consistent issues that came up and have been forwarded to the Task Force. Participants in the forums came with the expectation that their voices would be heard and their comments valued. Following are some of the issues expressed at the forums (partial list):

- The Professional Credential needs to be drastically redesigned or eliminated.
- There is a need for better collaboration between institutions of post-secondary education and employing school districts.
- There is perceived redundancy in content between the Preliminary and Professional levels.
- The level and intensity of field experience at the Preliminary level does not present an adequate picture of the responsibilities of an administrator, since it is offered in a part-time format, because candidates are not able to obtain release time to participate more extensively.
- There needs to be a better blend between theory and practice.
- The content of the Preliminary level needs to be updated.
- The content of professional development after employment of an administrator needs to be monitored by the employing school district.
- A structure needs to be developed to give all new administrators the benefit of support, mentoring and assistance during the early years of employment as an administrator.
- The new administrator is heavily involved with the demands of the position that makes the thought of "additional requirements" very unattractive.
- Alternative delivery systems should be developed to facilitate the recruitment and training of administrators in "hard to staff" schools or to help districts "grow their own" administrators.
- The complexity of the job of the administrator, the demands of the responsibilities and the level of compensation are a disincentive for individuals to seek administrative positions.
- The current structure of the Administrative Services Credential may also be a further barrier preventing persons from applying for an administrative position.

In addition to the five forums, Commission staff members were invited to the annual ACSA Special Education/Pupil Personnel Services Conference and the ACSA Superintendent's Symposium to conduct mini-forums with interested participants.

### Administrative Services Credential Task Force

The first meeting of the Task Force was December 12, 2000 in Sacramento. A two day meeting was held in San Diego on January 24 and 25 and a two day meeting was held in Fullerton on February 7 and 8. Subsequent monthly meetings are scheduled through September. The first meetings of the Task Force have been largely devoted to gaining the necessary background to approach the job. Members are required to process a considerable amount of information in order to prepare themselves to understand the work before them. The Task Force members recognize that they will need to evaluate competing ideas before they will be able to formulate recommendations for the Commission. Most of the members have attended at least one of the Forums. Following is a list of the Task Force members.

### Task Force Roster

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Affiliation</i>
Kathleen McCreery	Assistant Executive Director	Association of California School Administrators
Dave Brown,	Superintendent	ACSA Superintendents Committee

	Napa Valley USD	
Jackie Flowers	San Joaquin County Office of Education	ACSA Secondary Schools Committee
Tom Zach	Principal Jefferson ESD	ACSA Middle Schools Committee
Sharon Millen	Principal Keppel School District	ACSA Elementary Schools Committee
Cameron M. McCune	Assistant Superintendent, Human Resources Walnut Valley USD	ACSA Human Resources Committee
Maureen Burness	Placer/Nevada County Office of Education	ACSA Pupil Personnel/Special Education Committee
Franklin Campbell Jones	California State University, Los Angeles	California State University
Jose Lopez	California State University, Hayward	California State University
Linda Orozco	California State University, Fullerton	California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA)
Philip J. Rusche	Dean, College of Education California State University, Northridge	California State University Deans
Bruce Newlin	Graduate School of Education University of California, Los Angeles	University of California
Paula Cordeiro	Dean, School of Education University of San Diego	Private & Independent Colleges and Universities
Mary McCullough	Loyola Marymount University	Private & Independent Colleges and Universities
Karen Kearney	Executive Director, California School Leadership Academy	California School Leadership Academy
R. Michael Dutton	Principal Antelope Valley USD	California School Boards Association
Kathy Falco	Teacher Stockton USD	California Teachers Association
Frank Gold	Retired Tamalpais Union HSD	California Federation Teachers
Kathy Moffat	Parent Member	California State PTA
Barbara MacNeil	Program Manager San Diego Unified School District	Special Education/Pupil Personnel Services
Harold J. Vollkommer	Assistant Superintendent Human Resources San Bernardino City USD	School District Human Resources and Personnel Administrators of San Bernardino and San Diego Counties
Glen Thomas	Executive Director	California County Superintendents Educational Services Association (CCSESA)
Kathryn I. Benson	Personnel Program Manager San Luis Obispo County Office of Education	Personnel and Administrative Services Steering Committee (PASSCo)

## Ex-Officio Members

Don Kairott	Technology Services Division California Department of Education	CDE Liaison
Ellen Curtis-Pierce	Office of the Chancellor	California State University
Bob Wells	Executive Director	Association of California School Administrators
John Borba	California State University, Stanislaus	Survey Facilitators
Chet Jensen	California State University, Stanislaus	Survey Facilitators

The major topics being studied by the Task Force are the efficacy of the current standards for the Administrative Services Credential, the efficacy of the current credential structure and the alignment of the existing standards with national standards. At its February meeting, the Task Force identified areas of emerging consensus in its thinking. Although the Task Force was able to agree on several issues, they have been careful to point out that more discussion is necessary to reach consensus on how these areas of agreement are translated into implementation policies and delivery systems. Following are areas that the Task Force has identified in which they feel a sense of agreement, including a summary of major discussion points.

- The Task Force has recognized the larger problem of the shortage of qualified applicants for many administrative positions. They do not see the credential structure and standards as the primary cause of that shortage, but do recognize that they may be a contributing factor. The Task Force is of the opinion that a major reason for the shortage is the difficulty of the job and its demands in relation to the salary levels available for administrators. The Task Force is concerned about this situation, but realizes that the solution lies largely outside of its charge and also outside of the authority of the Commission. This problem will continue to be a part of the discussion as the Task Force considers its recommendations.
- The general opinion of the Task Force, based upon their collective experiences and the discussions at the Forums, is that the Preliminary Credential level is not the major problem area, although there are some areas in which changes should be made. The content at this preparation level needs to be adjusted or expanded slightly, and there are some specific content areas that need to be added, including focused attention on the K-12 academic content standards for students and strengthening accountability for student achievement. There seems to be some interest in implementing a type of performance or outcomes assessment at the end of the Preliminary level program. There is a feeling that there needs to be more emphasis on the "applied" or "theory into practice" parts of the Preliminary level curriculum. Further discussions need to be held to determine if the structure of the delivery system for the Preliminary level should be modified and what alternative delivery systems, if any, might be developed.
- Another area of agreement is the need for a more intensive types of field experiences within and following Preliminary preparation. It is recognized that most Administrative Services Credential candidates are full time employees and are not able to participate in substantive fieldwork activities because of the responsibilities of their full-time jobs. The field experiences are part-time, done usually outside of normal work responsibilities. Candidates do not receive release time from their responsibilities in order to participate in fieldwork. The Task Force recognizes that implementing a change in this area might require a change in the structure and delivery system of the Preliminary level. As an alternative, some discussion was held about the possibility of instituting some type of administrative "residence" after a candidate has finished the requirements for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. This "residency" could be incorporated as part of the initial employment of an administrator and would include supervision, mentoring and support.
- The Task Force members (supported by discussion at the Forums) agree that major adjustments need to be made at the Professional Credential level. The important components are following, but the details about how they should be implemented are still the subject of extensive discussion. Each new administrator needs to be provided with the opportunity to develop a professional development plan during the first year of employment. This plan is a collaborative effort between the candidate, the employing school district, and the program sponsor. Each new administrator needs to have access to a mentor administrator or contact



with a job-alike credential holder for support and assistance during the first one or two years of service as an administrator. The Task Force does not want to see the requirements at this level all completed at the beginning of a program in the first one or two years of administrative service. They should be spread out over the five years of the Preliminary Credential. The professional development experiences at this level need to be very closely related to the administrative position held by the credential holder. There was some discussion about the need to develop a "portfolio" type of assessment for this credential. There continues to be discussion about who would be the most appropriate sponsor of programs for the induction and professional development new administrators.

- It is initially recognized by the Task Force that the Commission's existing standards (at least for the Preliminary level) are aligned fairly closely with the ISLLC standards. Further, it was noted that the California Standards for Administrators (developed through a collaborative effort sponsored by ACSA and CSLA) are even more closely aligned with the ISLLC standards. The Task Force will continue its analysis of alignment between the sets of standards.

The Task Force recognizes that Governor Gray Davis will be proposing legislation related to the preparation and professional development of school administrators. When those proposals are introduced, they will be thoroughly discussed by the Task Force. A very important part of the responsibilities of the Task Force will be to understand the Governor's initiative. They will want to insure that the structure and standards for the preparation and professional development of administrators and the provisions of the Governor's initiative work together to make certain that all administrators are knowledgeable of the K-12 student content standards, understand how to implement those standards, and are able to assess instruction to those standards for all children.

Future meetings of the Task Force will focus on refining the items presented above, considering other relevant ideas, and developing recommendations for revised policies, as appropriate. Recommendations will be presented in the context of modifying the structure and the standards in a way to provide access to the elements of the "learning to lead" continuum for all candidates seeking to become administrators in California schools.



[Return to March 2001 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 March 2001 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:**

March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PREP-4

**Committee:**

Preparation Standards

**Title:**

Progress Report on the Implementation of CFASST: Evaluation Report of the Field Review 1998-2000

✓ Report

**Prepared by:**

Teri Clark, Consultant  
Professional Services Division

### Progress Report on the Implementation of CFASST: Evaluation Report of the Field Review 1998-2000

#### Professional Services Division

February 19, 2001

#### Executive Summary

This report summarizes work completed during 1999-2000 on the design, development, implementation and evaluation of the California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST). CFASST is a formative assessment and support system for credentialed, first and second year teachers. CFASST was designed by the Interagency BTSA task force and Educational Testing Service and is currently implemented by the majority of Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment programs in California. CFASST formatively measures beginning teacher development at the element level of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. In CFASST year two, performance task events direct teachers to teach and assess the K-12 student academic content standards.

#### Fiscal Impact Summary

Design and development work for CFASST is funded through a no-cost contract with Educational Testing Service. Costs for materials and training are funded through local BTSA programs. The agency's base budget funds the participation of division staff in CFASST related activities, including design, revision and development, training, and evaluation activities.

#### Policy Issues To Be Considered

Does the California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST) contribute to the effectiveness of new teachers? Is it an important element of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program?

## Background Information

The California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers (CFASST) rests on the same assumptions about teaching that underlie the overall design of the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA), and were articulated by the Commission in the introduction to the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) publication. These assumptions include a holistic vision of teaching, a developmental view of teaching, and recognition of the diversity of teaching in California. The CSTP define six critical teaching standards:

- engaging all students in learning;
- creating an environment for learning;
- understanding and organizing subject matter;
- designing learning experiences for all students;
- assessing student learning; and
- developing as a professional educator.

CFASST is an assessment system designed to provide beginning teachers with accurate information about their teaching for each of the thirty-five elements of the six CSTP. CFASST directs beginning teachers and support providers to document teaching evidence through structured activities. The system provides a comprehensive and responsive process that supports the developmental needs of new teachers. CFASST provides an accurate and consistent basis for determining the course of each new teacher's extended preparation.

In 1997, Assembly Bill 1266 (Education Code Section 44279.1), authored by then Assembly Member Kerri Mazzoni, established the BTSA System. The law requires that BTSA include a coherent system of formative performance assessments that are based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. The current *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs* detail the requirements of the formative assessment and support system in Standard 8. (*These standards are currently under revision pursuant to SB 2042 and are included in draft form under PREP 5 of the Commission's March 2001 Agenda. Draft Standard 13 is the proposed replacement for existing Standard 8 on formative assessment.*)

In 2000-2001, BTSA serves 26,500 teachers in 145 local programs with an operating budget of \$88.9 million. In 2001-2002, the program is expected to serve 30,500 new teachers with an expanded operating budget of \$104 million. The continued growth of BTSA reinforces the need for a statewide, systemic approach to reliable formative assessment. Evaluation data provides evidence that CFASST assists programs to ensure consistent, high quality teacher development. CFASST requires substantive training for support providers in formative assessment and differentiated support strategies. Currently, funded BTSA programs are the primary vehicle for the delivery of assessment and support services to credentialed beginning teachers. When SB 2042 is fully implemented, induction will become the vehicle through which new teachers earn a professional credential. CFASST, a statewide, systemic, formative assessment system will support districts as they prepare to become part of the credentialing process in California.

A majority of BTSA programs (134 of the 145), currently implement CFASST. As a system, CFASST includes two years of assessment and support activities which require beginning teachers to work with trained support providers. Support Providers receive eleven days of training over the two years. Support Provider training focuses on how to support beginning teachers using an evidence based decision making process, how to do both inquiry with and observation of new teachers, and how to assess beginning teacher performance using the Description of Practice scales. Support Providers learn deeply about the CSTP and in year two training explore how to combine the CFASST process with the K-12 student academic content standards.

## Overview of the California Formative Assessment and Support System for Teachers

The purpose of CFASST is to support beginning teachers in their professional development and to help them learn to focus their work as teachers through a dynamic, ongoing process that includes planning and teaching lessons, reflecting on the results, and making informed changes in their teaching. CFASST assessment components include seventeen "events" over two years that fall within the following categories:

- **Class, School, District and Community Profile:** the beginning teacher and support provider define the beginning teacher's teaching context, students' strengths and needs and implications for instruction. This document is periodically updated to reflect changes in the student roster or teaching context.
- **Inquiry:** A four to six week exploration of a critical teaching topic. An inquiry includes a

structured series of activities in which beginning teachers and support providers investigate a particular aspect of practice in depth using a problem solving process of plan, teach, reflect and apply. Each inquiry closes with a collaborative assessment of the beginning teacher's practice using the Description of Practice scales (DOPs).

- **Profile of Practice:** A trained support provider conducts formal observations of a beginning teacher's instruction. The process includes designing instruction, conducting the lesson, collecting student work, and reflecting on practice. This method also follows the plan, teach, reflect, and apply process and concludes with an assessment using the DOPs.
- **Individual Induction Plan:** An organizer that a beginning teacher and support provider create to focus and guide professional development and further education. The IIP is linked directly to evidence based findings from CFASST events and assessments of practice. The IIP acts as the super-organizer for the teacher's development goals during each year of the process.

For each of the elements within the CSTP, four levels of teaching practice are described. This scale, called the **Descriptions of Practice (DOP)**, is used by the BTSA participating teacher and the support provider to examine the new teacher's practice based on evidence. Designations in the scale include:

- Practice Not Consistent with Standard Expectations
- Developing Beginning Practice
- Maturing Beginning Practice, and
- Experienced Practice that Exemplifies the Standard.

The remainder of this report summarizes the findings of a two year evaluation of CFASST and includes a description of revisions to CFASST that will be completed this year.

## Section One: CFASST Evaluation Plan and Findings

The evaluation of the field review for CFASST Year One and Year Two was conducted in conjunction with Educational Testing Service. The overall purpose of the evaluation was to examine the feasibility and effectiveness of the program by analyzing key attributes of the CFASST system: local program implementation, training for support providers, and perceived effectiveness of the system, as professional development, to improve practice. These elements were selected based on suggestions from an advisory committee, the BTSA Interagency Task Force, and professional evaluators. The evaluation findings, organized by attribute, are summarized below:

### CFASST Year 1 Implementation

- Implementation was most effective when organizational structures were created to support use.
- Continuing issues for sites included expectations for assessment event completion and availability of time and resources.
- Some BTSA programs were able to link CFASST with other efforts.
- Strong leadership was essential.

### CFASST Year 1 Training

- Quality of training was strong and consistent.
- Support providers were positive about clarity and usefulness of training modules.
- Support providers were confident that training provided sufficient skills for their work.
- Support providers reported concerns related to time to work with beginning teachers.
- Support providers suggested distributing training throughout the school year.

### CFASST Year 1 Materials

- Paperwork was considered to be clear, instructive and useful in helping beginning teachers.
- Amount of paperwork is a concern for many beginning teachers and support providers.
- Beginning teachers reported the usefulness of information gathering and support providers' observations.
- Beginning teachers reported the helpfulness of following two students through lessons.
- Recommendations included combining questions into fewer forms, combining events, and adding emphasis on subject area content in Year 1.

### CFASST Year 2 Materials and Implementation

- Teachers were extremely positive about academic content standard focus.

- Events and activities were seen as useful.
- Paperwork was less of an issue than with Year 1.
- All beginning teachers completed all events.
- Role of program director was critical.

## CFASST as Professional Development

- Beginning teachers engaged in inquiry about their practice.
- Beginning teachers collaborated with colleagues.
- Beginning teachers collected information, planned lessons and reflected on their practice.
- Beginning teachers valued feedback from their support providers.
- Beginning teachers and support providers reported improvement in beginning teacher practice.
- Beginning teachers viewed participation as valuable professional development and reported engaging in more reflective practice.

## Methodology

The Educational Testing Services (ETS) evaluation of CFASST was designed in collaboration with the Commission and California Department of Education. At the outset, the evaluators made the decision that the first-year evaluation effort should focus on the formative assessment of CFASST-- providing feedback about the assessment system. Data collected in the first year of the evaluation process has been utilized to inform improvements, adaptations and clarifications throughout the field review. A preliminary report was made to the Commission in January, 2000 summarizing the evaluation efforts through December, 1999. The evaluation activities and findings that were presented at that time are summarized in [Table 1](#).

**Table 1: Evaluation and Action Summary 1998-1999**

Component	Method	Outcomes
Training for Support Providers	Survey of participants in state and local trainings	Modification and/or revision of training design and content for 1999/00 trainings. Revised training design and content implemented July 1, 1999. (N=787)
Local Program Implementation	Survey of local BTSA program directors in November, '98, January, March and June '99.	Revision of director' resource guide; recommendations on future implementation options and strategies. Completed as planned. Cluster leadership teams assist programs on more effective implementation strategies from June, 1999. (N=58)
Local Program Implementation and Quality of feedback to beginning teacher	Focus groups of beginning teachers and paired support providers from 10 local programs in January, March and June, 1999.	Modifications of training design and content; inform revisions of CFASST assessment design and content. Completed as planned: July 1, 1999. Data analyzed and synthesized to feed into 2001 revised version. (BT N = 50, SP N = 48)
Quality of Feedback to Beginning Teachers	Support providers complete open-ended comment form for each CFASST event.	Inform revisions of CFASST assessment design and content. Completed as planned. Data analyzed and synthesized to feed into 2001 revised version. (N = up to 6500 per event)
Quality of Feedback to Beginning Teachers	Examination of completed beginning teacher boxes selected from among volunteer programs.	Inform revisions of CFASST assessment design and content; modification of training design; revised local implementation options. Completed as planned. Data analyzed and synthesized to feed into 2001 revised version. (N= 55)

The ongoing formative evaluation collected information about many aspects of CFASST, using several different methods and instruments. The methods used included written surveys, focus group and individual interviews, review of CFASST materials, and observations. While large-scale surveys provided information about support providers' perceptions of the CFASST training and materials, case study methods (including interviews and observations) were used to follow the implementation

of CFASST Years 1 and 2 at selected sites. (ETS report, October 2000, page 6) The evaluation methodology for 1999-2000 is summarized in [Table 2](#).

**Table 2: Formative Evaluation Data Sources 1999-2000**

Data Source	From whom and when data was collected	What information data was intended to provide
CFASST Year 1 Training Surveys--closed choice survey	SPs statewide completed these after CFASST Year 1 training	Reactions to and perceptions about the usefulness and clarity of CFASST Year 1 training modules; suggestions for improvement.
CFASST Year 1 Event Evaluation Forms (open ended survey)	SPs statewide completed these after each CFASST Year 1 event	Use of and reactions to particular event forms; suggestions for improving forms.
CFASST Box Review	Sample of 36 boxes statewide June 2000	The extent to which CFASST forms were used; whether and how well the responses matched the questions in the CFASST events; whether forms were used in a timely fashion and whether CFASST boxes contained evidence of selected dimensions of beginning teacher practice.
CFASST Years 1 and 2 BT Focus Groups--Semi-structured protocols	Case study sites February 2000 May/June 2000	Use of CFASST materials and processes; reactions to CFASST experience; BTs perceptions about their growth and improvement in their practice.
CFASST Years 1 and 2 SP Focus Groups--Semi-structured protocols	Case study sites February 2000 May/June 2000	What SP support for BTs looks like; SPs reactions to and suggestions for CFASST events; SPs perceptions about BT development.
CFASST Years 1 and 2 Director interviews--Semi-structured protocols	Case study sites February 2000 March/April 2000 May/June 2000	Site implementation and training model; supports and resources available to BTs and SPs; skills needed by CFASST program directors; reactions to CFASST.

In order to learn about how CFASST was being implemented, case studies of selected BTSA programs were conducted. It was decided that sites that were using CFASST Year 1 for a second year, in 1999-2000, were likely to provide the richest information on what was working and not working well in the implementation of CFASST Year 1. A sample of BTSA programs that represents the varied teaching contexts in California was selected: urban, suburban, rural; K-12 district or consortium of districts, high school district; and region of California. [Table 3](#) includes a detailed description of the case study sites.

**Table 3: CFASST Formative Evaluation Case Study Sites**

Site name	Type of site	Geographical Location	Case Study Level
East Bay Consortium	Consortium of four urban/suburban districts	Alameda County (Northern California)	CFASST Year 1
Glendale Unified School District	K-12 urban/suburban school district	Los Angeles County (Southern California)	CFASST Year 1
Grossmont Union High School District	9-12 suburban high school district	San Diego County (Southern California)	CFASST Year 1 and 2
Merced County Office of Education Consortium	Consortium of 18 mostly rural districts	Merced and Mariposa Counties (Central Valley)	CFASST Year 1

Sacramento City School District	K-12 urban/suburban school district	Sacramento County (Northern California)	CFASST Year 1
Sacramento County	Consortium of 20 districts in the Sacramento area	Sacramento County (Northern California)	CFASST Year 2
San Diego City Schools	K-12 urban/suburban district	San Diego County (Southern California)	CFASST Year 2

## Conclusions

The formative evaluation of CFASST implementation sought to determine how well CFASST is working, and how implementation impacts CFASST effectiveness for beginning teachers. The conclusions drawn from all the information collected are summarized below:

### Value

- CFASST users (Beginning Teachers, Support Providers and Program Directors) saw tremendous value in CFASST participation.
- CFASST events engaged beginning teachers and support providers in inquiry and reflective practice.
- CFASST acted as vehicle for accessing and engaging with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP).

### Commitment

- Tremendous personal commitment was demonstrated by support providers and Program Directors.
- Program Directors found necessary resources to make CFASST successful.
- Support providers matched their support to needs of beginning teachers going beyond expectations.
- Support providers saw CFASST as stronger than their own induction.
- Program Directors saw need for additional site administrator information and training.

### Logistics

- Continuing concerns about time requirement for completing forms and events.
- Support providers and Program Directors found Year 2 less daunting than Year 1.
- It may be necessary to include suggestions regarding time in support providers or Program Director training or materials.
- Site-level concerns included necessary release time for support providers and beginning teachers, timeline for matching support providers and beginning teachers, beginning of CFASST events and use in non-traditional schedules.

### Flexibility

- Field review involved many changes leading to flexibility in training, materials and support structures.
- State guidelines and models can support BTSA programs in CFASST implementation.

The BTSA Task Force is currently working within the Cluster structure and directly with field staff (Professional Development Consultants) to build capacity in local BTSA programs to support CFASST implementation. CFASST Year One is currently being revised. The revision process has taken into consideration all the conclusions from the field review evaluation process.

## Section Two: CFASST Year Two

Implementation of Year Two on a state-wide scale presented new challenges to the BTSA Task Force, and the CFASST Design Team. Unlike CFASST Year One, local BTSA programs must have in place a solid understanding of how and when participating school districts are implementing the academic content standards for students and curriculum frameworks associated with each content area. Unlike CFASST Year One, training for Year Two relies on outside resources for beginning teacher and support provider training. CFASST assessment Event 12, *Applying Framework to Practice*, provides an overview of the subject area standards and framework, and then directs teachers to participate in district and/or county office of education framework training. To better understand how to implement the second year on a wider scale, the design team surveyed local

BTSA program directors at the September, 1999 directors' meeting on their interest in and readiness to implement CFASST Year Two. While there was substantial interest in using CFASST Year Two, capacity to implement, as measured by familiarity with and use of the frameworks in participating districts, appeared to be widely varying across the state.

As a result the design team, as agreed to by the BTSA Task Force, recommended a multi-phase implementation. During the 1999-2000 academic year local programs were provided information at each cluster meeting on how to work with curriculum directors and staff developers to increase knowledge of the standards and frameworks. Local programs had an opportunity to evaluate their own readiness and based on the input, begin work with CFASST Year Two in full implementation or a phased-in approach. A small group of 4 BTSA programs piloted CFASST Year 2 during the 1999-2000 year.

CFASST Year Two was released statewide in July, 2000. Three statewide trainings, led by members of the design and development teams, took place in July, August and October, 2000 to train over 100 program trainers in CFASST Year Two. Cluster level trainings have been held throughout the fall and winter. There are now almost 300 program trainers working in the 113 BTSA Programs that are implementing CFASST Year Two during the 2000-2001 academic year.

Continued work with frameworks and the academic content standards for students will enable all BTSA programs to implement CFASST Year Two during the 2001-2002 school year.

### Section Three: CFASST Implementation 2000-2001

Of the current 145 BTSA Programs, 134 programs use CFASST. The remaining 11 programs had local formative assessment processes in place prior to June 1998 when CFASST was first released. These programs have participated in an approval process for their local assessment process and continue to use the locally developed formative assessment processes instead of CFASST. All CFASST using BTSA Programs implement CFASST Year One. There are 618 CFASST Trainers that work directly with support providers in the local programs in implementing CFASST Year One.

CFASST Year Two is in its first year of field review. The thirteen programs new to BTSA in the 2000-2001 year do not have any teachers that have participated in CFASST Year One and therefore are not participating in CFASST Year Two this year. See [Table 4](#) for numbers of programs, beginning teachers, and CFASST trainers across California.

**Table 4: CFASST Implementation 2000-2001**

Cluster	BTSA Programs	CFASST Users		CFASST Trainers		CFASST Year Two Implementation	
		Programs	Beginning Teachers	Year One	Year Two	Programs Beginning	Programs Full
1	26	25	2,978	127	57	13	6
2	31	25	4,142	76	35	19	1
3	30	30	5,918	143	74	23	2
4	27	26	3,492	155	47	20	5
5	31	28	4,056	117	63	9	15
<b>Totals</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>20,586</b>	<b>618</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>29</b>

### Section Four: CFASST Year One Revision Process

The revision process reviewed information gathered from the BTSA Community during the statewide field review of CFASST (June 1998-Fall 2000). This includes all the evaluation data collected and analyzed by Educational Testing Service and the use of an advisory panel of CFASST users. The Revision Advisory Panel was comprised of representatives from all five BTSA Clusters. The users of CFASST are beginning teachers and support providers. These groups were represented on the panel by 4 beginning teachers and 9 support providers that currently work with beginning teachers. CFASST is disseminated at the program level through the organization and structures developed by the local BTSA Directors. This group was represented on the revision panel by 5 BTSA Program Directors. (See [Table 6](#) for Revision Panel Membership.)



The advisory panel met monthly from September, 2000 through January, 2001. The panel reviewed the original design specifications of CFASST, the implementation data, all evaluation data collected by Educational Testing Service and shared personal and program views.

The panel made suggestions at the monthly meetings. The panel maintained the valued attributes of CFASST while fine tuning the assessment and support system. Revised forms were returned to the panel for further editing. Panel members have shared within their clusters the process that they worked through and an overview of the revised CFASST Year One.

**Table 6: Revision Panel Members**

	<b>Members</b>	<b>Role in BTSA</b>	<b>BTSA Program</b>
Cluster 1	Rosemarie Groth	Beginning Teacher	Eureka Union School District
	Sally Plicka	Support Provider	Davis-Winters-Esparto BTSA
	Barbara Shinn	BTSA Director	Sacramento County BTSA
	Tracy Zarate	Beginning Teacher	San Juan BTSA
Cluster 2	Jennifer Balaian	Beginning Teacher	Newark Unified School District
	Michele Brynjulson	BTSA Coordinator	San Ramon Valley BTSA
	Arlene Miro	BTSA Coordinator	Ventura COE BTSA
	Theresa Rouse	BTSA Coordinator	Monterey COE BTSA
Cluster 3	Linda Childress	BTSA Director	Riverside COE BTSA
	Esteban Diaz	CSU San Bernadino	Riverside COE BTSA
	Merry McCalley	BTSA Director	Kern COE BTSA
	Mary Rockwell	BTSA Coordinator	Antelope Valley Union High School BTSA
Cluster 4	Kelly Bushman	BTSA Director	Beverly Hills BTSA
	La Rie Colosimo	BTSA Director	West Covina BTSA
Cluster 5	Jodee Brentlinger	BTSA Director	Capistrano BTSA
	Bonnie Schindler	BTSA Coordinator	San Diego City Schools BTSA
	Tamara Van Wagoner	Beginning Teacher	San Diego City Schools BTSA

### **Section Five: CFASST 1.0**

Based on the data collected through this evaluation, CFASST has undergone substantial revision. The new edition of CFASST, *CFASST 1.0*, is coming on line in July 2001. CFASST 1.0 supports beginning teachers and support providers to assess professional practice based on:

- California Standards for the Teaching Profession
- Element Descriptions and scaled Descriptions of Practice
- K-12 State Adopted Academic Content Standards for Students
- California Curriculum Frameworks

#### **Comparison of the Field Review and CFASST version 1.0**

##### **CFASST Field Review**

- 10 events in CFASST Year One
- 17 events over two years
- Isolated Individual Induction Plans

##### **CFASST version 1.0**

- 6 events in CFASST Year One
- 12 events over two years
- Embedded Individual Induction Plans

- Individual Descriptions of Practice are completed in each CFASST event
- One set of Descriptions of Practice for each year allows the beginning teacher to create a visual profile or growth
- CFASST Year 2 focuses on Academic Content Standards for Students, curriculum frameworks and English Learners
- Focus on Academic Content Standards for Students and subject specific support over two years
- Focus on supporting English Learners over two years
- Resource Folders to support beginning teachers' work

CFASST 1.0 maintains the basic assessment activities that were in the field review version. The revisions include streamlining forms and strengthening connections between the events in CFASST and the individual induction plan. (See Table 7 and 8 for the titles of the events and the timeline.)

The basic CFASST assessment activities will continue to include the following kinds of activities:

***Class, School, District and Community Profile (CSDC)*** Examines the beginning teacher's teaching context and the implications for instruction.

***Inquiry:*** Beginning teachers and support providers investigate a significant aspect of teaching. They gather data through conversations with and observations of colleagues, examine student work, read research, reflect on practice and reflect on evidence to make choices in instruction. There are two inquiries in CFASST Year 1 and CFASST Year 2.

- Creating Effective Classroom Environments for Student Learning (Year 1-Fall)
- Developing and Assessing Instructional Experiences (Year 1-Spring)
- Designing a Lesson Series (Year 2-Fall)
- Assessing Student Learning Over Time (Year 2-Spring)

***Observation:*** A trained support provider conducts a formal observation of a beginning teacher's instruction and together they analyze evidence and create a profile of practice using the criteria of the Description of Practice scales.

- Profile of Practice I (Year 1-Fall)
- Profile of Practice II (Year 1-Spring)
- Observations embedded in Inquiries (Year 2)

***Descriptions of Practice:*** The Descriptions of Practice are now one document that is used over the year of induction activities. Teachers revisit the Descriptions of Practice at the end of each CFASST event, marking their practice, the date and the sources of evidence that led to the assessed level of practice.

***Individualized Induction Plan:*** A guided planning process that documents a beginning teacher's professional growth during two years of induction based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the state adopted academic content standards for students.

***Assessment Summary and Colloquium:*** The ultimate events in CFASST Year 1 and Year 2 are reflections on the work completed during each of the earlier CFASST events that year. Beginning teachers review the history of the year of teaching and select important learnings to share at the BTSA colloquium. The Colloquium provides a unique opportunity for the induction community to learn from each other and celebrate the teaching profession.

**Table 7: Events in CFASST Year One**

Event	Activity	Month	Length
1	CSDC: Class, School, District and Community Profile	0-1	4 weeks
2	Inquiry: Establishing an Environment for Student Learning	2-3	5 weeks
3	Profile of Practice 1	3-4	2 weeks
4	Inquiry: Developing and Assessing Instructional Experiences	5-7	8 weeks
5	Profile of Practice 2	7-8	2 weeks
6	Assessment and Summary of Growth Preparation for Colloquium	9	2 weeks

CFASST Year Two events have been renumbered to align with Year One. In addition, the embedded Individual Induction Plan and the year-long Descriptions of Practice have been integrated into the Year Two process in a similar manner as in CFASST Year One.

**Table 8: Events in CFASST Year Two**

Event	Activity	Month	Length
7	CSDC: Class, School, District, Community Profile including a focus on student assessment data	1	2-3 weeks
8	Applying Framework to Practice: Study session on K-12 academic content standards	1-2	3 weeks
9	Inquiry: Designing a Lesson Series	2-4	8 weeks
10	Individual Induction Plan and Self Assessment	5	2 weeks
11	Inquiry: Assessing Student Learning Over Time	6-8	10 weeks
12	Assessment and Summary of Professional Growth and Planning for Colloquium	9	1 week

## **Section Six: Connections to Professional Teacher Induction Standards**

The CFASST revision has been aligned with SB 2042 initiatives and the Learning to Teach System as detailed in the Preliminary Draft Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs and the Preliminary Draft Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs. CFASST is designed to build on the experiences educators participate in during the Professional Teacher Preparation phase and extend the experiences through the two-year induction phase. We will continue to evaluate and subsequently refine the CFASST system as we learn more about its feasibility and power to impact teaching quality and student learning.

[Return to March 2001 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 March 2001 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:**

March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PREP-5

**Committee:**

Preparation Standards

**Title:**

Overview of Draft Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Induction Programs

Information

**Prepared by:**

Margaret Olebe, Administrator, and  
Amy Jackson, Administrator  
Professional Services Division

### Overview of Draft Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Induction Programs

#### Professional Services Division

February 19, 2001

#### Executive Summary

The Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards (SB 2042) has completed Draft Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Teacher Preparation and Induction Programs. In addition, the Elementary Subject Matter Panel has completed Preliminary Draft Standards of Program Quality for Subject Matter Programs for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential. In January 2001, all three sets of standards were presented to the Commission for information, prior to launching an extensive field review. In February, the Commission had the opportunity to review the Professional *Preparation* standards in depth. The purpose of this agenda report is to provide the Commission an opportunity for in-depth study and analysis of the Draft Standards for Professional Teacher *Induction* Programs. This report includes an overview of this set of standards, a guide to understanding the standards, and the draft standards themselves. Commission staff will present the draft Elementary Subject Matter Standards for in-depth review in April.

#### Policy Question

Do the Draft Standards of Quality for Professional Induction Programs reflect the Commission's policy goals for teacher induction in the future?

#### Fiscal Impact Summary

The costs associated with implementing SB 2042 were estimated to be incurred over multiple years, and are included in the agency's base budget.

## Background

Late in 1998, the Commission launched an extensive standards and assessment development effort designed to significantly improve the preparation of K-12 teachers. Commission sponsored legislation in 1998 (SB 2042, Alpert/Mazzoni) served as the impetus for this work on standards and assessments, which will be, pursuant to statute, aligned with the state-adopted academic content standards for students as well as the California Standards for the Teaching Profession adopted by the Commission and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Advisory panels, task forces, and contractors are carrying out the work. In January 2001, the initial results of these efforts were presented to the Commission during the meeting of the Performance Standards Committee of the Whole. They included:

- Draft Standards of Program Quality and Content Specifications for *the Subject Matter Requirement* for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential;
- Draft Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness and Teaching Performance Expectations for Professional Teacher *Preparation* Programs; and
- Draft Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher *Induction* Programs.

During its February 2001 meeting, the Commission had the opportunity to review in depth the Draft Professional Preparation Standards. The purpose of this agenda report is to provide the Commission an opportunity for in-depth study and analysis of the Draft Standards of Quality and Effectiveness Professional Teacher Induction Programs, which are appended to this report. In future months, staff will bring to the Commission agenda reports that provide an analysis of the Draft Standards of Program Quality and Content Specifications for the Subject Matter Requirement for the Multiple Subject Teaching Credential and the Draft Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Blended Programs.

## Overview of Draft Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs

The attached *Draft Standards of Program Quality for Professional Teacher Induction*, when adopted by the Commission will be used to guide all *induction* programs in the future. Pursuant to SB 2042, all teachers will be required, once new standards have been adopted, to complete an induction program, like the highly successful Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) Program, in order to earn their Professional Teaching Credentials. These standards build on the prior subject matter and pedagogical preparation that teachers complete, and focus on refining a beginning teacher's understanding of and ability to teach the state-adopted content standards for students and the new teacher's professional practice. Local education agencies and post-secondary institutions that offer induction programs in the future will be required to meet these standards in order to prepare and recommend candidates for the Professional Teaching Credential.

The draft Professional Teacher Induction Standards were developed by the Induction Program Standards Task Force, under the auspices of the SB 2042 Panel and the Interagency BTSA Task Force, during the last year. The Induction Task Force includes 13 members, including representatives from the BTSA community as well as the SB 2042 Advisory Panel. A complete roster of the Induction Program Standards Task Force and staff are included in the draft standards under [Attachment 1. Table 1](#) provides an overview of the preliminary draft Professional Teacher Induction Program Standards. [Table 2](#) provides an overview of the content and purpose of each of the nineteen draft induction standards.

**Table 1. Professional Teacher Induction Standards**

<b>Foundational Standards for All Multiple Subject and Single Subject Professional Teacher Induction Programs</b>	<b>Purpose:</b>
Standard 1: Sponsorship, Administration, and Leadership	Foundational Standards for all Multiple Subject and Single Subject Professional Teacher Induction Programs describe standards that all sponsors of induction programs must address in order to develop and implement high quality programs. These standards direct how to establish sponsorship, allocate resources, design and provide professional development for teachers, collaborate within and across the education community and support participating teachers as they move from preparation programs to induction programs.
Standard 2: Resources	

Standard 3: Professional Development Providers

Standard 4: Evaluation

Standard 5: Articulation from Professional Teacher Preparation Programs

Standard 6: Advice and Assistance

Standard 7: Collaboration

Standard 8: Support Provider Selection and Assignment

Standard 9: Support Provider Professional Development

**Category A: Program Design**

Standard 10: Program Design

Standard 11: Roles and Responsibilities of K-12 Schools

Standard 12: Comprehensive Professional Development Based on an Individual Induction Plan

Standard 13: Formative Assessment Systems

**Purpose:**

Category A describes key structural design elements that guide induction programs to collaborate with the K-12 education community, provide targeted professional development opportunities for teachers based on individual induction plans, and establish a systematic, performance based, formative assessment process based on the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the state adopted academic content standards for students.

**Category B. Teaching Curriculum in California Schools**

Standard 14: K-12 state adopted Academic Content and Subject Specific Pedagogy

Standard 15: Using Computer

**Purpose:**

Category B requires induction programs to offer professional development and support based on the K-12 state adopted academic content standards for students in concert with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession. This category also highlights the importance of computer based technology to support student learning.

Based  
Technology to  
Support  
Student  
Learning

**Category C. Teaching All Students in California Schools**

**Purpose:**

Category C addresses major concepts and principles related to how teachers understand, approach and interact with their students on a daily basis. This set of standards focuses on how to differentiate instruction and support for all students, how to establish a healthy environment for learning, how to develop additional pedagogical skills for teaching English learners, and emphasizes professional conduct during the induction program.

Standard 16: Supporting Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum

Standard 17: Creating a Supportive and Healthy Environment for Student Learning

Standard 18: Teaching English Learners

Standard 19: Teaching Special Populations

**Guide for Standards Study and Analysis**

The purpose of this section is to provide Commissioners with a conceptual framework for thinking about and understanding the content of the draft standards. For each standard, a brief description of the content and purpose is provided. This is followed by several prompts for considering the category as a whole. These prompts will be used to guide discussion during oral presentation of this item at the Commission meeting.

**Table 2. Content and Purpose of Draft Induction Standards**

**Part 1: Foundational Standards for All Multiple and Single Subject Professional Teacher Induction Programs**

<b>DRAFT STANDARD</b>	<b>CONTENT</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
Standard One -- Sponsorship, Administration and Leadership	Calls for the sponsors of the program to establish an administrative structure that effectively manages and delivers support and formative assessment services to participating teachers.	To ensure that program sponsors have the necessary commitment and knowledge to implement high quality induction; that roles and responsibilities are clearly defined; and that resources are allocated appropriately.
Standard Two -- Resources	Requires induction programs to allocate sufficient resources among program sponsors to enable the program to meet all standards and deliver high quality induction to participants.	This standard defines resources in terms of funding, time, materials, and personnel, and calls for sufficient allocation of resources to ensure that programs meet all



		standards and provide necessary services to new teachers.
Standard Three -- Professional Development Providers	Provides for the careful selection of professional development providers, includes selection criteria, and calls for their regular evaluation.	Professional development providers are one of the central resources in induction. This standard is intended to ensure that providers are selected based on their knowledge and experience and that they receive training and are regularly evaluated for their effectiveness in meeting the goals of the induction program.
Standard Four -- Evaluation	Requires that induction programs include a comprehensive formative program development and evaluation system.	This standard calls for regular evaluation of the program to ensure consistent, high quality implementation of the standards.
Standard Five -- Articulation with Professional Teacher Preparation Programs	Calls for articulation between induction and teacher preparation programs, and collaboration between induction programs and local human resource professionals responsible for employing and assigning teachers.	Linking the phases of learning to teach is one of the central goals of this credentialing reform effort. Articulation between preparation and induction programs will enable new teachers to extend and deepen their knowledge of teaching in a coherent and systematic way.
Standard Six -- Advice and Assistance	Provides for participating teachers to receive clear information, advice and assistance regarding their professional development and credential completion requirements, and states the responsibility of the program sponsor to recommend for professional credentials only those teachers who complete the induction program.	As the purpose of induction expands to include preparation for a professional teaching credential, it is essential that participating teachers receive clear information, advice and assistance regarding program requirements. This standard sets forth the obligations of program sponsors to put in place clear procedures to enable teachers to complete induction programs and qualify for a professional credential.
Standard Seven -- Collaboration	Sets forth the requirement that induction programs be developed and implemented through collaborative partnerships that involve at least one K-12 school organization and one postsecondary institution. Identifies other potential collaborators, and calls for roles and responsibilities to be clearly defined. Requires that program sponsors collaborate with local bargaining units.	This standard is intended to establish formal linkages across the learning to teach continuum and open communication among the partners for the benefit of teachers in the program. The collaboration is also intended to yield clear and coherent curricula for participating teachers across the continuum.
Standard Eight -- Support Provider Selection and Assignment	Establishes criteria for the selection and assignment of support providers. Requires that support providers be familiar with state adopted	Most induction program requirements are met in the context of the support provider/new teacher relationship. Careful selection

	academic content standards and frameworks, content specific pedagogy, and the specific needs of students.	of individuals who serve in this role is vital to the overall quality of the program.
Standard Nine -- Support Provider Professional Development	Provides for the preparation and professional development of support providers, including training in the appropriate use of the instruments and processes of the formative assessment system. Requires program sponsors to provide support providers with regularly scheduled time to meet in order to develop and refine their skills.	As the primary deliverers of induction services to new teachers, it is essential that support providers are well trained for their role, and that training be aligned with the goals of the program. The purpose of this standard is to specify some of the areas in which support providers must be trained in order for the induction program to be of high quality in relation to standards.

Questions to Consider:

- Are the concepts addressed in this category important to the overall design and purpose of an induction program?
- Is the content of the standards reflective of current ideas and perspectives on teaching and learning in California?
- Will these standards lead to a teacher induction program that would provide candidates a comprehensive professional education leading to a high degree of success as a beginning teacher?

**Part 2: Implementation Standards for All Multiple and Single Subject Professional Teacher Induction Programs**

**Category A: Program Design**

<b>DRAFT STANDARD</b>	<b>CONTENT</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
Standard Ten -- Program Design	Calls for the development of a purposeful, logically sequenced structure of extended preparation and professional development that prepares teachers to meet the academic learning needs of all K-12 students.	This standard sets out the design parameters for a high quality teacher induction program in California. It asks program sponsors to create a program that is based on research and scholarship in the field and is relevant to the contemporary conditions of schooling.
Standard Eleven -- Roles and Responsibilities of K-12 Schools	Provides for the involvement of site administrators and policy boards in the induction program; calls attention to assignment practices; requires site administrators to provide the structure and climate for the program's intensive support and formative assessment activities; calls for site administrators to receive professional development to support them in their role.	This standard recognizes the critical role played by a site administrator in establishing the conditions within a local school that contribute to the success of a new teacher's induction. The goal of this standard is to ensure that program sponsors attend to the role and needs of administrators as key variables in the quality of induction programs.
Standard Twelve -- Professional Development Based on an Individual Induction Plan	Requires that program sponsors provide professional development for participants to support their attainment of the CSTP in relation to the state	This standard reflects a commitment to professional development and extended preparation that integrates the process of individualized

	adopted standards and frameworks; requires that professional growth be guided by an Individual Induction Plan (IIP); and that the IIP be informed by the TPA as well as CSTP-based formative assessment.	support and assistance from support providers with formal professional development offerings. Standard 12 also reinforces connections across the learning-to-teach continuum.
Standard Thirteen -- Formative Assessment Systems	Sets forth the requirement that each induction program include a formative assessment system that guides and informs participating teachers about their own professional growth. Requires that the formative assessment system be characterized by multiple measures of teaching, collaboration with colleagues, focus on classroom practice, and together with a trained support provider about evidence, using specific criteria.	Systematic, formative assessment is the primary vehicle for teacher development during induction. Given that local contexts for induction vary significantly in different regions of the state, this standard sets forth the parameters for formative assessment to ensure that every new teacher has the opportunity to participate in a comprehensive and substantive professional development experience.

Questions to Consider:

- Are the concepts addressed in this category important to the overall design and purpose of an induction program?
- Is the content of the standards reflective of current ideas and perspectives on teaching and learning in California?
- Will these standards lead to a teacher induction program that would provide candidates a comprehensive professional education leading to a high degree of success as a beginning teacher?

**Category B: Teaching Curriculum To All Students in California Schools**

<b>DRAFT STANDARD</b>	<b>CONTENT</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
Standard Fourteen -- K-12 Core Academic Content and Subject Specific Pedagogy	Calls for participating teachers to improve their ability with respect to the CSTP; demonstrate knowledge of and ability to teach state adopted academic content standards and frameworks in the context of their teaching assignment; and deliver content specific instruction consistent with the adopted curriculum and differentiated to address the needs of students.	The purpose of this standard is to ensure, within the context of support and formative assessment, that participating teachers have opportunities to further develop their ability to teach and their knowledge and ability with respect to the state adopted standards and frameworks.
Standard Fifteen -- Using Computer Based Technology to Support Student Learning	Sets forth the requirement that participating teachers build on the knowledge, skills and abilities acquired during preliminary preparation for the delivery of comprehensive, specialized use of appropriate computer-based technology to facilitate the teaching and learning process.	This standard has a corollary in the professional preparation standards. Standards for preparation to use computer-based technology were the subject of legislation, and were intended to ensure that every teacher had the opportunity to learn to use technology to support student learning.

Questions to Consider:

- Are the concepts addressed in this category important to the overall design and purpose of an induction program?
- Is the content of the standards reflective of current ideas and perspectives on teaching and learning in California?
- Will these standards lead to a teacher induction program that would provide candidates a comprehensive professional education leading to a high degree of success as a beginning teacher?

**Category C: Teaching All Students in California Schools**

<b>DRAFT STANDARD</b>	<b>CONTENT</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>
Standard Sixteen -- Supporting Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum	Requires that induction programs build on the knowledge, skills and abilities acquired during professional preparation for creating environments that support learning for diverse students and provide equitable access to the core curriculum.	The purpose of this standard is to ensure that teachers understand the implications of socioeconomic, linguistic, cognitive, racial, cultural, ethnic and gender diversity on teaching and learning.
Standard Seventeen -- Creating a Supportive and Healthy Environment for Student Learning	Requires that induction programs build on the knowledge, skills and abilities acquired during professional preparation for the delivery of comprehensive support for students' physical, cognitive, emotional and social well-being.	This standard is directly responsive to the requirement of SB 2042 to eliminate the clear credential course requirement in health and, alternatively, address important content in the area of health and safety in professional preparation and induction standards.
Standard Eighteen -- Teaching English Learners	Requires that induction programs build on the knowledge, skills and abilities acquired during professional preparation for the delivery of comprehensive, specialized instruction for English learners.	This standard is directly responsive to 1999 legislation requiring that all multiple and single subject credential candidates receive substantive preparation to teach English learners in their professional preparation and induction programs.
Standard Nineteen -- Teaching Special Populations	Requires that induction programs build on the knowledge, skills and abilities acquired during professional preparation for teaching students with disabilities, students in the general education classroom who are at risk, and students who are gifted and talented.	This standard is directly responsive to the requirement of SB 2042 to eliminate the clear credential course requirement in "mainstreaming" and, alternatively, address important content regarding teaching special populations in professional preparation and induction standards.

Questions to Consider:

- Are the concepts addressed in this category important to the overall design and purpose of an induction program?
- Is the content of the standards reflective of current ideas and perspectives on teaching and learning in California?
- Will these standards lead to a teacher induction program that would provide candidates a comprehensive professional education leading to a high degree of success as a beginning teacher?

Click [HERE](#) for ATTACHMENT 1: Draft Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs (Document 3). ([Adobe Acrobat Reader Required](#))

---



[Return to March 2001 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 March 2001 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:**

March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

FPPC-1

**Committee:**

Fiscal Policy and Planning

**Title:**

Overview of the Legislative Analyst's Review of the 2001-2002 Governor's Budget

✓ Information

**Prepared by:**

Pearl Yu, Analyst  
Fiscal and Business Services

---

### BACKGROUND

Each year the Legislative Analyst's Office publishes its review of the Governor's Budget. This agenda item is intended to provide Commissioners with an analysis of that review.

### SUMMARY

At the time this agenda item was prepared, the Legislative Analyst had not yet published its review. Staff will present information as it becomes available as an in-folder item at the Commission's meeting in March 2001.

---



[Return to March 2001 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](#)



---

[Return to March 2001 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:** March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:** FPPC-2

**Committee:** Fiscal Policy and Planning

**Title:** Update Regarding Status of the Teacher Credentialing Service Improvement Project

✓ Information

**Prepared by:** Rosemary Yurman, Analyst  
Information Management Systems

---

### BACKGROUND

As the State's lead agency in the certification of new K-12 teachers, the Commission is dedicated to streamlining its business practices and taking advantage of technology opportunities to accommodate the projected increase in the number of teachers required for California schools. The results of this effort will also empower both the Commission's customers (primarily teachers) and business partners (primarily institutions of higher education, county offices of education, and school districts, as well as law enforcement agencies) by deploying an automated, interactive process for the exchange of information and the delivery of services. To accomplish this objective, the Commissioners approved a Budget Change Proposal in April 2000 for the first-year funding of the Teacher Credentialing Service Improvement Project.

The following benefits are expected to result from the project's successful implementation:

- The Commission's growing volume of credential applications will continue to be processed in no more than 75 business days;
- The Commission's customers and business partners will be empowered to access status information quickly and easily;
- The Commission's future staffing needs related to credential processing will be curtailed by at least five positions, an estimated savings of at least \$2.1 million over a seven-year period; and
- State policymakers will receive timely and useful reports regarding the Commission's activities.

In addition, the project is fully consistent with the Governor's e-government vision and strategies that focus on providing citizens with more effective and timely access to State government services.

### SUMMARY

The project is anticipated to require an investment of several million dollars to cover

necessary development and implementation costs over the next two fiscal years. To achieve the benefits summarized above, the project will eventually involve the replacement of the Commission's COBOL-based information technology systems (that are outdated, cannot be cost-effectively modified, and will eventually be without vendor support). The project will also incur additional costs related to ongoing maintenance, support, and technical staff. The first-year cost of the project has been estimated to be \$1.8 million. Staff anticipates that there will be measurable customer service benefits achieved by the end of the project's first year.

At the Commission's request, the Governor proposed \$1.8 million from the Teacher Credentials Fund in first-year funding for the project in a May Revision Budget Change Proposal that, following approval by the Legislature, was included in the 2000 Budget Act. These funds were intended to cover the estimated first-year costs of a business needs-based procurement of an innovative solution that addresses the Commission's business needs.

On behalf of the Commission, staff:

- Requested and was granted control-agency approval pursuant to State Administrative Manual section 5215 to conduct an alternative procurement.
- Prepared an Alternative Procurement Business Justification that received control-agency approval.
- Prepared and is anticipating imminent control-agency approval of a Request for Proposal document that will govern a procurement process that will take advantage of the new State E-Commerce/E-Government Master Contract List.
- Will soon begin to prepare a Feasibility Study Report for control-agency review that will justify the ultimate selection of the best-value solution.
- Plans to begin working with a development vendor to implement the new system in early Spring 2001.



[Return to March 2001 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](#)





---

[Return to March 2001 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:** March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:** FPPC-3

**Committee:** Fiscal Policy and Planning

**Title:** Proposed Revisions to Commission Policy Manual Pertaining to Contract Review

✓ Action

**Prepared by:** LeMardeio Morris, Analyst  
Fiscal and Business Services

---

### BACKGROUND

Prior to 1988, the Executive Director exercised the authority to approve and execute contracts on behalf of the Commission. To codify this authority, the Commission sponsored legislation that resulted in the enactment of Section 44220(b) of the Education Code in 1988, which reads as follows:

Any power, duty, purpose, function, or jurisdiction that the commission may lawfully delegate is delegated to the executive director, unless the commission specifically has reserved the same of its own action.

### COMMISSION POLICY MANUAL

Subsequent to the enactment of the law cited above, the Commission adopted a policy in 1990 that limited the Executive Director's authority to approve and execute contracts and agreements for goods and services with a value that exceeding \$12,000. This policy is found in Commission Policy Manual Section 650.

### PROPOSED POLICY MANUAL CHANGES

Staff is proposing that Commission Policy Manual Section 650 be amended to recognize that the Executive Director or his or her designee has the authority to develop, execute, and administer certain contracts and agreements (see attached). The proposed changes would specifically authorize the Executive Director to secure the services of temporary employees under the state's interjurisdictional personnel exchange program (such as "visiting educators" from local educational agencies) and the state's student assistant program (with the CSU Sacramento Foundation). The value of these contracts or agreements would not exceed \$100,000.

### JUSTIFICATION

The proposed changes would be consistent with the Executive Director's statutory authority

under Education Code Section 44221 to employ such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the Commission's duties and responsibilities. In addition, the changes would increase the Commission's operating efficiency and expedite the process of securing the temporary personnel that may be needed to assist the Commission in achieving its strategic goals.

This delegation of authority is commonly found in other similarly structured state boards and commissions such as the Student Aid Commission, the Board of Control and the California Lottery Commission. It is also in full compliance with Public Contract Code Sections 10295, 10297, 10335, and 10360 and State Administrative Manual Section 1215(3) governing the review and approval of contracts by the Department of General Services.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the attached changes to Policy Manual Section 650.

### PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR POLICY MANUAL CHANGES

#### 650. CONTRACT REVIEW PROCEDURES

##### (a) Authority of the Commission

The Commission reserves to itself the authority to authorize the Executive Director to approve contracts and agreements with the following characteristics:

- (1) Contracts or agreements for goods or services with a value in excess of \$12,000 when such contracts are not let under the auspices of a state master agreement or regulation.
- (2) Contracts or agreements for personal services with a value in excess of \$12,000 or a duration longer than two months.
- (3) Contracts or agreements to be entered into without advertising or bidding (sole source contracts) with a value in excess of \$12,000, when the Commission or its staff initiates the request to let a sole source contract rather than on the basis of competitive bids.

##### (b) Authority of the Executive Director

All contracts and agreements other than those specified in Subsection (a) may legally be entered into by the Director or his or her designee, and are hereby delegated to the Executive Director or his or her designee for review and signature approval. Such contracts and agreements include those whose purpose is to secure the services of temporary employees under the state's interjurisdictional personnel exchange program and the state's student assistant program with a value that does not exceed \$100,000 per contract or agreement.

##### (c) Authority of the Commission's Standing Policy Committees

The Preparation Standards Committee, the Performance Standards Committee, the Legislative Committee, and the Executive Committee shall each have the authority to review and recommend Commission approval of contracts that have the characteristics specified in Subsection (a), and that relate to activities previously reviewed by each committee.

##### (d) Additional Authority of the Commission's Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall monitor and receive informational reports regarding contracts that are let under the provisions of Subsections (a), (b), and (c). These reports shall state the names of contractors and the amounts of the contracts.

[Return to March 2001 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 March 2001 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:**

March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PERF-1

**Committee:**

Performance Standards

**Title:**

Recommended Award of a Contract for Administration, Validity Study, and Development of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA), and Proposed 2001-02 Test Fees

✓ Action

**Prepared by:**

Bob Carlson, Ph.D., Administrator  
Professional Services Division

### Recommended Award of a Contract for Administration, Validity Study, and Development of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA), and Proposed 2001-02 Test Fees

#### Professional Services Division

February 16, 2001

#### Executive Summary

The RICA has been administered by National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) since 1998 pursuant to a contract that will expire on October 31, 2001. The last administration of the RICA under this contract will be the June 9, 2001, administration of the RICA Written Examination. In December 2000, following approval by the Commission, the Executive Director released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a contractor to administer the RICA through June 2004, implement a validity study, and develop new RICA exam/assessment materials. This report recommends that a contract be awarded to NES as a result of a competitive bidding process. The proposed contract, which includes a number of program improvements that will be part of the basic package of services provided by NES at no additional cost to the Commission, is summarized, and additional potential improvements and their costs are described. RICA fees for 2001-02 are proposed. Background information about the RICA is provided, as well as a summary of the proposal solicitation and evaluation process.

#### Fiscal Impact Summary

The costs of the proposed contract will be paid for with examinee fees pursuant to Education Code Section 44298.

#### Policy Issues To Be Decided

Should the Commission award a contract to NES for administration, validity study, and

development of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)?

Which, if any, RICA program improvements (in addition to those included in the basic contract package) should the Commission purchase as part of the contract?

What test fees should candidates be charged in 2001-02 for the RICA Written Examination and the RICA Video Performance Assessment?

### Recommendations

1. That the Commission authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract for the administration, validity study, and development of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) as described in Part 1 of this report and summarized below.

- Contract Number      TCC-0046
- Contractor          National Evaluation Systems, Inc.
- Contracting Period    Upon approval by the Department of General Services, until October 31, 2004
- Purpose of Contract    To administer, implement a validity study for, and develop exam/assessment materials for the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)
- Method of Procurement   Request for Proposals
- Total Contract Amount    \$7,148,568 basic contract amount plus the estimated costs of all additional improvements selected
- Source of Funding        Examinee fees

2. That the Commission adopt the following RICA test fees for administrations in 2001-02:

- Written Examination:      \$122
- Video Performance Assessment:
  - Registration:                \$50
  - Submission:                 \$140

### Overview of this Report

In December 2000, the Executive Director released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for administration of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) through June 2004, implementation of a RICA validity study, and development of new RICA exam/assessment materials. Proposals were due on February 7, 2001. Proposals were received from Educational Testing Service (ETS) and National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES). A Proposal Review Team participated in a three-stage proposal review process in which each proposal was carefully reviewed and evaluated. As a result of the competitive bidding process, staff recommends that a contract be signed with NES, the sponsor of the highest scored proposal.

[Part 1](#) of this report provides a summary of the proposed contract with NES, which includes several

program improvements. [Part 2](#) presents for the Commission's consideration additional improvements to the RICA program and their costs. [Part 3](#) discusses RICA test fees for 2001-02. Attached to this report is an appendix that provides background information about the RICA, summarizes the procedures that were used to solicit proposals from potential contractors, and describes the process that was implemented to evaluate the proposals that were received and the results of that process.

---

## Part 1 Summary of the Proposed Contract with NES

This section describes the features of the basic package of services for administration of the RICA, the validity study, and test development under the proposed NES contract. The basic package includes a number of program improvements at no additional cost to the Commission. Information regarding additional improvements that have added costs is presented for Commission consideration in [Part 2](#) of this report.

### Administration of the RICA

Under the basic package NES will continue to administer the RICA through June 2004. This includes:

- assuring the security of the testing process and materials,
- producing all program communications and materials,
- producing and distributing annual registration bulletins,
- registering candidates,
- administering the RICA Written Examination and the RICA Video Performance Assessment,
- providing alternative testing arrangements to candidates with verified disabilities,
- scoring and reporting scores to candidates, institutions, and the Commission, and
- producing reports.

NES will administer the RICA Written Examination six times per year in 21 test areas (up from 18 test areas currently). The dates will be the same dates as the CBEST test dates, which are in the even-numbered months. Candidates may work on, complete, and submit to NES their Video Performance Assessments at any time; NES will score them three times per year.

In addition to the services that are currently provided in the program, NES will provide the following additional services as improvements to the RICA program at *no additional cost* to the Commission:

#### Information Access and Dissemination

- Examinee service representatives available by phone from 9-5 every business day (currently 9-3)
- Toll-free access to the automated information system (currently a toll call)
- Candidates can communicate with NES via email and fax

#### Registration for the RICA

- Web-based registration services for the Written Examination
- Regular registration period for the Written Examination extended by one week (currently ends six weeks and one day before administration)
- Late registration for Written Examination by telephone (currently by mail only; essentially extends deadline by 3-4 days)
- No Written Examination withdrawal fee (currently \$40), and can withdraw and receive a refund up to the late registration deadline (currently regular registration deadline)
- No fee to change Written Examination test date or area (currently \$25)
- Quicker mailing of Video Performance Assessment materials to those who pay for overnight mailing (within two business days instead of within one week)

#### Test Administration

- Three added test areas in California (currently 18)

#### Score Reporting

- Video Performance Assessment score reports mailed in four weeks (currently six)
- Written Examination and Video Performance Assessment scores available on Web

## Implementation of a Validity Study

Under the proposed contract, NES will implement a validity study of the RICA in 2003-04. The purpose of the study is to ensure that the RICA remains a valid assessment of a beginning teacher's knowledge, skills, and abilities related to the teaching of reading. The study will involve a review and potential revision of the current specifications and will result in (a) a potentially revised set of RICA content specifications that delineate the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by beginning teachers in order to effectively teach reading, and (b) documentation supporting the validity of the specifications. The results of the validity study and any recommendations for revisions to the RICA specifications will be presented to the Commission in the spring or summer of 2004.

## Development of Test/Assessment Materials

Following the review and potential revision of the RICA content specifications, NES will develop new RICA test/assessment materials. The primary purpose of this work will be (a) development of new Written Examination items and (b) revision of Video Performance Assessment materials as needed on the basis of the revised RICA content specifications. (There will be Written Examination test development work even if there are no changes to the specifications, or the changes do not require new materials.) The validity study and the test development activities will be scheduled so that the Written Examination and Video Performance Assessment reflect the revised content specifications beginning in the 2004-05 testing year (which will not be a part of this contract).

The test development work for the Written Examination will involve the following steps:

- determining item needs,
- drafting new items,
- presenting draft items to an advisory panel and the Bias Review Committee,
- revising items as needed on the basis of panel and committee reviews,
- field-testing items, and
- finalizing the new items.

In addition, NES will make any changes necessary in the Video Performance Assessment materials to assure their alignment with the revised RICA content specifications.

## Service Fees

Service fees are charges that candidates incur for additional services needed beyond regular registration and administration of the examination or performance assessment. A list of the services with the current and proposed fee for each are provided in [Table 1](#). Two of the current fees have been dropped. The other fees will remain unchanged in the proposed new contract. These fees are paid directly to NES by candidates who request the services and do not represent revenue or a contract cost to the Commission.

**Table 1**  
**RICA Service Fees Charged to Candidates by NES**

Service	Current Fee	Proposed Fee
Written Examination test area or test date change	\$25	No charge
Late registration fee for Written Examination (in addition to the basic test fee) <sup>1</sup>	\$30	\$30
Emergency registration fee for Written Examination (in addition to the basic test fee)	\$70	\$70
Withdraw from Written Examination	\$40 if withdraw by regular registration deadline	No charge, and can withdraw through late registration deadline
Score report reprint <sup>2</sup>	\$20 each	\$20 each
Score verification (rescoring of multiple-choice responses on the Written	\$35	\$35

Examination)		
Express mailing of Video Performance Assessment materials <sup>4</sup>	\$20 and mailed within 7 calendar days	\$20 and mailed within 2 business days
File correction fee <sup>5</sup>	\$20	\$20
Charge for processing a disputed credit card charge or personal check returned by a bank	\$20	\$20

<sup>1</sup>When the score report mailing date for an administration of the RICA Written Examination is after the regular registration deadline for the next administration, candidates who do not pass the exam are given a RICA Written Examination Consecutive Retake Coupon that waives the \$30 late registration fee for the next RICA Written Examination administration date.

<sup>2</sup>The RICA test fees include sending score reports to the examinee and to one institution requested by the examinee.

<sup>3</sup>If it is determined during score verification that an error was made by the contractor in the score report originally mailed to the examinee, a corrected score report is issued and sent to all recipients of the original score report at no charge, and the score verification fee is refunded.

<sup>4</sup>For this fee, NES will mail the Video Performance Assessment materials to a registrant via overnight (as opposed to first-class) mail.

<sup>5</sup>Candidates may request corrections to their files, such as correcting the spelling of names, correcting a social security number, etc.

## Contract Costs

### Administration of the RICA Written Examination

For the RICA Written Examination, [Table 2](#) shows the per-examinee cost NES will charge the Commission for the basic package of test administration services for each of three volume ranges of examinees. For each absentee (i.e., candidates who register for the Written Examination, do not withdraw by the late registration deadline, and do not attend the administration), NES will charge the Commission 90 percent of the per-examinee cost.

**Table 2**  
**Per-Examinee RICA Written Examination Administration Costs**  
**Charged to the Commission by NES**  
**(Basic Package)**

Examinees Per Year	Cost Per Examinee
14,000-17,999	\$107
18,000-21,999	\$104
22,000-25,999	\$98

It is estimated that the number of examinees in each of the next three years will be approximately 20,000. Comparing current contract costs with the costs in [Table 2](#) is difficult because the volume ranges used in the current contract differ from the volume ranges in [Table 2](#). If the annual examinee volume is 18,000-20,000, the cost shown in [Table 2](#) (\$104 per examinee) is \$6 less than the current cost. If the annual volume is 20,000-21,999, the cost shown in [Table 2](#) (\$104) is \$9 more than the current cost.

### Administration of the RICA Video Performance Assessment

For the RICA Video Performance Assessment, [Table 3](#) shows the cost per registrant and the cost per submission scored that NES will charge the Commission. These costs apply to an annual number of submissions scored ranging from 1 to 200. Staff estimates about 100 submissions scored per year.



**Table 3**  
**RICA Video Performance Assessment Administration Costs**  
**Charged to the Commission by NES**

Cost per registrant:	\$65
Cost per submission scored:	\$195

Currently, the Commission pays NES nothing per registrant and \$345 for each submission scored. The new costs shown in [Table 3](#) are expected to result in lower contract costs than the current costs, as shown in the following example. In 1999-00, there were 111 Video Performance Assessment registrants and 80 submissions scored. These numbers are similar to what is expected in the future. Under the current contract, this volume of registrants and submissions scored would cost the Commission \$27,600 (\$345 x 80). Under the proposed contract, this volume would cost \$22,815 ((\$65 x 111) + (\$195 x 80)).

**Validity Study and Test Development**

NES will implement the validity study for \$270,580 and develop new test materials for \$127,988.

**Estimated Total Three-Year Contract Costs for the Basic Package of Services**

The total estimated costs for the three-year contract include (a) costs for administration of the RICA based upon anticipated volumes of examinees, (b) the cost of the validity study, and (c) the cost of test development. [Table 4](#) shows the anticipated contract costs for each of these activities and the total. The administration costs are based on estimates of 20,000 registrants in 2001-02, 21,000 in 2002-03, and 22,000 in 2003-04, of whom 95 percent become examinees and 5 percent become absentees. It should be noted that NES would only be compensated for the products and services provided, according to the terms of the contract, which are summarized above. These contract costs are to be paid for from examinee fees, as described in [Part 3](#) below.

**Table 4**  
**Estimated Contract Costs**  
**(Basic Package)**

Activity	Cost
2001-02 Administration	\$2,150,000
2002-03 Administration	2,250,000
2003-04 Administration	2,350,000
Validity Study	270,580
Test Development	127,988
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$7,148,568</b>

---

**Part 2**  
**Additional Program Improvements for Consideration**

So that the Commission would have the opportunity to make improvements to the RICA program, staff required that bidders (a) include some improvements in the basic package of RICA services and (b) indicate the costs, if any, of several other improvements that were specified in the RFP. In addition, the RFP encouraged bidders to offer other program improvements and indicate their costs, if any. Several improvements, listed in Part 1, are already part of the basic package of services that would be provided by NES for the contract costs described in [Part 1](#). This part of this report describes other potential improvements and their costs. Staff recommends that the Commission not purchase any of these additional improvements at this time.

**Input From Credential Counselors and Analysts of California (CCAC) Members**

In an effort to determine the improvements considered most valuable by professionals working with RICA candidates, staff solicited the opinions of members of the Credential Counselors and Analysts

of California (CCAC). The improvements specified in the RFP (other than the required improvements) were included in a survey to CCAC members, who were asked to rate each item as "Not Important" (1), "Moderately Important" (2), or "Very Important" (3). Judgments were received from 22 individuals representing colleges and universities with teacher preparation programs.<sup>6</sup> Table 5, described below and presented on the next page, includes the CCAC mean rating for several of the additional program improvements available. (As this survey was initiated prior to receipt of proposals, only the improvements specified in the RFP were included in the survey.)

### Available Improvements and Their Costs

Table 5 shows the program improvements offered by NES and their costs. These improvements are in addition to those listed in Part 1, and their costs would be in addition to the costs of the basic package shown in Table 2. The improvements listed in Table 5 include ones that were included in the RFP as well as ones proposed by NES, but do not include the improvements included by NES for no additional cost in the basic package. For each improvement, the table provides the cost of the improvement and, for those specified in the RFP, the CCAC mean importance rating and the rank of that importance rating.<sup>7</sup> Each of the improvements are discussed below.

<sup>6</sup>Staff greatly appreciates the assistance of the CCAC members who responded to the survey, and especially the help of Dr. Mel Hunt, CCAC President, who distributed the survey and collected and tallied the responses.

<sup>7</sup>The CCAC members also rated three improvements that NES will include in the basic package: toll-free access to automated information system (currently a toll call; mean rating 2.19, rank 5), late registration by telephone (currently by mail only; mean rating 2.38, rank 3), and electronic registration services (mean rating 2.41, rank 1).

#### Information Access and Dissemination

1. Toll-free access to examinee service representatives (as opposed to a toll call) every business day.

This improvement would save money for those candidates who call long distance to speak with an NES examinee service representative. It would cost the Commission, however, \$1.78 for each and every examinee (or approximately \$112,000 over the life of the contract), regardless of whether the examinee needed to contact NES by telephone or not. CCAC members rated this improvement as important, probably because it would reduce costs for some candidates, but staff believes that keeping test fees as low as possible for all examinees is more important.

2. Toll-free access to examinee service representatives (as opposed to a toll call) on testing days.

This improvement would save money for those candidates who call long distance to speak with an NES examinee service representative on the day of a test. NES would provide this improvement at no charge to the Commission if the Commission purchased improvement #1 above; otherwise the cost would be \$.65 per examinee, or approximately \$41,000. CCAC members thought this improvement was moderately important. Staff believes that this improvement is not a good value given the limited number of examinees it would benefit.

**Table 5**  
**Additional RICA Program Improvements Available**

Improvement	CCAC Mean Importance Rating (Rank) <sup>8</sup>	Cost	
		Per-Examinee	Estimated Total Contract <sup>9</sup>
1. Toll-free access to examinee	2.41	\$1.78	\$111,600

#### Information Access and Dissemination

1. Toll-free access to examinee

service representatives (as opposed to a toll call) every business day	(2)		
2. Toll-free access to examinee service representatives (as opposed to a toll call) on testing days	1.86 (8)	0 if #1 selected; otherwise .65	0 or 41,000
3. Provide a <i>RICA Faculty and Credential Counselor Manual</i> online		.09	5,700
Test Administration			
4. Add a California test area (metropolitan; 3 have already been added in basic package)	1.81 (9)	1.82	115,000
5. Add a California test area (non-metropolitan)	1.90 (7)	1.45	91,000
6. Add a 7 <sup>th</sup> statewide administration date of the Written Examination	2.30 (4)	18.84	1,200,000
7. Fingerprint examinees at Written Examination test sites		.35	22,000
Scoring			
8. Report Written Examination scores in three weeks (rather than four)	2.10 (6)	16.53	1,040,000

<sup>8</sup>Based on a three-point scale: 1 = Not Important, 2 = Moderately Important, 3 = Very Important. Available only for improvements specified in the RFP. Rankings based on all improvements specified in the RFP; the table includes only those for which NES would charge an additional charge.

<sup>9</sup>Based on an estimate for the Written Examination of 20,000 registrants in 2001-02, 21,000 in 2002-03, and 22,000 in 2003-04, of whom 95 percent become examinees and 5 percent become absentees, and for the Video Performance Assessment of 120 registrants and 90 submissions each year.

3. Provide a *RICA Faculty and Credential Counselor Manual* online.

NES offers to develop and publish on the RICA Website a *RICA Faculty and Credential Counselor Manual* designed to help faculty, credential counselors, and others interpret the

information they receive from the testing program. It would contain program information and examples to assist users in understanding both the individual roster information and the summary data provided to IHEs. This information could help orient faculty and credential counselors to score report information and its use in remediation. NES would make this manual available for \$.09 per examinee, or approximately \$6,000.

Institutions currently receive a report with summary RICA score information accompanied by a brief description of the report. This description could, perhaps, be made more helpful, and staff expects to be able to do this with NES. Because its benefits are not clear, staff believes that the Commission should not add this to the NES contract.

#### Test Administration

4. Add a California test area (metropolitan).
5. Add a California test area (non-metropolitan).

Adding test areas is a good way to increase access to the RICA. CCAC members rated adding test areas as moderately important. NES has already increased the number of test areas, however, from 18 to 21 in the basic package. The Commission could add additional test areas for a cost of \$1.82 per examinee (\$115,000 total) for each metropolitan test area, and \$1.45 per examinee (\$91,000) for each non-metropolitan test area. Staff believes that, given the addition of three new test areas already, adding others is not necessary at this time.

6. Add a seventh statewide administration date of the Written Examination.

Adding test dates is another way to increase access to the exam. This particular improvement, however, is prohibitively expensive (\$18.84 per examinee; \$1,200,000 over the three-year contract). Staff recommends not adding a seventh test date

7. Fingerprint examinees at Written Examination test sites.

NES offers to obtain an image of each examinee's thumbprint on the examinee's answer document. The thumbprint would thus be available, and connected with the answer document, in the event the need to verify the examinee's identification should arise following the test administration. The thumbprint would serve to verify the identity of the person who took the test at the test site. NES would provide this service for \$.35 per examinee, or an estimated total contract cost of \$22,000.

Staff believes that this service is not a good value. Given the large numbers of RICA examinees, there are very, very few whose identity is questioned. Making all examinees provide a thumbprint seems inappropriate and invasive. It would also create an unpleasant affective environment at the test site.

#### Scoring

8. Report Written Examination scores in three weeks (rather than four).

This would be a desirable improvement, rated as moderately important by CCAC members. At a cost of \$16.53 per examinee, however, it is prohibitively expensive. A related improvement that is included in the basic package, online access to scores, will allow examinees to learn their scores 3-4 days earlier than they can now.

---

### Part 3 Proposed 2001-02 RICA Test Fees

Education Code Section 44298 requires that, in the absence of designated appropriations by the Legislature from the Teacher Credentials fund, fees charged for an assessment be sufficient to cover the full cost of the assessment program. Because RICA registration bulletins are developed and published annually, the Commission has an annual opportunity to consider and adopt test fees for the following year. This part of this report discussed proposed test fees for 2001-02.

The current (2000-01) RICA test fees, adopted by the Commission in March 2000, are:

- Written Examination: \$122
- Video Performance Assessment:

Registration:	75
Submission:	145
Total:	220

For each Written Examination test taker, the Commission currently pays NES \$110, leaving a \$12 program management fee to pay for the Commission's other exam-related responsibilities (e.g., salaries, operating expenses, panel costs, etc.) as well to cover the shortfall in revenue from the Video Performance Assessment. This shortfall is because for each Video Performance Assessment submission, the Commission pays NES \$345, which is \$125 less than the amount owed to NES. The Commission set the Video Performance Assessment fees lower than cost to keep that assessment option viable.

Given the contract costs and estimated examinee volumes discussed above, staff recommends the following RICA test fees for 2001-02:

- Written Examination: \$122 (no change from current year)
- Video Performance Assessment:
 

Registration:	50 (down \$25)
Submission:	140 (down \$5)
Total:	190 (down \$30)

Although, for each Written Examination test taker, NES will charge the Commission \$104 (given an estimated 19,000 examinees), the Commission has additional contract costs for the validity study and test development of approximately \$6.50 per examinee (if these costs are spread out over all examinees during the three-year contract). Thus, the contract costs for administration, validity study, and test development will be about the same as they are currently: \$110 per examinee. The \$12 program management fee continues to be needed to cover other Commission costs as well as the revenue shortfall from the Video Performance Assessment, discussed below.

For the Video Performance Assessment, staff recommends reducing the fees as shown above to make this assessment an even more viable option than it is today. Given the estimated numbers of Video Performance Assessment registrations (120) and submissions (90), the recommended fees will result in a modest revenue shortfall of about \$6,800. This amount can be covered within the \$12 program management fee for the Written Examination.

---

## Appendix Background Information

California Education Code Sections 44283 and 44283.2 require the Commission to administer a teacher certification assessment that measures a prospective teacher's knowledge, skills, and abilities relative to effective reading instruction. The Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) was developed to fulfil this legislative mandate, and passage of the RICA is a requirement for most candidates for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials and Education Specialist Instruction Credentials. The RICA includes two assessments: the RICA Written Examination and the RICA Video Performance Assessment. To meet the RICA requirement, candidates are required to pass one of the assessments (their choice).

In October 1997, as a result of a competitive bidding process, the Commission awarded a contract to National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) for the development and administration of the RICA. The RICA Written Examination was administered for the first time on June 20, 1998, and the initial submission deadline for the RICA Video Performance Assessment was July 10, 1998. The contract with NES will expire on October 31, 2001. The last administration under that contract is scheduled for June 9, 2001 (Written Examination). At its October 2000 meeting, the Commission approved releasing a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a contractor to administer the RICA through June 2004, implement a validity study of the RICA content specifications, and develop new RICA test/assessment materials. In December 2000 the RFP was released. Two proposals were received in response to the RFP, one from Educational Testing Service (ETS) and one from National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES).

## Description of the RICA

As required by law, the RICA consists of two assessments: the RICA Video Performance Assessment and the RICA Written Examination. Most candidates for Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials or Education Specialist Instruction Credentials are required to pass one of the assessments (their choice).<sup>10</sup> Both the Written Examination and the Video Performance Assessment are based on the RICA Content Specifications, adopted by the Commission in January 1998. The RICA Content Specifications consist of 43 teacher competencies in the area of reading. The competencies are organized into the following four domains:

- Domain I: Planning and Organizing Reading Instruction Based on Ongoing Assessment
- Domain II: Developing Phonological and Other Linguistic Processes Related to Reading
- Domain III: Developing Reading Comprehension and Promoting Independent Reading
- Domain IV: Supporting Reading Through Oral and Written Language Development

---

<sup>10</sup>Exceptions are (a) candidates who hold valid California teaching credentials other than internship credentials, internship certificates, and emergency permits, (b) candidates who hold valid teaching credentials issued by jurisdictions in the United States other than California, (c) candidates for Education Specialist Instruction Credentials who are applying for Early Childhood Special Education Certificates or Credentials, and (d) candidates for Education Specialist Instruction Credentials who are applying for a Deaf and Hard of Hearing Credential under the provisions for the prelingually deaf.

### The RICA Written Examination

The RICA Written Examination consists of two sections: a constructed-response section and a multiple-choice section. Each is described below. The two sections, together, permit a broad and deep assessment of credential candidates' knowledge about effective reading instruction, and their ability to apply that knowledge.

#### The Constructed-Response Section

This section of the Written Examination includes two types of items for which candidates have to write a response.

Focused educational problems and instructional tasks. These items present problems or tasks in educational contexts, and require candidates to (a) consider information about a class, a group of students, an individual student, or an instructional situation and (b) either devise or provide explanations related to appropriate instructional strategies or assessment approaches. Four focused educational problems and instructional tasks are included on each form of the exam. Each problem or task assesses one or more competencies in one of the four domains, and there is one problem or task for each domain. The problems or tasks for Domains I and IV each require a written response of approximately 50 words. Those for Domains II and III each require a written response of approximately 150 words.

Case study based on a student profile. For this item type, candidates receive substantial background information about a student and samples of materials illustrating the student's reading performance. Candidates are asked to assess the student's reading performance, describe appropriate instructional strategies, and explain why these strategies would be effective. Each exam form has one case study, which includes content related to all four domains of the RICA Content Specifications.

#### The Multiple-Choice Section

Each exam form includes 70 multiple-choice questions: 60 "scorable" questions, which are used to determine a candidate's score, and 10 "nonscorable" questions, which are questions being field-tested that are not used to determine a candidate's score. The multiple-choice questions include both content questions, in which knowledge about reading and reading instruction is directly

assessed, and contextualized questions that assess the candidate's ability to apply specific knowledge, to analyze specific problems, or to conduct specific tasks related to reading instruction. Approximately 20% of the multiple-choice questions assess competencies in Domain I, 30% assess competencies in Domain II, 30% assess competencies in Domain III, and 20% assess competencies in Domain IV.

### The RICA Video Performance Assessment

The design of the RICA Video Performance Assessment allows for candidate choice and the submission of a candidate's best classroom work. It centers on candidate-created videotapes of the candidate teaching reading. Each candidate who elects to take this RICA assessment will create three "Video Packets," each of which includes:

- a completed *Instructional Context Form*, on which the candidate provides information relevant to understanding the videotaped instruction, such as information about the students involved, a lesson plan, and a description of assessment methods and results the candidate used to determine the appropriateness of the planned lesson;
- a ten-minute videotape of the candidate providing reading instruction; and
- a completed *Reflection Form*, on which the candidate provides an appraisal of the videotaped instruction, suggestions for further or alternative instructional strategies, and similar information.

One Video Packet is to be based on whole-class instruction, one on small-group instruction, and the third on individual instruction. In addition, one videotape should demonstrate the candidate's competencies in Domains I and II, one should demonstrate the candidate's competencies in Domains I and III, and one should demonstrate the candidate's competencies in Domains I and IV. A *RICA Video Performance Assessment Information Guide*, which provides a detailed description of the requirements of the Video Performance Assessment and the candidate steps it entails is available to prospective candidates and faculty.

### Administration of the RICA

#### RICA Written Examination

The RICA Written Examination is administered six times per testing year (July 1-June 30) at test sites in 18 areas throughout California. Standard administration dates are on Saturdays; alternative administration dates for examinees who cannot test on Saturdays for religious reasons are on Sundays. During an administration, candidates are given four hours to complete the examination.

Table A-1 on the next page shows the number of RICA Written Examination examinees at each administration since the first administration in June 1998 through the 1999-00 testing year. On average, about five percent of the registrants for each administration become absentees (i.e., registrants who do not show up on the testing date and who haven't withdrawn).

Alternative testing arrangements are available for individuals who cannot take the examination on Saturday due to religious convictions and for individuals who have disabilities. These arrangements include accommodations such as an alternative testing day, additional time, separate testing rooms, special seating arrangements, enlarged-print exam books, large-block answer sheets, sign language interpreters, colored overlays, etc.

#### RICA Video Performance Assessment

Unlike the RICA Written Examination, the RICA Video Performance Assessment is not "administered" on specific dates. Rather, candidates register, complete their assessments on their own, and then submit their completed assessments for scoring. The Video Performance

**Table A-1**  
**RICA Written Examination Examinees (excludes absentees) by Administration**

Year	Aug	Oct	Dec	Feb	April	June	Total
1997-98						731	<b>731</b>
1998-99	701	1,186	2,866	2,103	4,459	4,210	<b>15,525</b>
1999-00	1,433	1,709	2,767	3,108	4,529	4,465	<b>18,011</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,134</b>	<b>2,895</b>	<b>5,633</b>	<b>5,211</b>	<b>8,988</b>	<b>9,406</b>	<b>34,267</b>

Assessment schedule is based on "submission deadlines," dates by which a candidate's Video Packets must be submitted in order to be scored in the subsequent scoring session. In 1998-99 and 1999-00, there were four scoring sessions each year with associated submission deadlines. In 2000-01, there are three submission deadlines.

Candidates register for a specific submission deadline. Upon registration, candidates are sent a packet of materials necessary to complete the assessment. Once registered, a candidate may submit her completed assessment for scoring at any time during that testing year. The assessment is scored at the next regularly scheduled scoring session (assuming the candidate met the submission deadline for that scoring session).

Table A-2 below shows, for each submission deadline, the number of candidates registered and the number of registrants who submitted assessments for scoring, from the first submission deadline through the 1999-00 testing year.

**Table A-2**  
**RICA Video Performance Assessment Registrants and Submissions by Submission Date**

Year	July		Sept		Nov		Dec		March		June		Total	
	Reg.	Sub.	Reg.	Sub.	Reg.	Sub.	Reg.	Sub.	Reg.	Sub.	Reg.	Sub.	Reg.	Sub.
1998-99	19	9					87	43	48	40	39	43	193	135
1999-00			4	2	20	10			39	28	48	40	111	80

## Summary of the Proposal Solicitation Process

### The Request for Proposals

The Executive Director in December 2000 released the *Request for Proposals for Administration, Validity Study, and Development of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)*. The RFP asked bidders to provide detailed plans for completing the scope of work described in the RFP, and evidence of their capacity to perform effectively. The RFP included background information about the RICA, contractual information and requirements, proposal requirements, a description of the proposal review process including the evaluation criteria, several appendices, and descriptions of the two scopes of work summarized below.

#### 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 (February 7, 2001).

#### RFP Part 1: Summary and Primary Participants

Part 1 of the RFP provided a summary of the RFP and descriptions of the primary participants in the project (the Commission, the Commission's Project Officer, the RICA Advisory Panel, and the Bias Review Committee).

#### RFP Part 2: The RICA

Part 2 of the RFP provided background information about the RICA. This section included a summary of the purpose and development of the RICA, a description of the Written Examination and Video Performance Assessment, and information on RICA administration and scoring.

#### RFP Part 3: Scope of Work

Part 3 of the RFP described the scope of the services and products required by the Commission. Part 3A described the scope of work associated with the administration of the RICA, Part 3B described the RICA validity study, and Part 3C discussed contractor responsibilities related to the



development of new RICA exam/assessment materials. Each of these three parts is summarized below.

Part 3A: Administration of the RICA. The responsibilities of the contractor in each of the following areas related to the administration of the RICA through June 30, 2004, were described:

- Security
- Program Communications
- Production of Program Materials
- Registration Policies and Procedures
- Registration Bulletins
- Administration of the Written Examination
- Administration of the Video Performance Assessment
- Alternative Testing/Assessment Arrangements
- Item Data File
- Scoring
- Score Reporting
- Reports
- Retention, Storage, and Destruction of Test Materials and Data

In an effort to obtain program improvements, staff required bidders to include the following in their basic package of services:

- Extend the regular registration period by one week (currently ends six weeks and one day before administration)
- Allow Written Examination registrants to withdraw and receive a refund through the late registration deadline (currently allowed through the regular registration deadline)
- Send Video Performance Assessment materials to those who pay for overnight mailing within two business days (current mailed within one week)
- Mail Video Performance Assessment score reports in four weeks (rather than the current six weeks)

In addition, the RFP strongly encouraged bidders to allow candidates to communicate with NES via both email and fax. Currently only phone and mail communication is provided. Finally, the RFP required bidders to propose additional program improvements. Specific improvements of interest to the Commission were outlined in the RFP, and bidders were encouraged to suggest other improvements in their proposals. Bidders were asked to provide costs, if any, for each of the specified and suggested improvements, and were advised that the quality and cost of these improvements would be considered separately from the basic package.

Part 3B: Implementation of a RICA Validity Study. This part of the RFP described the scope of work related to a validity study of the RICA content specifications. Three primary tasks were described:

- development of preliminary (new) RICA content specifications, which would include a literature review and focus groups;
- implementation of a statewide validity study survey;
- development of final RICA content specifications on the basis of the survey results; and
- development of a comprehensive report of the validity study methodology and results.

Part 3C: Development of New RICA Exam/Assessment Materials. This part of the contractor's scope of work is the development of new RICA exam/assessment materials. The primary goal would be to develop new materials to align the exam and assessment to the new content specifications. Five development steps were described for Written Examination test items:

- determine item needs,
- draft new items,
- present draft items to an advisory panel and the Bias Review Committee,
- revise items as needed on the basis of panel and committee reviews,
- field-test items, and
- finalize the new items.

In addition, potential bidders were informed that they would need to make any changes necessary in the Video Performance Assessment materials to assure their alignment with the revised RICA content specifications.

RFP Part 4: 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 materials, (c) financial arrangements, (d) transition at the conclusion of the contract, (e) priority hiring considerations, and (f) other contract provisions.

#### RFP Part 5: Disabled-Veteran Business Enterprise Participation Requirements and Small Business Preference

Part 5 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. The RFP included information about the participation goals, requirements for documenting a good faith effort, and a required form. In addition, the RFP described the availability of and the qualification requirements for a small business preference.

#### RFP Part 6: 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) a detailed description of how the work would be accomplished, (b) proposed administration, validity study, and test development costs, (c) a description of their corporate capability to carry out the contract, and (d) technical information, including required state forms related to nondiscrimination and a drug-free workplace. Additionally, bidders were required to propose costs for program improvements specified in the RFP as well as any other improvements suggested by the bidder.

#### RFP Part 7: 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 provided on the following pages.)

#### RFP Appendices

The following appendices were included in the RFP:

- A: Notice of Intent to Bid
- B: RICA Content Specifications
- C: RICA Performance Characteristics and Scoring Scales for Constructed-Response Items
- D: RICA Score Report Explanations and Sample Score Reports
- E: Contract Provisions
- F: Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Participation Summary Form (STD 840)
- G: Nondiscrimination Compliance Statement (STD 19)
- H: Drug-Free Workplace Certification (STD 21)

### **Request for Proposals**

### **for Administration, Validity Study, and Development of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)**

#### **Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part I**

Proposal Sponsor: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Compliance with Proposal Requirements**

The Professional Services Division of the Commission will indicate whether or not each of the

following criteria is met by checking "yes" or "no" in the appropriate space. Proposals lacking one or more of the following requirements will not be evaluated further.

- |              |             |  |
|--------------|-------------|--|
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Proposal was received at or before 10:00 a.m. on February 7, 2001, at the offices of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.   |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Ten copies of the proposal were received.  |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | 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<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | 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 6 of the RFP:

- |              |             |  |
|--------------|-------------|--|
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | A Cover Page   |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | A Table of Contents  |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | An Introduction  |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 1: Statement of Work for the Administration of the RICA                        |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 2: Statement of Work for the Implementation of a RICA Validity Study           |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 3: Statement of Work for the Development of New RICA Exam/Assessment Materials |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 4: Validity Study, Test Development, and Invoicing Schedule                    |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 5: Contract Costs  |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 6: Corporate Capability  |
| Yes<br>_____ | No<br>_____ | Section 7: Technical Information   |

**Request for Proposals  
for Administration, Validity Study, and Development of the Reading  
Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA)**

**Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part II**

**Criteria for the Evaluation of Proposals**

	Maximum Score
(1) Administration of the RICA. The proposal provides sound, feasible, and complete plans for the administration of the RICA as described in Part 3A 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.	120
• Security	10
• Program Communications	10
• Production of Program Materials	5

• Registration Policies and Procedures	10
• Registration Bulletins	5
• Administration of the Written Examination	20
• Administration of the Video Performance Assessment	15
• Alternative Testing/Assessment Arrangements	10
• Item Data File	5
• Scoring	15
• Score Reporting	5
• Reports	5
• Retention, Storage, and Destruction of Test Materials and Data	5

(2) Implementation of RICA Validity Study. The proposal provides a sound, feasible, and complete plan for the implementation of a RICA validity study as described in Part 3B of the RFP. Sufficient detail is provided to know what the bidder will do. The proposal presents clear evidence that the bidder will provide a high quality validity study that is both technically and legally defensible. 40

- Task I (Develop Preliminary Specifications) 10
- Task II (Statewide Validity Study) 25
- Task III (Develop Final Specifications and Report) 5

(3) Development of New RICA Exam/Assessment Materials. The proposal provides a sound, feasible, and complete plan for the development of new RICA materials as described in Part 3C 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 development products and services. 25

(4) 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 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. 20

- Corporate experience 10
- Corporate resources 10

(5) 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. 20

- Sound, feasible organizational plan 10

- Qualifications and experience of key staff 10

(6) Contract Costs. The 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. 115

- Per-examinee and per-absentee costs for basic package (Written Examination) 40
- Video Performance Assessment costs 25
- Service fees 15
- Validity study cost 20
- Test development cost 15

(7) Presentation. The proposal is clearly written, to the point, and well-organized. Ideas are presented logically and all requested information is presented skillfully. 10

**Maximum Possible Score 350**

### Release and Distribution of the RFP

On December 29, 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 (a) has done assessment work in the field of teacher certification of which Commission staff is aware, (b) has expressed an interest in receiving RFPs from the Commission in the past, or (c) has been recommended by panel members, Commissioners, staff, or others. In addition, the RFP was advertised on the Electronic California State Contracts Register (ECSCR) and with a RFP clearinghouse known as BidNet. Three additional RFPs were sent to potential bidders who learned about it after it was released, either from BidNet or the ECSCR.

The RFP indicated that proposals were due at the Commission office by 10:00 a.m. on February 7, 2001, and that there would be a Telephone Bidders' Conference on January 11, 2001. 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 prevent a potential bidder from submitting a proposal.) Notices of Intent to Bid were received from two firms, the same two who subsequently submitted proposals.

### Telephone Bidders' Conference and Responses to Written Questions

As indicated in the RFP, Commission staff held a Telephone Bidders' Conference on January 11, 2001. The purpose of the conference was to give potential bidders an opportunity to ask questions about the RFP and the anticipated contract. Representatives from four firms participated in the conference. Commission staff began the conference with an overview of the RFP. Potential bidders then posed, and Commission staff responded to, questions. In addition, as described above in "Key Information for Prospective Bidders," potential bidders submitted written questions. Commission staff responded to all written questions in writing and provided the responses to all firms who had submitted a Notice of Intent to Bid.

### Proposals Received in Response to the RFP

Two proposals were delivered to the Commission in response to the RFP. Proposals were received from:

- Educational Testing Service (ETS) of Princeton, New Jersey
- National Evaluation Systems, Inc., (NES) of Amherst, Massachusetts

After 10:00 a.m. on February 7, 2001, the proposal review process began, as described below.

## The Proposal Review Process and Results

The proposals submitted in response to the RFP were 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 proposals.

### 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. Proposal Review Team members are listed below:

- Nicole Amador  
Assistant Consultant, Examinations and Research Unit  
Professional Services Division
- Bob Carlson  
Administrator, Examinations and Research Unit  
Professional Services Division
- Mark McLean  
Assistant Consultant, Examinations and Research Unit  
Division of Professional Services
- Richard Naccarato  
Consultant, Examinations and Research Unit  
Professional Services Division
- Diane Tanaka  
Assistant Consultant, Examinations and Research Unit  
Professional Services Division

### The Proposal Review Process

#### Proposal Review Stage 1

The first stage of the review focused on the compliance of the bidders with the legal and format requirements specified in the RFP as "Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part I." To be considered responsive to the RFP, the proposals had to conform to these requirements. Staff reviewed the proposals and determined that both proposals met the requirements.

#### Proposal Review Stage 2

The second stage of the proposal review process consisted of independent reviews of the proposals 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. This stage began on February 7, 2001, 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 each proposal. In addition, team members were given and trained to use a Proposal Review Documentation Form. For each evaluation criterion (Part II), the Proposal Review Documentation Form had space for recording an initial score

and any notes, questions, or concerns a team member might have about a bidder's responses. Team members were advised to consider only the basic package of services in determining their scores, not the additional program improvements specified in the RFP or suggested by a bidder unless they were included in the basic package (i.e., unless there was no additional cost for them). Following the February 7 orientation and training meeting, Proposal Review Team members independently read and awarded initial scores to each proposal.

### Proposal Review Stage 3

Stage 3 of the proposal review process began with a meeting of the Proposal Review Team on February 14, 2001. At this meeting, team members shared and discussed the results of their independent reading and initial scoring of each proposal. Team members reported their initial scores for each proposal. This was followed by a discussion of the relative strengths and weaknesses of each proposal. Team members decided to ask one bidder questions about the bidder's proposal. The questions were sent to the bidder in writing, and written responses were received and reviewed. Each team member was given the opportunity to assign a second and final set of scores to each 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. Using the second set of scores, mean criterion scores for each proposal were computed across team members. For each proposal, the mean criterion scores were summed to yield a total score.

### Results of the Proposal Review Process

Table A-3 on the next page shows, for each of the two proposals, the total score and percent of the total score at the conclusion of Stage 3.

**Table A-3**  
**Final Score and Percent of**  
**Total Possible (350) for Each Proposal**

Bidder	Score	%
Educational Testing Service (ETS)	228	65
National Evaluation Systems, Inc., (NES)	296	85

NOTE: Scores and percentages rounded to the nearest whole number.

Working independently during Stage 2 of the proposal review process, each of the Proposal Review Team members judged the NES proposal to be superior to the ETS proposal. This pattern was maintained during Stage 3 as no team member decided to change initial scores. Consequently, the proposal submitted by NES earned the highest final score during Stage 3 of the process: 296 points out of 350 possible (85%). The Proposal Review Team concluded unanimously to recommend that the Commission award the contract to NES.

There were three primary reasons the NES proposal was rated higher than the ETS proposal. First, the NES proposal most strongly addressed the requirements of the RFP by providing complete descriptions of the work that they would do, the services that they would include as part of the contract, and the staff and resources available to NES. In providing this specificity, the NES proposal demonstrated that it was well thought out and indicated a strong understanding of the tasks and issues presented in the RFP. Secondly, the proposal included several program improvements, which are not currently available, as part of the basic package of services at no additional cost to the Commission. These improvements are identified in Part 1 of this report. Finally, the costs proposed by NES were in nearly every case lower than the costs proposed by ETS.



[Return to March 2001 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 March 2001 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:**

March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PERF-2

**Committee:**

Performance Standards

**Title:**

Proposed 2001-02 Test Fees for the Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT) and the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

✓ Action

**Prepared by:**

Mark McLean, Assistant Consultant  
Professional Services Division

### Proposed 2001-02 Test Fees for the Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT) and the (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations

#### Professional Services Division

February 16, 2001

#### Executive Summary

Education Code Sections 44253.8 and 44298 require that, in the absence of designated appropriations from other sources of funds, fees charged for an assessment be sufficient to cover the full cost of the assessment program. Because registration bulletins are developed and published annually, the Commission has the yearly opportunity to consider and adopt test fees for the following year. This report describes the costs associated with development and administration of examinations and recommends tests fees to cover those costs in the 2001-02 testing year for the Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT) and (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations.

#### Fiscal Impact Summary

The costs of administering and developing examinations required for certification will be paid for with examinee fees pursuant to Education Code Sections 44253.8 and 44298.

#### Policy Issues To Be Decided

What test fees should candidates be charged in 2001-2002 for the Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT), and (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations?

#### Recommendations

1. That the Commission adopt the 2001-02 SSAT test fees shown in [Table 1](#) of this report.
2. That the Commission adopt the 2001-02 CLAD/BCLAD test fees shown in [Table 2](#) of this report.

## Overview of this Report

The Commission issues Single Subject Teaching Credentials that authorize the teaching of specific subjects in departmentalized classrooms, typically found in secondary schools. One of the requirements for earning a Single Subject Teaching Credential is verification of subject matter competence. Prospective teachers have two alternative ways to meet this requirement: (a) completion of a Commission-approved program of subject matter preparation for teaching in the subject area, or (b) passage of the Commission-approved subject matter examinations. Education Code Section 44281 requires the Commission to administer subject matter examinations and assessments for the purpose of ensuring minimum levels of subject matter knowledge for teachers who take exams in lieu of completing approved subject matter programs. National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES) administers the twenty-five Single Subject Assessments for Teaching (SSAT) which are used for verifying subject matter competence for Single Subject Teaching Credentials. Education Code Section 44298 requires that, in the absence of designated appropriations by the Legislature from the Teacher Credentials fund, fees charged for the subject matter tests be sufficient to cover the full cost of the assessment program.

California Education Code §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 §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. The (Bilingual) Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD/BCLAD) Examinations, administered by NES, provide one way an individual can complete some of the requirements for the CLAD or BCLAD Certificate. Education Code §44253.8 requires that, in the absence of designated appropriations from other sources of funds, fees charged for these assessments be sufficient to cover the full cost of the testing program.

Because registration bulletins are developed and published annually, the Commission has the yearly opportunity to consider and adopt test fees for the following year. The fees include (a) a fee that registrants pay for each examination to cover the Commission's costs of administering the tests, and (b) a program management fee that registrants pay to cover the Commission's other contract and non-contract costs. This report describes the costs associated with development and administration of these examinations and recommends test fees to cover those costs in the 2001-02 testing year for the SSAT and CLAD/BCLAD Examinations.

## Costs of the SSAT and CLAD/BCLAD Programs

In operating the SSAT and CLAD/BCLAD examination programs, the Commission bears costs in two major categories. The contracted costs category is the largest and is for the test administration and development work performed by NES. The non-contract cost category includes the Commission's other expenses related to these examinations. Details about each of these two cost categories are provided below.

### Contract Costs

The Commission's contracts with NES for the SSAT and CLAD/BCLAD Examinations specify costs in the areas described below.

#### Administration of the Examinations

The Commission pays to NES a fee per test administered that is based upon the total number of tests administered each year. The per-test administration costs pay for:

- assuring the security of the testing process and materials,
- producing all program communications and materials,
- producing annual registration bulletins,
- registering candidates,

- administering the SSAT four times per year and the CLAD/BCLAD tests two times per year,
- providing alternative testing arrangements to candidates with verified disabilities,
- scoring and reporting scores to candidates and the Commission, and
- producing reports.

These costs are to be covered through the fee examinees pay for administration of the examination. Pursuant to the contracts for the SSAT and CLAD/BCLAD Examinations, after each administration in a testing year, the Commission will pay NES a per-test cost that is based on the estimated annual number of tests administered. Following the last administration in a year, when the actual number of tests administered for the year is known, the Commission and NES will reconcile the amount paid to NES. If the number of tests administered in the year falls in a volume range *lower* than expected, the cost per test will be higher than what the Commission had been paying, and the Commission will pay NES the difference. If the number of tests administered in the year falls in a volume range *higher* than expected, the cost per test will be lower than what the Commission had been paying, and NES will reimburse the Commission the difference. For the subsequent year, the per-test payment to NES for each administration will be set based on the estimated annual number of tests in the year ahead.

In addition, for the SSAT, NES charges the Commission a \$15 registration processing fee for each registrant.

### Non-Contract Costs

The Commission incurs additional costs associated with the overall management and administration of these examinations beyond the contract costs described above. Unlike the contract costs, these other costs are not related to examinee volume. The non-contract costs include staff time for managing the programs, monitoring the contracts, and completing other Commission responsibilities related to the testing programs. For the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations, the non-contract costs also include \$3200 annually for providing two additional testing areas.

### SSAT Test Fees

The current twenty-five SSAT exams are comprised of three different test types: (1) multiple-choice only tests, (2) combined multiple-choice/constructed-response tests, and (3) combined multiple-choice/constructed-response language tests. The SSAT subject areas and test types are as follows:

#### Type 1: Multiple-Choice Only Tests

Art, Biology, Chemistry, French, General Science, Literature and English Language, Mathematics, Music, Physical Education, Physics, Spanish, and Social Science

#### Type 2: Multiple-Choice/Constructed-Response Tests

Agriculture, Business, Geoscience, Health Science, Home Economics, and Industrial and Technology Education

#### Type 3: Multiple-Choice/Constructed-Response Language Tests

German, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Punjabi, Russian and Vietnamese

The major SSAT contract cost for the Commission is the per-test cost of test administration charged by NES. These costs are dependent on the type of examination administered and on examinee volume. Type 1 tests are the least expensive to administer, because there are no constructed-response items to administer or score. Type 2 tests are more expensive to administer because of the essays to be administered and scored, and Type 3 tests are the most expensive to administer because there are multiple written and oral responses to administer and score.

As previously discussed, contract costs for administration of the SSAT examinations are dependant upon the number of examinations administered for each of the three types of tests. Staff estimate that the following number of tests, by type, will be administered in 2001-02:

Type 1: 9,918

Type 2: 1,400

Type 3: 176

Contract costs, described above, and estimated test volumes can be used to set examinee test fees for 2001-02 such that the Commission generates sufficient revenue to cover the contract costs and the Commission's other costs of operating the SSAT program. On the basis of the above estimates

of test volumes, recommended test fees for 2001-02 are shown in [Table 1](#). They include (a) a fee for each test, depending on test type, (b) a registration processing fee paid by each registrant regardless of the number of tests to be taken, and (c) a program management fee, paid by each registrant each time s/he registers, regardless of the number of tests for which s/he registers.

Type 1 test	\$57
Type 2 test	77
Type 3 test	104
Registration Processing Fee	15
Program Management Fee	30

The test fees by type are the exact amounts the Commission will owe NES for each test administered given the estimated volumes. These fees represent increases of two dollars each for test Types 1 and 2, and four dollars for test Type 3 from the current fees. These are the first fee increases for these examinations since 1996-97. The \$15 registration processing fee is a contract cost charged to the Commission by NES for each registrant.

The \$30 program management fee is charged to examinees by the Commission pursuant to Education Code §44298 to recover its costs for the development and administration of the subject matter examinations. This is the same fee that has been in place since 1996-97. In this time of teacher shortage and efforts to increase the supply of teachers, staff does not recommend increasing this fee at this time.

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the 2001-02 SSAT test fees shown in [Table 1](#).

### **CLAD/BCLAD Test Fees**

The CLAD/BCLAD Examinations consist of the following series of six examinations:

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

Passage of Tests 1-3 is one way for candidates to meet one of the requirements for the CLAD Certificate. Passage of Tests 1-6 is one way for candidates to meet one of the requirements for the BCLAD Certificate in a specific language of emphasis. Tests 1, 4, and 5 contain multiple-choice questions only. Tests 2 and 3 include multiple-choice and constructed-response items. Test 6 includes tests for listening, speaking, reading, and writing that are available in ten languages.

As with the SSAT, contract costs for administration of the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations are dependent upon the number of examinations administered during the testing year. However, the costs charged the Commission by NES for the CLAD/BCLAD Examinations are based upon the total number of examinations administered during the year regardless of the test type. Based on examinee and test volumes in the past, staff estimates that in 2001-02 approximately 5,000 examinees will take approximately 11,000 tests.

CLAD/BCLAD test fees include (a) per-test fees, which vary by test, and (b) a program management fee, paid by each registrant each time s/he registers, regardless of the number of tests for which s/he registers. The per-test fees should be set at the amounts that NES charges the Commission for test administration. The program management fee should be set to recover the Commission's other program-related costs. [Table 2](#) shows the recommended 2001-02 CLAD/BCLAD Examination fees. These test fees are unchanged from the current fees, and the program management fee is the same fee that has been charged since 1996-97. In an effort to keep certification costs down during the current shortage of teachers, staff does not recommend increasing the program management fee for this testing year.

**Table 2****Recommended CLAD/BCLAD Test Fees for 2001-02**

Program Management Fee	\$18
Test 1	45
Test 2	75
Test 3	75
Test 4	45
Test 5	55
Test 6 - all four	145
Test 6 -Listening	45
Test 6 -Reading	45
Test 6 -Speaking	50
Test 6 -Writing	55

On the basis of the above estimates of costs and examinee volumes, staff recommends that the Commission adopt the CLAD/BCLAD test fees shown in [Table 2](#) for 2001-02.

### Annual Review of Test Fees

The SSAT and CLAD/BCLAD Examination fees adopted by the Commission would be in effect for the 2001-02 testing year. About this time next year (and each subsequent contract year), staff will recommend test fees for the following year, based on the contract costs and on the estimated exam volume by test type.



[Return to March 2001 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 March 2001 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:**

March 7-8, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PERF-3

**Committee:**

Performance Standards

**Title:**

Proposed Request for Proposals for Development of a New Teaching Performance Assessment for Preliminary Credential Candidates

✓ Action

**Prepared by:**

Amy Jackson, Administrator, Teacher Development Professional Services Division

### Proposed Request for Proposals for Development of a New Teacher Performance Assessment for Preliminary Credential Candidates

#### Professional Services Division

March 7, 2001

#### Executive Summary

This report proposes the release of a Request for Proposals for the development of a new Teaching Performance Assessment for Preliminary Teaching Credential Candidates.

#### Fiscal Impact Summary

The costs associated with the preparation of the proposed Request for Proposals and the selection of a contractor can be supported by the Commission's base budget. Title II funds are available to support the development of the Teaching Performance Assessment.

#### Policy Issues To Be Decided

Should the Commission release a Request for Proposals to secure a contractor for the development of a new Teaching Performance Assessment for Preliminary Teaching Credential Candidates?

#### Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Proposals to secure a contractor for the development of a new Teaching Performance Assessment for Preliminary Credential Candidates.

SB 2042 requires that a teaching performance assessment be included in each professional preparation program leading to preliminary Multiple Subject or Single Subject Teaching Credentials. To satisfy this provision of the law, sponsors of the professional preparation programs have three choices: (a) develop and administer their own assessment, which must be approved by the Commission based on Assessment Quality Standards adopted by the Commission, (b) administer the assessment that the law requires the Commission to develop, or (c) ask the Commission to administer the Commission-developed assessment to their candidates. The teaching performance expectations that will be adopted by the Commission will be the bases for all teaching performance assessments developed pursuant to SB 2042.

The teaching performance assessment will primarily be a pedagogical assessment. It will not assess subject matter knowledge directly, but will assess content-specific pedagogy. It is expected that the teaching performance assessment will involve multiple sources of evidence in multiple modalities, assess the teaching performance expectations and generate both formative and summative information to the candidate.

In October 1998, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing approved a general plan for the development of a teaching performance assessment for preliminary credential candidates. The assessment development work was originally proposed in the following three phases:

Phase One: Job Analysis

Phase Two: Validation of Teaching Performance Expectations and Evaluation of Extant Assessments

Phase Three: Development of a Teaching Performance Assessment and Rater Training System

Commission staff, contractors, and task forces have completed several major activities in preparation for the launching of the development of the teaching performance assessment. The Phase One job analysis has been completed and teaching performance expectations (TPEs) were developed. Phase Two, the TPE validity study, will be conducted with teachers, administrators and teacher educators in March with an analysis to be completed by May of 2001. Phase Three, development of a teaching performance assessment, will begin when a Request for Proposals is generated and awarded.

The development of the teaching performance assessment (TPA) will be built on the results of the job analysis and the validity findings completed in the first two phases of work, resulting in a legally defensible assessment for preliminary candidates. The teaching performance assessment will also be based on and consistent with the Assessment Quality Standards, Category E, of the Professional Teacher Preparation standards which will be recommended to the Commission for adoption later this year. (These draft standards were presented to the Commission in February for an in depth discussion.) The third guiding set of documents for development of the TPA are the K-12 student academic content standards and frameworks. An assessor training system will also be developed as part of the Phase Three set of tasks. The assessment and the assessor training system will be field-tested in California, and the results will be used to finalize the assessment and the training system.

### **The Proposed Request for Proposals (RFP)**

Staff proposes that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Proposals to secure a contractor for the development of a new Teaching Performance Assessment for Preliminary Teaching Credential Candidates

As previously indicated, a validity study of Teaching Performance Expectations is currently underway and will be completed by May 2001. Based on this work, the contractor will develop a prototype performance assessment system that will include performance tasks and proficiency scales. Development of the Teaching Performance Assessment will begin with the award of the contract, and assessment development would continue for the duration of the contract. The proposed RFP will consist of multiple performance assessment design tasks that need to be developed. The RFP will include an option for contractors to bid on all tasks of the RFP or on selected tasks depending on their expertise and capacity to work and deliver services, including training, in California. The RFP tasks include developing:

- Performance Assessment Tasks
- Teaching Performance Expectation Scales

- Processes to set passing scores on the Performance Assessment Tasks using the TPE Scales
- A Reporting System to generate formative and summative assessment feedback to candidates
- Training Programs including:
  - Assessor Training: Performance Assessment and Scoring
  - Training of Trainers of Assessors Process
  - How to Administer the Teaching Performance Assessment and Database Management
- Evaluation of the Teaching Performance Assessment System

Each of the tasks are briefly described below.

### **Performance Assessment Tasks**

A series of performance assessment tasks need to be developed to meet specific criteria set out in the SB 2042 legislation. Teacher Preparation institutions must be able to embed the tasks in the flow of instruction. The tasks must measure more than one Teaching Performance Expectation and make use of multiple modes of assessment including observation by an assessor. Because these tasks primarily measure teaching pedagogy, tasks need to be developed to allow candidates to demonstrate their knowledge and ability to teach real students in classroom contexts. Profiles of practice need to be returned to the candidate once a task is completed and scored, which describe formatively, aspects of teaching that they are doing well and clearly defines what they need to improve. In addition to a task's formative purpose, a task must also provide summative feedback about whether or not the candidate met the passing score. All tasks must be field tested and revised based on the evaluation findings. All tasks must have a high level of validity and, therefore, reliability before they are used as part of the system.

### **Teaching Performance Expectation Scales**

A teaching performance expectation scale needs to be developed for each Teaching Performance Expectation. The scales need to define clearly the knowledge, skill and ability a teacher must demonstrate for each level of accomplishment. The scales need to have several levels, have distinctive differences, and provide formative language so that beginning teachers and assessors develop a common knowledge about what teaching performance requires. Scales need to grow in complexity, starting with practice that is novice to practice that is competent. Scales will be used to assess task performance and need to be linked to language and directions for each developed task. All scales must be field tested and revised based on the evaluation findings. All scales must have a high level of validity and, therefore, reliability before they are used as part of the system.

### **Identifying Passing Scores for Performance Tasks**

The contractor will need to develop a process for establishing passing scores for each performance task based on the Teaching Performance Expectation scales. This process must include setting marker performances by a jury of trained, professional, assessors who are currently working in the California Teacher Preparation field and in California Public School districts. In addition, these passing scores must then be used to develop a reliable scoring training that will be used across the state to prepare assessors to consistently and accurately rate teacher performance. The scoring process must generate data in such a manner that it can be easily reported to the Commission, to teacher preparation institutions and candidates.

### **Reporting System**

A reporting system needs to be developed that will be able to systematically and reliably produce formative and summative reports of candidates' performance task scores. A database system will need to be designed that is efficient, makes use of the most accessible technology, and is simple to use and maintain. The system must be able to handle all data generated from the assessment for a given year in California and across years. A training system will also have to be designed to assist institutions in using the database system and in how to maintain the system. It must be able to produce reports for candidates about their individual task assessments. Each candidate will need a record that documents their progress in the learning to teach credentialing system. Issues of privacy will need to be examined closely and appropriate steps taken to ensure a system that will be secure. The system should be able to link to other existing database systems currently used to support teachers in California.

### **Teacher Performance Assessment Training Programs**



The contractor will need to develop efficient yet reliable training for assessors. These trainings need to include appropriate professional development activities and methods that best support adult learning. The training will need to make use of video tape and other technologies that will provide opportunities to calibrate scorers across California. Each assessor will need to demonstrate that they are competent and consistent as they score a series of teacher performance tasks. The training will need to include clear criteria by which assessors are judged and certified to be a TPA assessor.

#### *Training of Trainers of Assessors Process*

In order to quickly make the assessment system accessible to institutions, a training of trainers model will need to be put into practice. This calls for a training process that can be delivered to the field by certified state trainers. This training would be similar to the TPA assessor training but would extend to include training on how to be a trainer and how to maintain high quality and reliable scoring.

#### *How to Administer the Teaching Performance Assessment (for teacher preparation institutions)*

This training needs to be developed to offer support to institutions so that they can become the administrator of the Teaching Performance Assessment system. Each institution will have to have assessors and be able to offer the tasks to candidates in a timely and appropriate manner. Administration will need to be equitable and fair. The Institution will need to train staff, embed the tasks in their curriculum and provide opportunities for candidates to refute their scores. They will also need to be able to maintain the reporting system that will be necessary for the TPA system. As a part of the training, institutions should receive training on how to manage the state designed database system to assist with tracking and reporting candidates scores to all appropriate stakeholders.

### **Teaching Performance Assessment System Evaluation**

An evaluation system will need to be developed in order to understand how the TPA is being implemented and what long term effects it may have on the learning to teach system. It should also assist with ongoing design issues related to the teaching performance assessment tasks and scales. Each training will need to have an evaluation component. Both formative and summative evaluation methodologies should be employed.

### **Preliminary Timeline for the Release of the RFP and Development of the new Teaching Performance Assessment for Preliminary Teaching Credential Candidates**

- 3/01 Release RFP
- 6/01 Commission awards contract (potentially to multiple contractors)
- 7/01 Commission adopts revised TPEs and program standards
- 7/01-7/02 Assessment development begins
- 02/03 assessment year First administration of the new Teaching Performance Assessment for Preliminary Teaching Credential Candidates.

