



- 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

**April 12, 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.

**THURSDAY, April 12, 2001**  
*Commission Office*

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

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

**2. General Session**

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)

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

- GS-1 Roll Call
  - GS-2 Pledge of Allegiance
  - GS-3 Approval of the March 2001 Minutes
  - GS-4 Approval of the April 2001 Agenda
  - GS-5 Approval of the April 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
  - GS-10 Committee of Credential Application Extension
- 

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

---



FPPC-  
1

Update on the Governor's Budget for Fiscal Year 2001-2002

---

#### 5. Preparation Standards Committee of the Whole (Chair Katzman)

---



PREP-  
1

Proposed Amendments to Sections 80105-80116 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to the Child Development Permit

---

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

---



PERF-  
1

Recommended Award of a Contract for the Development and Validation of Subject Matter Requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, Mathematics, Science and Social Science

---

#### 7. 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

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)

---

#### 8. Public Hearing

11:30  
a.m.



PH-1

Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Regulations, §80487, Pertaining to the CBEST Fees

---

## 9. Reconvene General Session (Chair Bersin)

---

**GS-11** Report of the Appeals and Waivers Committee

**GS-12** Report of Closed Session Items

**GS-13** Commissioners Reports

**GS-14** Audience Presentations

Old Business

**GS-15**     • Quarterly Agenda for Information  
April and May and June 2001

**GS-16** New Business

**GS-17** Adjournment

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **NEXT MEETING**

**May 2-3, 2001**

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

*Join us for the  
Day of the Teacher  
and the Commission's 30th Anniversary Celebration*



[Return to Agenda Archives](#)

[Top](#) | [CA Home Page](#) | [Governor's Home Page](#) | [About the Commission](#) | [Credential Information](#) | [Examination Information](#)

[Coded Correspondence](#) | [Credential Alerts](#) | [Educational Standards](#) | [Reports-on-Line](#) | [Committee on Accreditation](#)

[Troops to Teachers](#) | [Other Sites of Interest](#) | [Home](#)



[CA Home Page](#)

[Governor's Home Page](#)

[About the Commission](#)

[Credential Information](#)

[Examination Information](#)

[Coded Correspondence](#)

[Credential Alerts](#)

[Educational Standards](#)

[Reports-on-Line](#)

[Committee on Accreditation](#)

[Troops to Teachers](#)

[Other Sites of Interest](#)

[Return to April 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:

April 12, 2001

### Agenda Item Number:

FPPC-1

### Committee:

Fiscal Planning and Policy

### Title:

Update on the Governor's Budget for Fiscal Year 2001-2002

✓ Information

### Prepared by:

Sandy Cook, Analyst  
Fiscal and Business Services

## BACKGROUND

In March 2001, the Commission's portion of the 2001-2002 Governor's Budget was considered in hearings before Assembly and Senate Budget Subcommittees. This information item provides the Commissioners with an update concerning the status of the 2001-2002 Governor's Budget as it pertains to the Commission's budget.

## SUMMARY

The following is a summary of recent legislative actions on the Commission's budget:

- Both the Assembly and Senate Budget Subcommittees have adopted supplemental report language recommended by the Legislative Analyst's Office that would require the Commission to report to the Legislature by December 1, 2001, on various efforts related to improving the teacher-credentialing process. This report is part of the Legislature's oversight of the Commission's progress in implementing the recommendations contained in the March 2000 management study.
- The Assembly Budget Subcommittee directed Commission staff to submit a written report by late-April 2001 concerning the Commission's plans for measuring and monitoring specific customer service improvements related to credentialing processing.
- The Assembly Budget Subcommittee expressed intent to (1) adopt trailer bill language eliminating credential renewal requirements, (2) augment the Commission's 2001-2002 budget from the General Fund to offset the resulting revenue loss, (3) abolish an unspecified number of staff positions that are currently devoted to credential renewal activities, and (4) augment the Commission's budget with additional staff positions to reduce credential processing time to 50 days.
- In reference to the request for two new staff positions and Attorney General contract funds to address increased disciplinary workload in the Division of Professional Practices, the Assembly Budget Subcommittee directed the Commission to identify (1) appropriate outcome measures related to the proposed use of these resources and (2) possible improvements that would result if additional resources were provided

beyond the requested amount.

- Although the Senate Budget Subcommittee adopted the Commission's budget as proposed, the Assembly Budget Subcommittee deferred action on the Commission's proposed budget until subsequent hearings in April 2001.



[Return to April 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 April 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:**

April 12, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PREP-1

**Committee:**

Preparation Standards

**Title:**

Proposed Amendments to Sections 80105 - 80116 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to the Child Development Permit

✓ Action

**Prepared by:**

Phyllis Jacobson, Ed.D., Consultant and  
Nadine Noelting, Consultant  
Professional Services Division

### Proposed Amendments to Sections 80105-80116 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Pertaining to the Child Development Permit

#### Professional Services Division

April 11, 2001

#### Executive Summary

Last year, the Commission approved a modification of the Child Development Permit structure to establish a Child Development Permit with a School-Age Emphasis option. The purpose of this emphasis option within the existing Permit structure was to allow child development personnel working in programs serving school age children to become better prepared to meet the needs of school age youth. This report provides background information about the School-Age Emphasis option, as well as about other minor amendments to the existing Child Development Permit regulations contained within Title 5, Sections 80105-80116, of the California Code of Regulations, and requests approval to schedule a public hearing on the proposed amendments to Title 5 pertaining to the Child Development Permit.

#### Fiscal Impact Summary

The Commission's base budget includes resources to support the activities relating to the Child Development Permit. No augmentation of the budget is needed to carry out the recommended Title 5 amendments process.

#### Policy Issues To Be Decided

Should the Commission approve the recommended amendments to Title 5, Sections 80105-80116, of the California Code of Regulations, and schedule a public hearing on these proposed amendments?

### **Recommendation**

That the Commission approve the suggested amendments to Title 5, Sections 80105-80116 of the California Code of Regulations, pertaining to the Child Development Permit, and schedule a public hearing on these proposed amendments.

### **Background Information**

The Commission has issued teaching and supervision permits for individuals working in state-funded child development programs since the 1960s. The recent proliferation of programs enrolling school-age children has brought about changes in the nature of the responsibilities of persons working in before-school, after-school and other school-age child care programs. The knowledge, skills, and abilities required to work effectively with school-age children go beyond what has been covered in the Child Development Permit structure.

In order to address the educational needs of persons preparing to work primarily with school age children, the Commission approved last year, a School-Age Emphasis option within the existing Child Development Permit structure. The School-Age Emphasis option allows candidates for all levels of the Child Development Permit to take required coursework that covers the developmental, social, and academic needs of children and youth ages birth through fourteen.

### **Individuals Mandated to Obtain the Proposed Child Development Permit with a School-Age Emphasis**

Individuals mandated to obtain a Child Development Permit with School-Age Emphasis would be those persons who do not presently hold a current valid Child Development Permit but who will be working with school age children within a program requiring a permit under the California Code of Regulations, Title 5.

It is estimated by the California Department of Education that the proposed Child Development Permit with School-Age Emphasis might ultimately affect individuals in more than 1,500 teaching and administrative positions in school-age programs governed by Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations.

### **Proposed Title 5 Regulations and Amendments to Update Current Regulations**

Title 5 regulations are now being proposed to implement the Commission's new School-Age Emphasis option within the existing Child Development Permit structure. The new School-Age Emphasis coursework option will focus primarily on young adolescent development and behavior, on the state's adopted K-12 student academic standards and curriculum content, and on the development of the academic tutoring skills of the Permit holders in order to assist students with their studies. The new permit structure will become effective in the year 2001.

In addition, staff is also recommending other minor amendments to the current Title 5 regulations, sections 80105-80116, pertaining to the Child Development Permit, in order to update these regulations, as follows:

- Section 80105:  
language is suggested to specify that coursework pursuant to the Child Development Permit must be of a non-remedial nature, and carry at least 3 semester or 4 quarter units of credit. This amendment will assure the quality and the depth of the training received by Child Development Permit candidates, and will help to standardize the amount of training received across all Child Development Permit preparation programs.

language is suggested to define the core coursework applicable to the School-Age Emphasis option.

language is suggested to specify that a holder of the Child Development Permit, Associate Teacher level, is authorized to supervise an aide. This

amendment will help address staffing shortages within child development programs.

language is suggested to define the term "School-Age Emphasis."

- Sections 80111-80115:  
language is suggested to clarify the School-Age Emphasis option requirements within each level of the Child Development Permit.

## Recommendations

Staff recommends:

(a) That the Commission approve the proposed new Title 5 regulations, and the proposed amendments to current Title 5 regulations, Sections 80105-80116, pertaining to the Child Development Permit; and

(b) That the Commission approve the scheduling of a Public Hearing on the proposed changes to Title 5 regulations, Sections 80105-80116, pertaining to the Child Development Permit.

A copy of the proposed Title 5 regulations follows below:

### §80105. Definitions.

As used in this article, each of the following terms has the meaning herein shown:

- "Child Development Permit" means any permit issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing which authorizes service in the care, development and instruction of children in a child care and development program. Child Development Permits were formerly referred to as Children's Center Permits.
- "Child care and development program" means any state licensed center-based child care and development program operated by a person, association, organization or school district legally authorized to conduct such programs.
- "General education" means course work from a regionally accredited institution of higher education in subject areas other than early childhood education and/or child development. The candidate must have earned a "C" or above in each course to be accepted.
- "Supervised field experience" means instruction performed in a child care and development program for college credit which is supervised by a person approved by a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
- "Early childhood education/child development course work" means college course work from a regionally accredited institution of higher education primarily related to children ages five years or younger. Twenty-five percent of the course work may be extended to cover children ages five to, and including, eight years. The candidate must have earned a "C" grade or above in each course to be accepted. The coursework cannot be remedial and each course must be three semester units, or four quarter units. "Non-remedial" coursework for the purposes of this section shall be defined as coursework that is applicable toward an associate of arts degree or higher at a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
- "Commission approved alternative education programs" means training which occurs outside of a regionally accredited institution of higher education that has been approved by the Commission to meet all or part of the requirements for obtaining a Child Development Permit. Commission approved alternative education programs must meet criteria established by the Commission in consultation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction in order to be applied toward the Permit.
- "Child Development Associate (CDA) credential" means a nationally recognized certificate issued by the CDA Credentialing Commission in Washington DC.
- "Professional growth" means participation in activities that contribute to a permit holder's competence, performance or effectiveness in the early childhood profession. Such activities may include but are not limited to college or university coursework,



conferences, workshops, institutes, academies, symposia, and staff development programs.

- (i) "Core areas" means individual courses or training in each of the following areas:
  - (1) child and/or human development;
  - (2) child, family and community or child and family relations; and
  - (3) programs and curriculum.
- (j) "Aide" means an individual who cares for and assists in the development and instruction of children under the supervision of a CDP Associate Teacher, Child Development Permit (CDP) Teacher, CDP Master Teacher, CDP Site Supervisor, or CDP Program Director. An aide may not be supervised by a CDP Associate Teacher or CDP Assistant. An aide is not required to hold a Child Development Permit.
- (k) "Adult supervision coursework" means a course that helps Child Development Permit candidates develop knowledge and skills for effective communication with and supervision of adults.
- (l) "Accredited Home Economics Related Occupations (HERO) program" means a high school training program that is certified by the Home Economics Education Unit, California Department of Education, and uses curriculum developed by the Home Economics Education Unit to train secondary students to serve as aides or assistants in a child care and development program. Such training qualifies an individual to obtain a Child Development Assistant Permit.
- (m) "Regional Occupational Program (ROP)" means a program designed to prepare secondary students or adults in one of a variety of occupations. When such training is in child development related occupations, it may be used to qualify an individual to obtain a Child Development Assistant Permit.
- (n) "School-age emphasis" means that the permit holder has completed coursework relating to children and youths from birth to age 14. The coursework cannot be remedial and each course must be three semester units, or four quarter units.
- (n) "Program year" means 175 days of three or more hours per day working in a child care and development program.
- (o)

#### **§80106. Filing of Credentials Deemed Permits.**

- (a) Submission of Application. Each applicant for a Child Development Permit of any type or for any renewal thereof shall submit an application to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, or to the Office of the County or District Superintendent of Schools of the county in which the applicant is employed.
- (b) Application Form. An application for a Child Development Permit shall be submitted on the application form, Application for Credential Authorizing Public School Service (form 4104, rev XX), furnished by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and shall be accompanied by all of the following:
  - (1) If the applicant does not already have fingerprint clearance on file with the Commission, the permit application must include duplicate personal identification cards as specified in Section 80442 and form Application for Character and Identification Clearance (form 41-CIC, rev 9-95).
  - (2) The fees as specified in Section 80487(a).

#### **§80107. Application Procedure and Date of Issuance of a Permit.**

- (a) Submission of Application. Each applicant for a Child Development Permit of any type or for any renewal thereof shall submit an application to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, or to the Office of the County or District Superintendent of Schools of the county in which the applicant is employed.
- (b) Application Form. An application for a Child Development Permit shall be submitted on the application form, Application for Credential Authorizing Public School Service (form 4104, rev XX), furnished by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and shall be

accompanied by all of the following:

- (1) If the applicant does not already have fingerprint clearance on file with the Commission, the permit application must include duplicate personal identification cards as specified in Section 80442 and form Application for Character and Identification Clearance (form 41-CIC, rev 9-95).
  - (2) The fees as specified in Section 80487(a).
  - (3) Official transcripts listing required college and university course work appropriate to the permit requested.
  - (4) Verification of training completed through Commission approved non-college based training, if appropriate to the permit requested.
  - (5) For each permit requiring experience, the application shall be accompanied by original letters, from authorized persons having knowledge of the facts, verifying the dates and nature of the experience claimed.
- (c) Date of Issuance. If all requirements for a permit are met by the date an application is filed, the permit will be dated as of that date, and that date will be the date of issuance. If further requirements are needed, then the date of issuance will be the date on which all necessary requirements have been met.
- (d) No Renewal of Expired Permit. An expired permit shall not be renewed. However, if an applicant with an expired permit meets all of the renewal requirements and submits an application and fee, the permit shall be reissued as of the date of filing.
- (e) Failure to Meet Renewal Requirements. In the event the holder of a permit fails to meet the renewal requirements for that permit he/she will be required to meet any new requirements that have been adopted subsequent to the initial date of issuance, unless an extension is granted pursuant to Section 80523.
- (f) Reduced Fee for Early Renewal. When a Permit holder completes all of the requirements for a higher level of the Child Development Permit within three years of the date of initial issuance, he/she may submit an application for renewal and the original unexpired permit and pay half the renewal fee.

#### **§80108. Character Requirement. Repealed**

#### **§80109. Levels of the Permit.**

- (a) The Commission on Teacher Credentialing shall issue the Child Development Permit for service in child care and development programs at the following levels:
- (1) Child Development Assistant Permit.
  - (2) Child Development Associate Teacher Permit.
  - (3) Child Development Teacher Permit.
  - (4) Child Development Master Teacher Permit.
  - (5) Child Development Site Supervisor Permit.
  - (6) Child Development Program Director Permit.
- (b) All permits may have a "School-Age Emphasis added to them when the individual takes half of his/her coursework in school-age requirements
- (c) All valid permits for service in a child care and development program issued prior to the effective date of this section shall continue in force and may be renewed as prescribed for each specific type of permit at the time it was issued. Upon request of the applicant, permits issued under prior regulations may be evaluated for the appropriate permit level under current regulations.
- (d) Individuals holding permits issued under previous regulations who did not complete the renewal requirements specified for that type of permit may reapply under current regulations.
- (e) Effective thirty days after these regulations become effective, the Commission on
- (d) Teacher Credentialing will no longer issue life permits.

## **§80110. Child Development Assistant Permit.**

- (a) Requirements. Each applicant for a Child Development Assistant Permit shall comply with the procedure prescribed for application in Section 80107 and shall meet one of the following:
  - (1) Completion of six (6) semester units of early childhood education or child development coursework;
  - (2) Completion of an accredited secondary Home Economics Related Occupations (HERO) program supported by local, federal, or Regional Occupational Center/Program (ROC/P) funds or Regional Occupational Program (ROP) in Child Development Related Occupations; or
  - (3) Completion of equivalent training approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Equivalent training may include traditional coursework taken through a regionally accredited institution of higher education and Commission approved alternative education programs.
- (b) An individual may apply for this permit with a "School-age emphasis" by completing half of his/her units in school-age coursework.
- (c) Term and Renewal. The Child Development Assistant permit shall be issued for five (b) years and may be renewed for a five year period upon submission of the following:
  - (1) an application for renewal;
  - (2) required fees; and
  - (3) verification of completion of 105 hours of professional growth.
- (d) Authorization. The Child Development Assistant Permit authorizes the holder to care for (c) and assist in the development and instruction of children in a child care and development program under the supervision of a CDP Associate Teacher, CDP Teacher, CDP Master Teacher, CDP Site Supervisor, or CDP Program Director.

## **§80111. Child Development Associate Teacher Permit.**

- (a) Requirements. Each applicant for a Child Development Associate Teacher Permit shall comply with the procedure prescribed for application in Section 80107 and shall meet one of the following:
  - (1) All of the following:
    - (A) Completion of a minimum of 12 semester units of coursework in early childhood education/child development (exclusive of field work used to satisfy Section 80111 a. 1. B) including at least one course in each of the following core areas: child/human growth and development; child, family and community, or child and family relations; programs/curriculum; and
    - (B) Fifty days of experience in an instructional capacity in a child care and development program, working at least three hours per day within the last two years.
  - (2) Completion of the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential.
  - (3) Completion of equivalent training approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Equivalent training may include traditional coursework taken through a regionally accredited institution of higher education and Commission approved alternative education programs.
- (b) An individual may apply for this permit with a "school-age emphasis" by completing half of his/her units in school-age coursework.
- (c) Term and Renewal. A Child Development Associate Teacher Permit shall only be (b) renewed once, and may only be held for a total of ten years. Upon expiration of the renewed Child Development Associate Teacher Permit, the applicant must qualify for the Child Development Teacher Permit.

- (1) In order to renew the Child Development Associate Teacher Permit, the applicant must have completed at least fifteen (15) semester units toward the Child Development Teacher Permit.
  - (2) At the end of the five year renewal period, the applicant must meet all requirements for a Child Development Teacher Permit. The Child Development Associate Teacher Permit may not be renewed a second time.
  - (3) An application for renewal must be accompanied by the required fees and verification that all renewal requirements have been met.
- (d) Authorization. A Child Development Associate Teacher Permit authorizes the holder to
- (c) provide service in the care, development, and instruction of children in a child care and development program, and supervise a Child Development Assistant Permit holder and an aide.

### **§80112. Child Development Teacher Permit.**

- (a) Requirements. Each applicant for a Child Development Teacher Permit shall comply with the procedure prescribed for application in Section 80107 and shall meet one of the following:
- (1) All of the following:
    - (A) Completion of twenty-four semester units of course work in early childhood education/child development including at least one course in each of the following core areas: child/human growth and development; child, family and community, or child and family, relations; programs/curriculum. Either of the following may be used to partially meet the 24-semester units requirements:
      1. A two- or three-semester unit supervised field work course, including both the field and course work components, may be used toward the required 24 early childhood education/child development semester units, but the same field work course may not be used to meet the experience requirement listed in Section 80112(a)(1)(B).
      2. Successful completion of the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential, which may be used for nine semester units of credit toward the required 24 semester units.
    - (B) Completion of 175 days of experience in an instructional capacity in a child care and development program, working at least three hours per day within the last four years.
    - (C) Completion of sixteen diversified semester units in general education (i.e., at least one course in each of the following areas: Humanities and/or Fine Arts, Social Sciences, Math and/or Science, and English/Language Arts).
  - (2) Completion of an associate degree or higher in early childhood education or child development or a related field, with a three (3) semester unit supervised field experience in an early childhood education setting.
  - (3) Completion of equivalent training approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Equivalent training may include traditional coursework taken through a regionally accredited institution of higher education and Commission approved alternative education programs.
- (b) An individual may apply for this permit with a "school-age emphasis" by completing half of his/her units in school-age coursework.
- (c) Term and Renewal. The Child Development Teacher Permit shall be issued for five
- (b) years and renewed for successive five year periods upon submission of:
- (1) an application for renewal;
  - (2) required fees; and
  - (3) verification of completion of 105 hours of professional growth.
- (d) Authorization. A Child Development Teacher Permit authorizes the holder to provide
- (c) service in the care, development, and instruction of children in a child development

program, and supervise a Child Development Permit Associate Teacher, a Child Development Permit Assistant, and an aide.

### §80113. Child Development Master Teacher Permit.

(a) Requirements. Each applicant for a Child Development Master Teacher Permit shall comply with the procedure prescribed for application in Section 80107 and shall meet one of the following:

(1) All of the following:

(A) Completion of twenty-four semester units of course work in early childhood education/child development including at least one course in each of the following core areas: child/human growth and development; child, family and community, or child and family, relations; programs/curriculum. Either of the following may be used to partially meet the required units:

1. A two- or three-semester unit supervised field work course, including both the field and course work components, may be used toward the required 24 early childhood education/child development semester units, but the same field work course may not be used to meet the experience requirement listed in Section 80113(a)(1)(E).
2. Successful completion of the Child Development Associate (CDA) Credential, which may be used for nine semester units of credit toward the required 24 semester units.

(B) Completion of sixteen diversified semester units in general education (i.e., at least one course in each of the following areas: Humanities and/or Fine Arts, Social Sciences, Math and/or Science, and English/Language Arts).

(C) Completion of six (6) additional semester units in an area of specialization which may include but is not limited to the following:

1. Infant and toddler care;
2. Bilingual and bicultural development;
3. Children with exceptional needs;
4. Preschool programming;
5. Parent/teacher relations;
6. Child health; and
7. Specific areas of developmentally appropriate curriculum.

(D) Completion of two (2) semester units of adult supervision coursework.

(E) Completion of 350 days of experience in an instructional capacity in a child care and development program, working at least three hours per day within the last four years.

(2) Completion of a baccalaureate degree or higher with twelve (12) or more semester units of early childhood education or child development coursework, and a three (3) unit supervised field experience in an early childhood education setting.

(3) Completion of equivalent training approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Equivalent training may include traditional coursework taken through a regionally accredited institution of higher education and Commission approved alternative education programs.

(b) An individual may apply for this permit with a "school-age emphasis" by completing half of his/her units in school-age coursework.

(c) Term and Renewal. The Child Development Master Teacher Permit shall be issued for (b) five years and renewed for five year periods upon submission of the following:

- (1) an application for renewal,
- (2) required fees, and
- (3) verification of completion of 105 hours of professional growth.

- (d) Authorization. A Child Development Master Teacher Permit authorizes the holder to
- (c) provide service in the care, development, and instruction of children in a child care and development program, and supervise a Child Development Permit Teacher, a Child Development Permit Associate Teacher, a Child Development Permit Assistant, and an aide. A Child Development Master Teacher Permit also authorizes the holder to serve as a coordinator of curriculum and staff development in a child care and development program.

#### §80114. Child Development Site Supervisor Permit.

- (a) Requirements. Each applicant for a Child Development Site Supervisor Permit shall comply with the procedure prescribed for application in Section 80107 and shall meet one of the following:
  - (1) All of the following:
    - (A) Completion of an associate degree or 60 semester units, with at least twenty-four (24) units of early childhood education or child development, including the core courses of child and/or human development; child, family and community; and programs and curriculum.
    - (B) Completion of six (6) additional semester units of coursework in the administration and supervision of child care and development programs. These six units must include at least two different courses. One course shall be introductory and one course shall be advanced, or they must be courses of different topical content.
    - (C) Completion of two (2) semester units of adult supervision coursework.
    - (D) Completion of 350 days of experience in an instructional capacity in a child care and development program, working at least three hours per day within the last four years. Experience must include at least 100 days of supervising adults in a child care and development program.
  - (2) Completion of a baccalaureate degree or higher with twelve (12) or more semester units of early childhood education or child development coursework, and a three (3) unit supervised field experience in an early childhood education setting.
  - (3) An Administrative Services credential authorizing services in public schools in California, with twelve (12) semester units of early childhood education or child development coursework and a three (3) semester unit supervised field experience.
  - (4) A current credential issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing authorizing teaching service in a self-contained classroom or a secondary teaching credential in home economics, with twelve (12) semester units of early childhood education or child development coursework and a three (3) semester unit supervised field experience.
  - (5) Completion of equivalent training approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Equivalent training may include traditional coursework taken through a regionally accredited institution of higher education and Commission approved alternative education programs.
- (b) An individual may apply for this permit with a "school-age emphasis" by completing half of his/her units in school-age coursework.
- (c) Term and Renewal. The Child Development Site Supervisor Permit shall be issued for
- (b) five years and renewed for successive five year periods upon submission of:
  - (1) an application for renewal;
  - (2) required fees; and
  - (3) verification of completion of 105 hours of professional growth.
- (d) Authorization. A Child Development Site Supervisor Permit authorizes the holder to
- (c) supervise a child care and development program operating at a single site, provide service in the care, development, and instruction of children in a child care and development program, and serve as a coordinator of curriculum and staff development in a child care and development program.

## **§80115. Child Development Program Director Permit.**

- (a) Requirements. Each applicant for a Child Development Program Director Permit shall comply with the procedure prescribed for application in Section 80107 and shall meet one of the following options:
- (1) All of the following:
    - (A) Completion of a baccalaureate degree with at least twenty-four (24) units of early childhood education or child development, including the core areas of child and/or human development; child, family and community; and programs and curriculum;
    - (B) Completion of six (6) additional semester units of coursework in the administration and supervision of child care and development programs. These six units must include at least two different courses. One course shall be introductory and one course shall be advanced, or they must be courses of different topical content.
    - (C) Completion of two (2) semester units of adult supervision coursework.
    - (D) Child Development Site Supervisor status, with at least one program year of site supervisor experience.
  - (2) A master's degree or higher in Child/Human Development, Early Childhood Education or closely related field.
  - (3) An Administrative Services credential authorizing services in public schools in California, with twelve (12) semester units of early childhood education or child development coursework and a three (3) semester unit supervised field experience.
  - (4) A current credential issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing authorizing teaching service in a self contained classroom or a secondary teaching credential in home economics, with twelve (12) semester units of early childhood education or child development coursework, three (3) semester units in a supervised field experience, and six additional semester units in administration of early childhood education or child development.
  - (5) Completion of equivalent training approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Equivalent training may include traditional coursework taken through a regionally accredited institution of higher education and Commission approved alternative education programs.
- (b) An individual may apply for this permit with a "school-age emphasis" by completing half of his/her units in school-age coursework.
- (c) Term and Renewal. The Child Development Program Director Permit shall be issued for
- (b) five years and renewed for successive five year periods upon submission of all of the following:
- (1) an application for renewal;
  - (2) required fees; and
  - (3) verification of completion of 105 hours of professional growth.
- (d) Authorization. A Child Development Program Director Permit authorizes the holder to
- (c) supervise a child care and development program operated in a single or multiple sites, provide service in the care, development, and instruction of children in a child care and development program, and serve as a coordinator of curriculum and staff development in a child care and development program.

## **§80116 Procedures for Denial, Private Admonition, Public Reproval, Suspension and Revocation.**

All proceedings for the denial, private admonition, public reproval, suspension or revocation of permits authorizing service in children's centers or child development programs are governed by the laws and regulations that govern the denial, private admonition, public

reproval, suspension or revocation of a credential.



[Return to April 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 April 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:**

April 12, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PERF-1

**Committee:**

Performance Standards

**Title:**

Recommended Award of a Contract for the Development and Validation of Subject Matter Requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, Mathematics, Science and Social Science

✓ Action

**Prepared by:**

Richard Naccarato, Ph.D., Consultant  
Professional Services Division

### Recommended Award of a Contract for the Development and Validation of Subject Matter Requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, Mathematics, Science and Social Science

#### Professional Services Division

March 23, 2001

#### Executive Summary

In February 2001, following approval by the Commission, the Executive Director released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a contractor to develop and validate subject matter requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, mathematics, science and social science. It has become necessary to update the subject matter requirements in these four areas in order to bring the Commission's subject matter examinations and program standards into better alignment with recently-developed California K-12 student content standards and curriculum frameworks. This report recommends that a contract be awarded for this work to the American Institutes for Research (AIR) as a result of a competitive bidding process.

This report includes a summary of the proposed contract for the above work to be done, some background information on the subject matter requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials, and a summary of the proposal solicitation and evaluation process.

#### Fiscal Impact Summary

The Commission has spending authority in its current budget to pay for the development and validation of subject matter requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, mathematics, science and social science. Pursuant to Education Code Section 44298, the costs of the proposed contract will be paid for with examinee fees.

#### Policy Issue To Be Decided

Should the Commission award a contract to the American Institutes for Research (AIR) for the development and validation of subject matter requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, mathematics, science and social science?

### Recommendation

That the Commission authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract for the development and validation of subject matter requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, mathematics, science and social science, as described in Part 1 of this report and summarized below.

- Contract Number TCC-0045
- Contractor The American Institutes for Research (AIR)
- Contracting Period Upon approval by the Department of General Services, through April 30, 2002
- Purpose of Contract To develop and validate subject matter requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, mathematics, science and social science
- Method of Procurement Request for Proposals
- Total Contract Amount \$475,399
- Source of Funding Examinee fees

### Overview of this Report

In February 2001, the Executive Director released a Request for Proposals (RFP) for the development and validation of subject matter requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, mathematics, science and social science. Proposals were due on March 12, 2001. Proposals were received from The American Institutes for Research (AIR) and Measured Progress (MP). 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 AIR, the sponsor of the highest scored proposal.

This report describes the subject matter requirements that will be developed and validated, and summarizes the proposed contract with AIR. Attached to this report is an appendix that 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.

### The Subject Matter Requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials

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: (1) completion of a Commission-approved college or university program of subject matter preparation for teaching in the subject area, or (2) passage of subject matter exams.

The term "subject matter requirements" refers to the set of subject-specific knowledge, skills, and abilities that beginning teachers need to know and be able to do. The subject matter requirements specify the subject matter content that (a) must be included in the curriculum of subject matter programs and (b) is eligible for testing on the subject matter exams candidates take in lieu of completing a subject matter program.

The new subject matter requirements in English, mathematics, science, and social science, to be developed and validated under the proposed contract, must have the following characteristics:

1. They must be aligned with the state's student content and performance standards for grades 6-12. Competence in the new subject matter requirements should enable beginning teachers to effectively assist students to meet the student content and performance standards. Although the new subject matter requirements must be aligned with the student standards, they can be broader than those standards.
2. Their intended purposes and uses are to delineate the subject matter knowledge, skills, and abilities that are (a) to be provided to candidates in a subject matter preparation program, and (b) eligible for inclusion on the exams (i.e., exam content specifications).
3. In terms of their use as exam content specifications, the subject matter requirements should enable (a) examination development specialists to create test items (both selected-response and constructed-response items) that have high validity, (b) Commission staff to monitor the work of examination development specialists in relation to clear, valid content specifications, and (c) candidates for credentials to ascertain clearly the breadth and content of subject matter knowledge, skills, and abilities eligible for assessment on the exams.
4. The new subject matter requirements for each subject area are expected to have two parts. The first part would describe several *content domains* for subject matter understanding and skill, and the second part would describe the subject matter *skills and abilities* applicable to the content domains.
5. In science, the Commission offers Single Subject Teaching Credentials in four emphasis areas: biology, chemistry, geoscience, and physics. Prospective science teachers are expected to have in-depth competence in one area (their emphasis area), and broad competence across all four areas (referred to as general science). Thus, the contractor will develop subject matter requirements for each emphasis area as well as a set of general science subject matter requirements, which is expected to include competencies from the four emphasis areas.

### **Summary of the Proposed Contract with the American Institutes for Research (AIR)**

The scope of work in the proposed contract with AIR involves three major tasks. Each is summarized below.

Task I of the proposed contract will involve the review of existing subject matter requirements, their relationship with the California K-12 student content standards, and the development of new (preliminary) subject matter requirements. Input to the preliminary subject matter requirements will come from the Commission's recently-appointed Subject Matter Advisory Panels who will review the California K-12 student content standards, the Commission's draft elementary subject matter requirements and standards, and national student and teacher content standards. The preliminary subject matter requirements will be reviewed by the Commission's Bias Review Committee. This task is expected to be completed by September 2001.

Task II will involve the implementation of a statewide validity study of the preliminary subject matter requirements that were developed in Task I. The contractor will develop validity surveys based upon preliminary subject matter requirements, conduct the statewide survey, analyze the results of the survey, and present the survey results to the panels and Commission staff. Survey recipients will include teachers, administrators, district and county curriculum specialists, and subject matter program coordinators and faculty. Many survey participants will be given the opportunity to respond online. The purpose of the survey will be to collect judgements about the importance and job-relatedness of the preliminary subject matter requirements. Task II is expected to be completed in December 2001.

In Task III, the contractor will work with the Subject Matter Advisory Panels, the Bias Review Committee, and Commission staff to finalize the subject matter requirements on the basis of the job analysis results. This work is expected to be completed in February 2002. If so, the new subject matter requirements in English, mathematics, science, and social science would be presented to the Commission for consideration and adoption in March 2002. As part of Task III, the contractor will write and comprehensive report that documents the methodology and results of the three project tasks.

# Summary of the Proposal Solicitation Process

## The Request for Proposals

The Executive Director in February 2001 released the *Request for Proposals for the Development and Validation of Subject Matter Requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, Mathematics, Science and Social Science*. 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 subject matter competence requirement for Single Subject Teaching Credentials, the relationship between these requirements and the California K-12 student content standards, contractual information and requirements, proposal requirements, a description of the proposal review process including the evaluation criteria, several appendices, and a description of the scope 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 (March 12, 2001).

### RFP Part 1: Summary and Background Information

Part 1 of the RFP provided a summary of the RFP, background information on current subject matter competence requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials, a description of the new subject matter requirements and their relationship to the California K-12 student content standards, and a description of the primary participants in the project (the Commission, the Commission's Project Officer, the Commission's Subject Matter Advisory Panels, and the Bias Review Committee).

### RFP Part 2: Scope of Work

Part 2 of the RFP described the three tasks that comprised the scope of the services and products required by the Commission. Task I involved the review of current subject matter requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, mathematics, science and social science, and the development of new (preliminary) subject matter requirements. Task II required the implementation of a statewide validity study of the preliminary subject matter requirements. Task III involved the development of final subject matter requirements in the four subject areas and a comprehensive project report.

### RFP Part 3: Important Dates

This section of the RFP listed the important dates to note, for both the proposal process (bidders' teleconference call, question submission and contract award date) and project milestones and deliverables.

### 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) payments to the contractor, (d) priority hiring considerations, and (e) 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 required forms. 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 detailed description of

how the work would be accomplished, proposed project costs, a description of their corporate capability to carry out the contract, and technical information, including required state forms related to nondiscrimination and a drug-free workplace.

#### RFP Part 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.

---

## Request for Proposals for the Development and Validation of Subject Matter Requirements for Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, Mathematics, Science and Social Science

### 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 \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Proposal was received at or before 10:00 a.m., March 12, 2001, at the office of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Fifteen complete copies of the proposal were received.

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ 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.

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

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

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ A Cover Page

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ A Table of Contents

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ An Introduction

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Section 1: Statement of Work

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Section 2: Schedules

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Section 3: Bidder Capability

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Section 4: Project Costs and Small Business Preference

Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_ Section 5: Technical Information

---

## Request for Proposals for the Development and Validation of Subject Matter Requirements for the Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, Mathematics,

# Science and Social Science

## Proposal Evaluation Criteria: Part II

	Maximum Score
(1) Plan for the Development and Validation of Subject Matter Requirements for the Single Subject Teaching Credentials in English, mathematics, science and social science. The proposal provides a feasible, complete, and both technically and legally defensible plan for the review, validity survey, and finalization of the subject matter requirements for single subject credentials, as described in Part Two of the 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.	80
• Task I .....	20
• Task II .....	50
• Task III .....	10
(2) Project Schedule. The proposal includes a well-organized, properly sequenced, and feasible project schedule that accomplishes the tasks of reviewing, developing and validating subject matter requirements in English, mathematics, science and social science (Tasks I-III of this proposal), and reflects recognition of due dates for tasks and deliverables.	20
(3) Bidder Capability. The proposal demonstrates that the bidder has (a) experience and expertise in validity studies, the development of examination and/or performance assessment specifications, the development of subject matter standards, and/or similar activities, and (b) sufficient resources to conduct the contracted tasks and provide the contracted products and services with high quality within the proposed timeline. 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.	30
• Bidder experience .....	10
• Bidder resources .....	5
• Sound, feasible organizational plan .....	5
• Qualifications and experience of key staff .....	10
(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.	60
(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.	10

**Maximum Possible Score**

**200**

The following appendices were included in the RFP:

- A: Notice of Intent to Bid
- B: Contract Provisions
- C: Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Participation Summary Form (STD 840)
- D: Nondiscrimination Compliance Statement (STD 19)
- E: Drug-Free Workplace Certification (STD 21)

### **Release and Distribution of the RFP**

On February 2, 2001, the RFP was mailed to 75 potential bidders across the nation. In the distribution process, the Executive Director mailed the RFP to every firm and every individual who (a) has conducted job analyses, validity studies, or 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 for studies of this nature, 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 an RFP clearinghouse known as BidNet. Eight additional RFPs were sent to potential bidders who learned about it through the ECSCR.

The RFP indicated that proposals were due at the Commission office by 10:00 a.m. on March 12, 2001, and that there would be a Telephone Bidders' Conference on February 20, 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 three firms; proposals were received from two firms.

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

As indicated in the RFP, Commission staff held a Telephone Bidders' Conference on February 20, 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 three 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 from the bidders. In addition, as described above in "Key Information for Prospective Bidders," potential bidders were invited to submit written questions. No written questions were submitted from the bidders, however.

### **Proposals Received in Response to the RFP**

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

- The American Institutes for Research (AIR) of Palo Alto, California; and
- Measured Progress (MP) of Dover, New Hampshire

The proposal review process began on March 12, 2001, 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 six-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:

- Bob Carlson  
Administrator, Examinations and Research Unit  
Professional Services Division
- Helen Hawley  
Assistant Consultant, Policy and Research Unit  
Professional Services Division
- Terry Janicki  
Consultant, Funded Programs Unit  
Professional Services Division
- Richard Naccarato  
Consultant, Examinations and Research Unit  
Professional Services Division
- Yvonne Novelli  
Program Analyst, 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 each of the 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 March 12, 2001, with an orientation and training meeting of the Proposal Review Team. Team members came to this meeting having read the RFP. 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. Following the March 12 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 March 19, 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 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, average criterion scores for each proposal were



computed across team members. For each proposal, the average criterion scores were summed to yield a total score.

### Results of the Proposal Review Process

Table 1 shows, for each of the two proposals, the total score and percent of the total possible score (200) at the conclusion of Stage 3.

**Table 1**  
**Final Score and Percent of**  
**Total Possible (200) for Each Proposal**

<i>Bidder</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Pct. Of Max.</i>
The American Institutes for Research (AIR)	168	84%
Measured Progress (MP)	142	71%

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

Working independently during Stage 2 of the proposal review process, *all* of the Proposal Review Team members judged the AIR proposal to be the superior of the two proposals. This pattern was maintained during the Stage 3 review process. Consequently, the proposal submitted by AIR earned the highest final score during Stage 3 of the process: 168 points out of 200 possible (84%). The Proposal Review Team concluded unanimously to recommend that the Commission award the contract to AIR.



[Return to April 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 April 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:**

April 12, 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 28, 2001

#### SPONSORED BILLS

Bill Number - Author - Version Summary	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
<b>SB 57</b> - Scott - Amended 3/12/01 Would make numerous noncontroversial, technical and clarifying changes to the Education Code. Allows pre-interns the option of taking subject matter courses to renew their certificate to advance to the intern program.	Sponsor - Introduced version - (Dec. 2000)	Senate Committee on Education Scheduled for hearing on 4/4/01
<b>SB 299</b> - Scott - Amended 3/22/01 Clarifies the Education Code Sections related to the Committee of Credentials.	Sponsor - Introduced version - (Dec 2000)	Senate Committee on Education Scheduled for hearing on 4/4/01

#### ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number - Author - Version Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position (Date Adopted)	Status
--	---	--------

<p><b>AB 75</b> - Steinberg - As amended on 2/22/01 Is Governor Davis' initiative to train California's entire corps of principals and vice-principals in academic standards, leadership skills, and the use of management and diagnostic technology in three years. The Governor's Budget proposes \$15 million for this program.</p>	<p>Watch - Introduced version - (Feb 2001) Support - 2/22/01 version - (March 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Appropriations</p>
<p><b>AB 272</b> - Pavley - As Introduced on 2/16/01 Would make a holder's first clear multiple or single subject teaching credential valid for the life of the holder if the holder meets specified requirements.</p>	<p>Oppose - Introduced version - (March 01)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Education Scheduled for hearing on 4/4/01</p>
<p><b>AB 1232</b> - Chavez - As Introduced on 2/23/01 Would establish the California State Troops to Teachers Act. Retired officers or noncommissioned officers who agree to teach for five years and participate in a paraprofessional, per-internship of internship program would be eligible for a bonus payment.</p>	<p>Seek amendments - Introduced version - (March 01)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Education</p>

## SENATE BILLS

<p><b>Bill Number - Author - Version Subject</b></p>	<p><b>Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)</b></p>	<p><b>Status</b></p>
<p><b>SB 79</b> - Murray - As introduced on 1/11/01 Would require the CCTC 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.</p>	<p>Watch - Introduced version - (Feb 2001)</p>	<p>Senate Committee on Education</p>
<p><b>SB 792</b> - Sher - As introduced on 2/23/01 Would require the CCTC to issue a certificate to a candidate who passes a subject matter exam that is aligned with state adopted content and performance standards.</p>	<p>Oppose - Introduced version - (March 01)</p>	<p>Senate Committee on Education Scheduled for hearing on 4/18/01</p>
<p><b>SB 837</b> - Scott - As introduced on 2/23/01 Would specify the documentation that a school district must provide the CCTC to justify a request for an emergency permit. This bill would also increase the state grant and district match for the pre-intern program and permit the CCTC to allow for district hardship.</p>	<p>Support - Introduced version - (March 01)</p>	<p>Senate Committee on Education Scheduled for hearing on 4/18/01</p>



[Return to April 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 April 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:**

April 12, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

LEG-2

**Committee:**

Legislative

**Title:**

Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission

✓ Action

**Prepared by:**

Dan Gonzales, Legislative Liaison  
Office of Governmental Relations

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Bill Number Author	Description	Recommended Position
AB 128 Shelley	Establishes The California School Paraprofessional Reading And Mathematics Training Program	Support, If Amended
AB 401 Cardenas	Even Distribution Of Emergency Permits	Watch
AB 721 Steinberg	Teachers For Low-Performing Schools Renewable Grant Program	Support, If Amended
AB 833 Steinberg	No More Than 10% Of The Average Number Of Underqualified Teachers To Any One School Within The District	Watch
AB 1431 Horton	Three Day Training Program For Teachers Hired On An Emergency Credential	Watch
AB 1662 Rod Pacheco	Graduate Degree Requirement For Pupil Personnel Services Credential	Oppose
SB 321 Alarcon	Requires School Districts To Provide A 30-Day Training Program For Teachers Hired On An Emergency Credential	Seek Amendments
SB 572 O'Connell	Salary Incentives For Teachers In The Lowest Performing Schools	Support, If Amended
SB 688 O'Connell	BTSA For Teachers In Regional Occupation Centers And Programs	Approve

---

## Bill Analysis

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Assembly Bill 128</b>
<b>Authors:</b>	<b>Assembly Member Kevin Shelley</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>California School Employees Association (CSEA)</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Establishes the California School Paraprofessional Reading and Mathematics Training Program</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>January 22, 2001</b>
<b>Last Amended:</b>	<b>March 12, 2001</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Referred to the Assembly Education Committee</b>
<b>Current CTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Support If Amended</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>March 12, 2001</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Leyne Milstein</b>

#### Summary of Current Law

Existing law permits school districts to employ various paraprofessionals, including, but not limited to instructional aides, teacher assistants and teacher aides to provide assistance to credentialed teachers in the classroom. Current law also establishes the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program (Paraprofessional Program), to recruit paraprofessionals to participate in a pilot program designed to encourage them to enroll in teacher training programs and to eventually serve as credentialed teachers in the public schools.

#### Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

As required by existing law, the Commission administers the Paraprofessional Program in participating K-12 public schools.

#### Analysis of Bill Provisions

This measure would enact the California Paraprofessional Reading and Mathematics Training Program (Paraprofessional Training Program). Districts and County Offices of Education would be able to apply to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for grant funds of \$1,000 per paraprofessional identified in the application to subsidize the employment and training of these paraprofessionals in kindergarten and grades 1 to 6 inclusive.

The bill would require the Superintendent of Public Instruction, in consultation with the State Board of Education, to evaluate the effectiveness of the Paraprofessional Training Program and to report those findings to the Governor and the Legislature on or before January 1, 2007.

#### Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policies may apply to this measure:

- **The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which**

would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.

- **The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**

### Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

The cost to implement this measure is unknown, as it is dependent upon the number of applications received by districts and county offices of education wishing to participate in the program. Implementation of this program is contingent upon Legislative appropriation in the annual Budget Act. This measure would not have any impact on the Commission's budget.

### Organizational Positions on the Bill

This measure, sponsored by CSEA, represents a discreet portion of AB 466, sponsored by Governor Davis and carried by Assembly Member Strom-Martin, which provides similar funding for paraprofessional training in reading and mathematics. In addition, AB 466 provides funding to provide training to teachers in various subject matters taught in the public schools. CSEA believes that paraprofessional training is more suitably addressed in a distinct bill.

### Comments:

The quality of instruction is the single most important determinant of student success and achievement in school and there are hundreds of paraprofessionals who are currently contributing to the education of hundreds of thousands of students in the California public schools. This bill would require districts and county offices of education receiving grant funds to adopt appropriate protocol and implement a staff development program specifically for math and reading paraprofessionals in an effort to enhance training and improve the instructional services provided by these paraprofessionals. The development of a clear set of standards defining paraprofessional competence and enumerating performance expectations governing the preparation of paraprofessionals will ideally both improve teaching and promote learning.

Consistent with historical practice, we concur that reform efforts must be evaluated for their impact and effectiveness. Should this measure be approved by the Legislature and implemented by the Department of Education it will be interesting to study the impact of this program on the quality of individuals moving through the Commission's Paraprofessional program. One would assume that the implementation of this program would result in better trained and qualified candidates for the Paraprofessional Program.

Commission staff have the following concerns with the measure as drafted:

- Other than the title, nothing in the bill specifies that the paraprofessionals participating in this program must receive training specific to reading and mathematics or work with students in these subjects.
- The bill does not specifically require that the training reflect the recently adopted content and performance standards.

### Suggested Position

Staff recommends a position of SUPPORT IF AMENDED upon inclusion of the following technical amendment:

- Add the following to the end of Section 44411 (a) (3): *in reading and mathematics consistent with Board of Education adopted subject matter content and performance standards.*

### Reason for Suggested Position

Commission staff recommends a Support If Amended position on this bill as it provides resources for districts and county offices of education to offer training and staff development to improve and expand the skills, knowledge and abilities of the paraprofessionals currently serving in the California public schools. Enhanced training opportunities will ultimately serve

---

## Bill Analysis

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>AB 401</b>
<b>Authors:</b>	<b>Assembly Member Cardenas</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>Author</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Emergency Permits</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 20, 2001</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Assembly Committee on Education (scheduled for hearing on April 4, 2001)</b>
<b>Current CTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Watch</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>March 22, 2001</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Dan Gonzales and Linda Bond</b>

#### Summary of Current Law

Individuals must obtain a credential from the Commission in order to teach in the public schools. State law establishes the requirements for emergency permits to allow school districts to assign individuals to teach when an appropriately credentialed teacher is unavailable. The Commission issues a "emergency permit" under specified conditions outlined in the law. Emergency permits must be renewed each year. In order to renew the permit, individuals must complete six semester units towards completion of the teaching credential. An emergency permit may only be issued five times.

**The Commission issues emergency permits.** An employer must file a *Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators* with the Commission every year declaring the number of permits expected to be requested.

Once the *Declaration* is on file, the employer may apply for emergency permits for qualified individuals.

Applicants for an emergency permit must:

1. Possess a baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited college or university;
2. Have passed the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), unless exempted by statutes or regulations;
3. Have completed the requirements for the specific permit, such as passage of the appropriate subject matter exams or successful completion of appropriate course work;
4. Submit a complete application packet, including the fee and other documents required to verify completion of all requirements for the specific emergency permit, to an employing agency, and;
5. Submit Livescan Service form or two fingerprint cards, and the Character and Identification Clearance form.

#### Background

**Increase in emergency permits.** The demand for teachers in California grew dramatically in the 1990s and continues to grow. Since the late 1980s the teacher workforce increased nearly 48%, from 197,000 teachers in 1988-89 to 291,000 in 1999-2000. The increase is



due to growth in student enrollment, class size reduction and attrition and retirement of working teachers. This resulted in a doubling in the percent of emergency permit teachers. In the early 1990s, 12,200 classroom teachers held emergency permits (about 5.5%), the number increased 32,700 teachers (11.5%) in the late 1990s.

**Distribution of underqualified teachers is seriously uneven.** Some districts and schools have a high percentage of teachers on emergency permits. Approximately 12% of California's teachers hold emergency permits, but permit holders are not evenly distributed among districts or schools. Twenty four percent of California's public schools have no underqualified teachers, however, 20% of the public schools have 20% or more teachers serving on emergency permits. Some schools have as many as 40% of their teacher on emergency permits.

According to studies by the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, schools with high percentages of teachers on emergency permits are generally low achieving, urban schools with poor minority students.

**Reasons for uneven distribution.** Teachers decide to teach at a school based on several factors. Teachers select schools with a shorter commute, where they feel they can be successful, and where they can feel safe.

**Teacher quality is important to student success.** Research shows a direct link between the qualifications of teachers and the achievement of students. Fully prepared teachers are better able to manage a classroom and achieve learning gains for students. The effects of a well-prepared teacher on student achievement can be stronger than the influences of student background factors including poverty, language, or minority status.

**Actions by Legislature and Governor.** The Legislature and the Governor have taken several actions to recruit teachers and increase the number of credentialed teachers in low achieving schools. CalTeach is a statewide recruiting effort for California public schools. The Teacher Recruitment Initiative Program (TRIP) has established regional teacher recruitment centers and serves as a clearinghouse for information on teaching and focuses on recruiting teacher for low performing schools. The Teaching as a Priority Block Grant program awards competitive grants to school districts to provide incentives to help lower the number of teachers with emergency permits in low performing schools.

### Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission encourages districts to establish pre-intern and intern programs to prepare teachers. The pre-intern and intern programs provide advice, training, support, and assistance to less than fully qualified teachers. These programs increase the retention rates among participating teachers.

### Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would require school districts that employ teachers who are not fully credentialed to assign less than fully credentialed teachers evenly throughout the district. Each school should have an equal or nearly equal percentage of teachers who are not fully credentialed. The bill is not intended to encourage districts to employ teachers who are not fully credentialed but intends to ensure that, to the extent uncredentialed teachers are employed they are evenly assigned throughout the district.

### Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

**5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**

### Organizational Positions on the Bill

Support  
No support on file

Oppose  
No opposition on file

## Reason for Suggested Position

Staff recommends a **WATCH** position because the distribution of teachers serving on emergency permits is a local employment issue.

---

# Bill Analysis

## California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Assembly Bill 721 (as proposed to be amended)</b>
<b>Authors:</b>	<b>Assembly Member Darrell Steinberg</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>Author</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Teachers for Low-Performing Schools Renewable Grant Program</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 22, 2001</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Assembly Education Committee</b>
<b>Current CTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Support if Amended</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>March 22, 2001</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Anne Padilla</b>

### Summary of Current Law

Current law establishes alternative teacher certification grant programs that provide incentives and support systems to recruit and prepare talented individuals from a variety of sources to teach in subject area and geographic shortage areas in California.

### Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

Currently the Commission administers the following state funded alternative preparation and support grant programs: Paraprofessional Teacher Preparation Program, Pre-Intern Program, the Intern Program, the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (jointly administered with the California Department of Education) and the California Math Incentive Program. In addition, the Commission administers federal grants for "blended" programs of undergraduate teacher preparation that integrate subject matter and pedagogy, and include early field work experiences for teacher candidates.

### Analysis of Bill Provisions

AB 721 would create the Teachers for Low-Performing Schools Renewable Grant Program, administered by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, designed to fund new programs (or enhance existing programs) that recruit, prepare and support new teachers to work successfully in low-performing schools. This competitive grant program would allow institutions of higher education with teacher preparation programs approved by the Commission to submit proposals. These proposals would be evaluated according to the extent that they meet criteria to:

- Recruit teacher candidates who are most likely to be successful in schools in low-income areas, which may include a plan for coordination between postsecondary institutions and the regional recruitment centers funded through the Teacher Recruitment Incentive Program (TRIP);
- Emphasize teacher education coursework on teaching strategies proven effective in low-performing schools with high numbers of low-income, minority pupils;
- Provide early candidate field experience in low-performing schools;
- Strengthen relationships with low-performing schools and involve school personnel as equal partners in the preparation of new teachers;
- Support and assist program graduates during their first teaching years through

professional development and technical assistance.

The bill also requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (or a contractor selected by the Commission pursuant to a competitive bidding process) to establish a statewide assistance center to support postsecondary institution program participants by:

- Facilitating communication and networking among participating institutions;
- Disseminating research and best practices;
- Recommending a program graduate tracking system;
- Coordinating with regional recruitment centers.

Grants would be renewed annually, based on the success of the program in recruiting, preparing, and supporting new teachers to work in low-performing schools. After four years, grants would only be renewed if the institution is able to show that 75 percent of its program graduates continue to teach in low-performing schools.

### Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

The bill provides \$5 million annually (from an unspecified fund source) for grants ranging from \$25,000 to \$200,000, and would be based on the number of enrollees. Grant recipients would receive \$25,000 for each group of 25 new candidates admitted to the program. In addition \$500,000 would be allocated to operate the statewide assistance center.

While the bill provides for sufficient grant funding, it does not provide the Commission specific funding for grant administration.

### Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

- 6. The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators, and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.**
- 7. the Commission opposes legislation that would give it significant additional duties and responsibilities if the legislation does not include an appropriate source of funding to support those additional duties and responsibilities.**

### Organizational Positions on the Bill

None known at this time.

### Reasons for Suggested Position

This bill would encourage institutions to develop programs that specifically recruit, prepare, and support new teachers to work and be successful in low-performing schools. While several postsecondary institutions currently offer such programs, there are an insufficient number of programs to address the needs of low-performing schools. This bill will provide funding to expand existing programs, and encourage the development of new programs that focus on successful strategies to prepare teachers to work in our most challenged schools.

Staff recommends two amendments to the bill that would: 1) provide funding to the Commission to administer the grant program; and 2) specify that funds provided through this grant program should supplement, not supplant current resources that the grant applicant presently dedicates to similar programs.

For these reasons, staff recommends a "Support if Amended" position.

---

## Bill Analysis

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>AB 833</b>
<b>Authors:</b>	<b>Assembly Member Steinberg</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>Author</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Teachers Serving on Emergency Permits</b>

<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 22, 2001</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Assembly Committee on Education (scheduled for hearing on April 4, 2001)</b>
<b>Current CTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Watch</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>March 22, 2001</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Dan Gonzales and Linda Bond</b>

### Summary of Current Law.

Individuals must obtain a credential document from the Commission in order to teach in the public schools. State law establishes the requirements for emergency permits to allow school districts to assign individuals to teach in emergency situations. The Commission issues a "emergency permit" under specified conditions outlined in the law. To be renewed the permit holder must show progress toward meeting state credential requirements.

**The Commission issues emergency permits.** An employer must file a *Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators* with the Commission every year declaring the number of permits expected to be requested.

Once the *Declaration* is on file, the employer may apply for emergency permits for qualified individuals.

Applicants for an emergency permit must:

1. Possess a baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited college or university;
2. Have passed the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), unless exempted by statutes or regulations;
3. Have completed the requirements for the specific permit, such as passage of the appropriate subject matter exams or successful completion of appropriate course work;
4. Submit a complete application packet, including the fee and other documents required to verify completion of all requirements for the specific emergency permit, to an employing agency, and;
5. Submit Livescan Service form or two fingerprint cards, and the Character and Identification Clearance form.

**Increase in emergency permits.** The demand for teachers in California grew dramatically in the 1990s and continues to grow. Since the late 1980s the teacher workforce increased nearly 48%, from 197,000 teachers in 1988-89 to 291,000 in 1999-2000. The increase is due to growth in student enrollment, class size reduction and attrition and retirement of working teachers. This resulted in a doubling in the percent of emergency permit teachers. In the early 1990s, 12,200 classroom teachers held emergency permits (about 5.5%), the number increased 32,700 teachers (11.5%) in the late 1990s.

**Distribution of underqualified teachers is seriously uneven.** Some districts and schools have a high percentage of teachers on emergency permits. Approximately 11.5% of California's teachers hold emergency permits, but permit holders are not evenly distributed among districts or schools. Twenty four percent of California's public schools have no underqualified teachers, however, 20% of the public schools have 20% or more teachers serving on emergency permits. Some schools even have as many as 40% of their teacher on emergency permits.

According to studies by the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, schools with high percents of teachers on emergency permits are generally low achieving, urban schools with poor minority students.

**Reasons for uneven distribution.** Teachers decide to teach at a school based on several factors. Teachers select schools with a shorter commute, where they feel they can be successful, and where they can feel safe.

**Teacher quality is important to student success.** Research shows a direct link between the qualifications of teachers and the achievement of students. Fully prepared teachers are better able to manage a classroom and achieve learning gains for students. The effects of a well-prepared teacher on student achievement can be stronger than the influences of student background factors including poverty, language, or minority status.

### Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Legislature and the Governor have taken several actions to recruit teachers and increase the number of credentialed teachers in low achieving schools. CalTeach is a statewide recruiting effort for California public schools. The Teacher Recruitment Initiative Program (TRIP) has established regional teacher recruitment centers and serves as a clearinghouse for information on teaching and focus on recruiting teachers for low performing schools. The Teaching as a Priority Block Grant program awards competitive grants to school districts to provide incentives to help lower the number of teachers with emergency permits in low performing schools.

The Commission also encourages districts to establish pre-intern and intern programs to prepare underqualified individuals. The pre-intern and intern programs provide advice, training, support, and assistance to less than fully qualified teachers. These programs increase the retention rates among participating teachers.

### Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would prohibit a school district from assigning more than 10% of the average number of underqualified teachers employed by the district to any one school within the district. A school district would have until January 1, 2005, to comply with this prohibition and how the district meets the requirements is within the district's discretion. This bill would not apply to districts employ less than 10% of their teachers on emergency permits. Underqualified teachers are defined as teachers teaching on an emergency permit but does not include teachers in an intern or per-intern program.

### Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

**5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**

### Organizational Positions on the Bill

Support  
No support on file

Oppose  
No opposition on file

### Reason for Suggested Position

Staff recommends a **WATCH** position because the distribution of teachers serving on emergency permits is a local employment issue, and staff understands that this bill soon will be amended.

---

## Bill Analysis

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Bill Number:** [Assembly Bill 1431](#)

**Authors:** [Assembly Member Jerome Horton](#)

<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>United Teachers of Los Angeles</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Requires School Districts to Provide a 3-day Training Program for Teachers Hired on an Emergency Credential.</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 23, 2001</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Referred to the Senate Education Committee. May be Acted On, On or After March 23, 2001</b>
<b>Current CTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Watch</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>March 23, 2001</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Leyne Milstein</b>

### Summary of Current Law

Existing law establishes the minimum standards with regard to basic skills and necessary for employment and subsequent training requirements as follows:

- Prohibits the governing board of a school district from initially hiring on a permanent, temporary, or substitute basis a certificated person seeking employment in the capacity designated in his or her credential unless that person has demonstrated basic skills proficiency or unless the person is exempted from this requirement.
- Establishes the Marian Bergeson Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment System to provide an effective transition into the teacher career for first-year and second-year teachers and to ensure that each participating beginning teacher receives intensive individualized support and assistance.
- Provides opportunities for staff development or in-service training, including the Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform Program which provides an eligible school district with a staff development allowance of \$270 for up to 3 days for each certificated classroom teacher who participates in staff development instructional methods.

### Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission is responsible for granting credentials, emergency permits and substitute permits to qualified individuals.

### Analysis of Bill Provisions

Beginning with the 2002-03 school year this bill would require a school district to provide each new substitute teacher with 3 days of training prior to the teacher serving as a substitute teacher. The bill would authorize a school district to apply for and receive an allowance under the Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform Program for each substitute teacher who participates, to the same degree that certificated classroom teachers are required to participate, in the staff development offered pursuant to that program.

The bill would require the Superintendent of Public Instruction to establish within the State Department of Education a statewide clearinghouse on substitute teaching. The clearinghouse would develop programs to address the needs and training of substitute teachers and provide information and support to school districts and county superintendents of schools with regard to these issues.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. This bill would provide that, if the Commission on State Mandates determines that the bill contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement for those costs shall be made pursuant to these statutory provisions.

### Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policies may apply to this measure:

- 1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.**
- 3. The Commission supports legislation which reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation which would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.**
- 6. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.**

### **Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill**

This measure does not impact the Commission's budget.

### **Organizational Positions on the Bill**

AB 1431 is sponsored by the United Teacher of Los Angeles.

#### **Comments:**

Ideally, the training proposed in this measure will provide substitute teachers with the basic skills necessary to remain in the classroom, effectively slowing the attrition of the substitute pool resulting from these individuals being unprepared to be in the classroom. However, as drafted, this measure leaves many questions unanswered.

The current language requires that the training be provided by districts to a "new substitute teacher". Does that mean an individual that is new to a specific district, or just new to teaching? If an individual were to participate in the training proposed in one district would that fulfill the training requirement or could districts require individuals fulfill their specific training requirements? Should individuals be required to attend this training at each district they elect to substitute for, this would result in unnecessary redundant costs to the State.

Of further concern is, if individuals are hired on an "substitute" basis, the delay of 3 days to get them into the classroom may not be responsive to a district's need. In order to assure that districts had an available pool of substitute teachers, they would have to offer training prior to being eligible to be in the pool in order to be responsive to immediate staffing needs. This could result in wasted time and money as often individuals register to teach as a substitute and never do teach. On the other hand, if an individual is willing to make the time investment in the training, perhaps they will be more likely to actually serve time in the classroom.

Further, given the nature of substitute teaching, these substitute teachers are entering classrooms throughout the school year. This raises the question of who will staff the training for the new substitute teachers? District staff? School staff? While this measure will provide needed funding, likely, neither the districts nor the individual schools currently have the personnel to provide this training on ad-hoc basis. There is also a timing concern with regard to when substitute teachers receive their permit from the Commission and when the training is provided. Substitute permits are only valid for one year from the date of issuance. If there is a delay in providing the training (a condition of employment) substitute teachers will have invested in the cost to obtain a permit, yet would technically not be employable until the training is made available. This could result in both lost earnings and lost time (on the valid credential).

This measure also raises the question of whether districts will be responsible for compensating the substitute teachers during the training period. If these individuals are expected to attend this training at their own expense, it could actually serve to discourage people from pursuing substitute teaching. However, compensating the teachers during the training period could place an undue financial burden on the districts.

Another question is why are the substitute teachers designing the training program? District personnel in consultation with teacher preparation programs and substitute teachers more

appropriately initiate program design. There is also an issue of accountability with regard to who will have the authority to determine whether the components of the training program are acceptable. There is no review requirement, by Department of Education or the Commission to evaluate the adequacy of the training program prior to funding and no reporting or audit requirements to determine the effectiveness of the on-going program. Approval of funds should be based not only on demonstrated need, but a proposed curriculum for the training to ensure that both the individual's time and the State's money are well spent.

Finally, the measure as drafted, does not include an opportunity to study the effectiveness of the ongoing program. If the State is going to invest funds in training, substitute teachers there should a requirement that districts provide documentation as to whether the training is contributing to substitute teacher retention and success in the classroom, and a Legislative reporting requirement based on the information collected.

### Reason for Suggested Position

Commission staff recommends a WATCH position on this bill. As drafted, the measure is vague in a number of areas and staff recommends observing the progression of the measure for resolution of these issues prior to taking any alternate position.

---

## Bill Analysis

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>AB 1662</b>
<b>Authors:</b>	<b>Assemblymember Rod Pacheco</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>California Association of School Psychologists</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Pupil Personnel Services Credential</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 23, 2001</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Introduced in the Assembly</b>
<b>Current CTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Oppose</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>March 22, 2001</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Linda Bond and Dan Gonzales</b>

### Summary of Current Law.

Current law sets the minimum qualifications for a services credential with a specialization in pupil personnel services.

**Background.** Certificated specialists in pupil personnel services are school counselors, school psychologists, school social workers, and child welfare and attendance supervisors. They are pupil advocates and provide prevention and intervention strategies to remove barriers to learning. These professionals, in partnership with other educators, parents and members of the community, maintain high expectations for all students, enable pupils to reach their highest potential, foster optimum teaching and learning conditions, and strive to prevent school failure.

More than 10,000 full-time pupil personnel service specialists work in California's public schools. These include 6,391 school counselors, 3,568 school psychologists, and 166 school social workers. No current data are available on the number of child welfare and attendance providers because they are not included in the California Basic Education Data System database.

School counselors, psychologists, social workers, and attendance specialists share some common training (generic competencies shared by all pupil personnel services providers) and areas of responsibility pertaining to the personal and educational development of students. At the same time, each group of specialists has a distinct, primary function in the school.

### Summary of Current Activity by the Commission



**Recent legislation and Commission action. AB 3188** (House, Chapter 661 of the Statutes of 1996) directed the Commission to re-examine the field experience standards for the school psychologist credential. One purpose of the legislation was to determine if California should adopt national standards pertaining to the field experience training of school psychologists. Another purpose was to examine ways in which future school psychologists could be well prepared to help students and their families protect their privacy rights in school environments.

In response to AB 3188, the Commission appointed a task force to recommend standards to forward to an advisory panel. The panel made recommendations to the Commission in February, 2000. The panel recommended that field experience hours be increased to match national standards in addition to new standards that will improve the preparation of school psychologists overall.

**AB 707.** Assemblymember House introduced AB 707 in 1999 which would have increased the requirements for persons to qualify to be school psychologists. Among many other things, the bill would have required a graduate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education. The Commission's position on the bill was oppose unless amended. The Commission's amendments included the deletion of the graduate degree requirement. The Senate Committee on Education did not approve the bill until it was entirely rewritten to exempt pre-lingually deaf school psychologists counseling deaf and hearing impaired pupils from the California Basic Educational Skills Test. The Governor signed the rewritten bill (Chapter 951 of the Statutes of 2000).

In October 2000, the Commission reviewed and approved the new standards for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential preparation programs. The standards approved by the Commission maintained the standards requirements and did not impose a graduate degree.

### Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would:

- Change the current Pupil Personnel Services Credential requirements on July 1, 2004.
- Substitute the current requirement for fifth year of study for an appropriate graduate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
- Eliminate the provision of law that prohibits a baccalaureate degree in professional education for the services credential with a specialization in pupil personnel services.
- Require the new requirements to take effect on July 1, 2004, and credential documents issued before July 1, 2004 under the current standards would remain valid.
- Maintain the other existing requirements for professional preparation.

### Comments

**No precedent for graduate degree.** The Commission requires a graduate degree as a condition for only one credential, the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential. The Commission requires a masters degree because failure to comply would have resulted in the withholding of federal funds for special education in California.

**Commission requires standards, not degrees.** The pursuit and completion of a graduate degree is an individual's choice. The Commission's responsibility has been to ensure that individuals complete standards-based programs to ensure the necessary competencies to provide the services authorized by the credential. The Commission does not impose a degree requirement on top of a standards requirement. To do so could bar otherwise fully qualified people from serving in the public schools and would not have any proven substantive effect on performance.

**Standards more effective at ensuring quality.** The Commission wishes to assure high quality services to students but disagrees with the sponsor on the best method to assure this quality. The Commission does not consider a graduate degree to be necessary. The Commission considers a standards-based fifth year program to be more effective because the credential program standards are designed to prepare individuals to perform all duties and expectations of employment.

**Unnecessary barrier.** In a time of teacher and school personnel shortages, requiring a master's degree in addition to the 60 semester units in a credential program seems imprudent. This new requirement could reduce the number of individuals seeking credentials.

One of the Commission's goals is to remove unnecessary barriers to credentials. Institutions offering these programs may, at their own discretion, offer these programs in the context of an advanced degree.

**Allows a baccalaureate or higher degree in education.** Current law does not allow for a baccalaureate or graduate degree in education to fulfill the requirements of the Pupil Personnel Credential. This bill would allow such a degree.

### Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

**4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.**

**5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**

### Organizational Positions on the Bill

Support  
No support on record

Oppose  
No opposition on record

### Reason for Suggested Position

Staff recommends an **OPPOSE** position. The Commission has an established precedent of requiring standards and not degrees, considers standards more effective at ensuring quality than a degree, believes requiring a degree would be an unnecessary barrier and the necessity of a degree has not been proven.

---

## Bill Analysis

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Senate Bill 321</b>
<b>Authors:</b>	<b>Senator Richard Alarcon</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>United Teachers of Los Angeles</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Requires School Districts to Provide a 30-day Training Program for Teachers Hired on an Emergency Credential.</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 20, 2001</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Referred to the Senate Education Committee. May be Acted On, On or After March 23, 2001</b>
<b>Current CTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Seek Amendments</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>March 21, 2001</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Leyne Milstein</b>

### Summary of Current Law

Existing law authorizes the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to issue or renew emergency teaching or specialist permits if the applicant possesses a baccalaureate

degree conferred by a regionally accredited institution of higher education, has fulfilled the subject matter requirements, and passes the state basic skills proficiency test and the commission approves the justification for the emergency permit submitted by the school district in which the applicant is to be employed and the employing agency submits a Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators to the Commission.

Existing law also requires holders of an emergency permit to attend an orientation to the curriculum and to techniques of instruction and classroom management, to teach only with the assistance and guidance of a teacher with 3 years of full-time teaching experience, and to participate in ongoing training, coursework, or seminars designed to prepare the individual to become a fully credentialed teacher or other educator in the subject area or areas in which he or she is assigned to teach or serve.

### Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission is responsible for issuing and renewing emergency teaching permits and for the administration of the Pre-Internship Teaching Program (Pre-Intern Program) established by AB 351 (Scott, Chapter 94/1997).

### Analysis of Bill Provisions

This measure would authorize school districts to develop a 30-day training program for teachers hired on an emergency basis. The bill requires that the training be completed prior to the commencement of classroom teaching and that a teacher participating in the training must spend half of the training period observing experienced fully credentialed teachers in a classroom of the same grade level as the teacher being trained.

The bill would appropriate an unspecified amount from the General Fund to the State Department of Education for allocation to school districts for purposes of implementing this program. The funds appropriated by this bill would be applied toward the minimum funding requirements for school districts and community college districts imposed by Section 8 of Article XVI of the California Constitution.

### Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policies may apply to this measure:

- 1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.**
- 3. The Commission supports legislation which reaffirms that teachers and other educators have appropriate qualifications and experience for their positions, as evidenced by holding appropriate credentials, and opposes legislation which would allow unprepared persons to serve in the public schools.**
- 6. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.**

### Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

This measure does not impact the Commission's budget.

### Organizational Positions on the Bill

SB 321 is sponsored by the United Teachers of Los Angeles.

Comments:

This measure is similar to SB 2073 introduced by Senator Alarcon in February 2000. While conceptually this is a sound idea, funds are already available in the Commission's Pre-Intern Program that could be utilized to increase the number of individuals participating in or transferring to (from and emergency credential) an existing Commission alternative certification program such as the Pre-Intern Program. Districts that establish Pre-Intern

Programs receive \$2,000 per pre-intern to provide program services. These funds, combined with funding and resources districts currently spend to provide support and guidance to emergency teachers will allow for the establishment of a high quality program.

Pre-intern retention rates in the first two year of the program have been approximately 90%. When this rate is compared with the 60% retention rate for emergency permit teachers, it provides a clear indication that the Pre-Intern Program provides valuable support for the teachers it serves and saves participating districts substantial resources otherwise lost through the attrition of emergency permit teachers. It is also important to note that, while the option to employ teachers on long-term emergency permits currently exists, the Commission intends to either substantially reduce or eliminate entirely the issuance of long-term emergency permits in California over the next few years.

Of further concern is, if individuals are hired on an "emergency" basis, the delay of 30 days to get them into the classroom may not be responsive to a district's need. This situation is similar to when fingerprinting was first required for employment in the public schools. Initially, until Live Scan was implemented shortening the waiting period to three days, there were significant problems with staffing at the district level while waiting for the fingerprint clearance to be completed.

Further, often emergency permit teachers are hired in the middle of the school year. This raises the question of who will staff the training for the new emergency permit holders? District staff? School staff? Likely, neither the districts nor the individual schools currently have the resources to provide this training on ad-hoc basis.

There is also an issue of accountability that is not addressed in this measure. This proposal is silent with regard to who will have the authority to determine whether the components of the training program are acceptable. There is no review requirement, by Dept of Education or the Commission to evaluate the adequacy of the training program prior to funding and no reporting or audit requirements to determine the effectiveness of the on-going program. All districts have to do is show the need to get the money without any follow up to determine whether the programs actually provide a benefit. Further, there is no audit requirement to assure the funds provided pursuant to this measure are actually spent on the training program. Approval of funds should be based not only on demonstrated need, but a proposed curriculum for the 15 hours that the trainee is not observing the credentialed teacher to ensure that both the teacher's time and the State's money are well spent.

Pursuant to the bill, the funds provided would be counted against a district's Proposition 98 minimum funding guarantee. As such, this measure would mandate districts to spend their funds on this training instead of other district priorities.

### **Suggested Amendments**

Current law provides for the Pre-Intern Program, a structured program for persons who wish to become fully credentialed teachers through an alternative path, and designed to replace the use of emergency permits. The Pre-Intern Program supports teachers who have not met all certification requirements by providing the following:

1. basic training in curriculum planning, classroom management and instruction in a format specifically designed for teachers who have not completed formal teacher preparation;
2. assessment and support services to assist these teachers in meeting the subject matter competence requirement and a prerequisite for participation in and internship program and a requirement for full certification; and,
3. an experienced teacher to serve as the pre-intern's coach, providing support as needed to ensure that the pre-intern is successful in the classroom. Currently the Commission issues pre-intern certificates for individuals teaching in a district that offers a pre-intern program.

Staff recommends that this measure be amended to highlight the Pre-Intern Program and reinforce the use of existing authorized programs to provide training to teachers entering the classroom who have not yet completed a teacher preparation program. Considering the limited future of long-term emergency permits, the success of the Pre-Intern Program in retaining and supporting new teachers, and the availability of state funding to establish and administer these programs locally, the Commission believes that the development of new

local Pre-Intern Programs will be beneficial to both the districts and the teachers that are served.

The benefits of the suggested amendments are two-fold: first, it would ensure that individuals entering the classroom who have not completed a teacher preparation program are provided the orientation and training necessary to be successful in the classroom through an already established and effective administrative framework of the Pre-Intern Program; and secondly, it would immediately reduce the use of emergency permits as a mechanism to provide classroom teachers.

### Reason for Suggested Position

Commission staff recommends a SEEK AMENDMENTS position on this bill for the following reasons:

- Funds are currently available to provide the training proposed in this measure through the Commission's Pre-Intern Program. These funds would be fittingly used to move more candidates into existing alternative certification programs with the goal of ultimately reducing the number of emergency permit teachers.
- This proposal does not provide the appropriate level of review and oversight of the training programs prior to funding and after implementation to ensure that the programs are worthwhile as a training program as well as sound financial investment.

This measure is too restrictive and could limit the flexibility of districts to provide staffing on an emergency basis.

---

## Bill Analysis

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>SB 572</b>
<b>Authors:</b>	<b>Senator O'Connell</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>EdVoice</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Salary Incentives for Teachers in the Lowest Performing Schools</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 22, 2001</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Senate Committee on Education</b>
<b>Current CTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Support, if amended</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>March 22, 2001</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Dan Gonzales and Linda Bond</b>

### Summary of Current Law

Individuals must obtain a credential document from the Commission in order to teach in the public schools. State law establishes the requirements for emergency permits to allow school districts to assign individuals to teach in emergency situations. The Commission issues a "emergency permit" under specified conditions outlined in the law. To be renewed the permit holder must show progress toward meeting state credential requirements.

**The Commission issues emergency permits.** An employer must file a *Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators* with the Commission every year declaring the number of permits expected to be requested.

Once the *Declaration* is on file, the employer may apply for emergency permits for qualified individuals.

Applicants for an emergency permit must:

1. Possess a baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited college or university;
2. Have passed the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST), unless exempted by statutes or regulations;
3. Have completed the requirements for the specific permit, such as passage of the appropriate subject matter exams or successful completion of appropriate course work;
4. Submit a complete application packet, including the fee and other documents required to verify completion of all requirements for the specific emergency permit, to an employing agency, and;
5. Submit Livescan Service form or two fingerprint cards, and the Character and Identification Clearance form.

**Increase in emergency permits.** The demand for teachers in California grew dramatically in the 1990s and continues to grow. Since the late 1980s the teacher workforce increased nearly 48%, from 197,000 teachers in 1988-89 to 291,000 in 1999-2000. The increase is due to growth in student enrollment, class size reduction, attrition, and retirement of working teachers. This resulted in a doubling in the percent of emergency permit teachers. In the early 1990s, 12,200 classroom teachers held emergency permits (about 5.5%), the number increased 32,700 teachers (11.5%) in the late 1990s.

**Distribution of underqualified teachers is seriously uneven.** Some districts and schools have a high percentage of teachers on emergency permits. Approximately 11.5% of California's teachers hold emergency permits, but permit holders are not evenly distributed among districts or schools. Twenty four percent of California's public schools have no underqualified teachers, however, 20% of the public schools have 20% or more teachers serving on emergency permits. Some schools even have as many as 40% of their teachers on emergency permits.

**Schools can become dysfunctional.** A report conducted by SRI International, entitled "The Status of the Teaching Profession 2000: An Update to the Teaching and California's Future Task Force," describes a point at which schools become dysfunctional due to the lack of credentialed teachers. This point varies by school based on the professional development and initial teacher training programs offered, but occurs when schools have about 20% uncredentialed teachers. The lack of a systemic support structure with mentor teachers that can aid their newer counterparts is primarily responsible for the dysfunction.

**Reasons for uneven distribution.** Teachers decide to teach at a school based on several factors. Teachers select schools with a shorter commute, where they feel they can be successful, and where they can feel safe.

**Teacher quality is important to student success.** Research shows a direct link between the qualifications of teachers and the achievement of students. Fully prepared teachers are better able to manage a classroom and achieve learning gains for students. The effects of a well-prepared teacher on student achievement can be stronger than the influences of student background factors including poverty, language, or minority status.

**Salary increases targeted to low performing schools may be effective.** Staff from RAND testified at the February 22, 2001 meeting of the Little Hoover Commission on factors that affect the supply and demand for teachers. They testified that because there is so little flexibility in teaching salaries, non-monetary conditions and benefits are very important. As a result, more qualified teachers tend to go to more desirable schools whenever the opportunity arises, thus exacerbating the existing inequities. The staff testified that across the board policies usually produce or exacerbate inequity and can be very expensive. RAND considers targeted policies to hold out a better hope of improving achievement, increasing equity and to be more cost-effective. RAND gave paying teachers more in difficult-to-staff schools as an example of a targeted policy that could increase the number of qualified teachers in difficult-to-staff schools.

**Recent activity by the Legislature and Governor.** The Legislature and the Governor have taken several actions to recruit teachers and increase the number of credentialed teachers in low achieving schools. CalTeach is a statewide recruiting effort for California public schools. The Teacher Recruitment Initiative Program (TRIP) has established regional teacher

recruitment centers and serves as a clearinghouse for information on teaching and focuses on recruiting teachers for low performing schools. The Teaching as a Priority Block Grant program awards competitive grants to school districts to provide incentives to help lower the number of teachers with emergency permits in low performing schools.

### Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission also encourages districts to establish pre-intern and intern programs to prepare underqualified individuals. The pre-intern and intern programs provide advice, training, support, and assistance to less than fully qualified teachers. These programs increase the retention rates among participating teachers.

### Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would provide a salary incentive of \$15,000 dollars to teachers in schools ranked in the first 2 deciles of the Academic Performance Index (API) that have more than 15% of their teachers serving on emergency permits. In order to receive the incentive the teacher must have a valid California teaching credential - teachers serving on an emergency permit, intern permit or credential or waiver are not eligible. The district would also be required to give teachers transferring from other districts full salary schedule credit for all of their experience and education. Funding would be subject to an appropriation.

### Suggested Amendments

This bill does not currently contain an appropriation. The amount that this program should be funded can not be determined at this time because the number of teachers that would participate is unknown. Once the amount that would be funded is determined, the following amendments should be added to the Budget Act:

*The sum of \$XXX,XXX is hereby appropriated to the State Department of Education for the purposes of the Incentive Pay for Teachers in Low-Performing School Program described in Education Code Section 45023.6.*

### Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

**5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**

### Organizational Positions on the Bill

Support  
Los Angeles Unified School District

Oppose  
No opposition on file

### Reason for Suggested Position

Staff recommends a **SUPPORT, IF AMENDED** position on this bill if funding for the bill is provided in the Budget. The high percentage of less than fully qualified teachers in schools that have the lowest API scores prevents those students from achieving. This bill would encourage fully qualified, experienced teachers to teach in the state's lowest performing schools but does not contain any funding.

---

## Bill Analysis

### California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

**Bill Number:** Senate Bill 688  
**Authors:** Senator O'Connell  
**Sponsor:** California Association of Regional Occupation Centers and Programs

<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>BTSA for Teachers in Regional Occupation Centers and Programs</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 23, 2001</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Senate Education</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Approve</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>March 11, 2001</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Marilyn Errett and Linda Bond</b>

### Summary of Current Law

Section 44279.1 of the Education Code established the California Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment System (BTSA) for first and second year teachers. This program, among other purposes, was established to provide an effective transition into teaching for beginning teachers, improve the educational performance of pupils, and ensure the professional success and retention of new teachers.

Current law also provides for the establishment of the California Reading Professional Development Institutes, High School English Professional Development Institutes, and Algebra Professional Development Institutes. These programs are intended to improve the effectiveness of instruction in California schools by providing intensive training focusing on California's student academic content standards and effective teaching strategies associated with the standards. Holders of Vocational Teaching Credentials, while not excluded by law from these programs, do not generally participate in the institutes.

Finally, existing law created Regional Occupation Centers and Programs (ROC/P) through Education Code statutes of 1976. These programs provide students with the opportunity for career/technical training. The State Board of Education approves ROC/P programs, which may be sponsored by county offices of education, school districts, or community college districts. Credits earned from courses completed in a ROC/P may be applied toward fulfillment of requirements for a high school diploma. High school students in vocational programs such as ROC/P participate in the statewide student assessment program (SAT 9 and STAR) and will be required to pass the upcoming High School Exit Exam.

### Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) and the California Department of Education co-administer the BTSA program. In addition, the Commission approves teacher preparation programs and issues Vocational Education Teaching Credentials, which are often required for teachers in ROC/P programs.

There are currently 72 ROC/P programs in California with approximately 5,800 teachers. Some BTSA programs serve teachers who hold vocational credentials, but the practice is not widespread. However, there are currently models within local BTSA programs specifically designed to meet the professional needs of beginning teachers in vocational programs such as the multi-county program lead by the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office.

### Analysis of Bill Provisions

SB 688 would authorize teachers who provide instruction for pupils in ROC/P programs who are serving in the first or second year of teaching to participate in the BTSA program.

In addition, SB 688 would authorize a teacher who provides instruction in a ROC/P to participate in the California Reading Professional Development Institutes, the High School English Professional Development Institutes, and the Algebra Professional Development Institutes if the instruction provided by the teacher is in courses that support pupil success in English language arts or mathematics performance.

Finally, SB 688 would appropriate \$12.1 million from the General Fund to the Superintendent of Public Instruction for allocation to ROC/Ps for the fiscal 2001-02.

### Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill



SB 688 would increase the number of BTSA participants by an unknown number. (BTSA programs currently serve some, but not all, beginning teachers with Vocational Education Credentials.) Commission staff indicates that the probable increase in participants will not result in higher administration costs to the Commission.

### Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policies apply to this measure:

**1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.**

**5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**

### Organizational Positions on the Bill

SB 688 is sponsored by the California Association of Regional Occupation Centers and Programs.

### Suggested Amendments

None.

### Reason for Suggested Position

The provisions in SB 688 are intended to address improving instructional quality in ROC/P programs including the following:

- the integration of career preparation programs and academic content standards to maximize the high school exit examination passage rate of pupils in career preparation programs;
- increase staff support, assessment and development to enhance integration and delivery of academic content standards within the ROC/P curriculum;
- facilitate pupil acquisition and application of the knowledge and skills required for employment in emerging and high demand career fields;
- increase pupil access to higher education and high-wage career certification programs through career preparation programs;
- and increase the number of pupils who meet industry certification standards.

For these reasons, staff recommends a position of Approve on SB 688.



[Return to April 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 April 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

# Public Hearing

**Meeting of:**

April 13, 2001

**Agenda Item Number:**

PH-1

**Title:**

Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Regulation, §80487, Pertaining to the CBEST Fees

Action

**Prepared by:**

Yvonne Novelli, Program Analyst  
Professional Services Division

### Proposed Amendments to Title 5 Regulation, §80487 Pertaining to the CBEST Fees

**March 15, 2001**

#### Executive Summary

This item is a proposal to amend §80487 so the Commission may adjust the CBEST fee, at a public meeting, to the amount needed to maintain the solvency of the CBEST fund.

#### Fiscal Impact Summary

The proposed amendment will allow the Commission to adjust the CBEST fee, as needed, to maintain the solvency of the CBEST fund.

#### Policy Issue to be Decided

Should the CBEST fee regulation be amended to allow the flexibility needed to maintain a solvent CBEST fund?

#### Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed regulations.

### Introduction

The proposed amendment to Section 80487 pertaining to the CBEST fee is being presented for public hearing. Included in this item is the background of the proposed regulations, a brief discussion of the proposed changes and the financial impact. Also included are the responses to the notification of the public hearing, and a copy of that notification distributed

## Background of the Proposed Regulation

California Education Code §44252(b), which became effective on February 1, 1983, establishes the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) requirement: a proficiency requirement in reading comprehension, writing competence, and knowledge of mathematics. This is required for nearly all California credentials and permits issued by the Commission, as a condition for public school employment in certain instances, and as an assessment instrument for enrollment in professional education programs. The Commission is responsible for the development and administration of the CBEST examination and must recover the related costs of the examination from the CBEST test fee. In January 1994, the Commission established the CBEST fee at \$40, which has remained unchanged since then.

Education Code §44252.5 allows the Commission to set the CBEST fee, for administrations after January 1, 2002, at a level necessary to recover the costs for the CBEST development and administration. Under its authority, the Commission at its February 2001 public meeting, approved a \$1 fee increase effective January 2002.

The request to amend §80487 allows the Commission to adjust the CBEST fee at a public meeting, to the amount needed to maintain the solvency of the CBEST fund. It was introduced to the Commission at the February 2001 Commission meeting as a request to establish a public hearing.

## Proposed Changes

As of January 1, 2002, Education Code §44252.5 will allow the Commission to set the fee at an amount needed to recover the costs of test administration and development. The proposed amendment to Title 5, section 80487 will reiterate this ability with the stipulation that, when a change in the amount of the CBEST fee is proposed, it be decided at a public meeting. The public meeting to be utilized will be the Commission meetings that are pre-scheduled and whose content is widely publicized.

The wording of the proposed amendment will allow the Commission the flexibility it needs to establish the amount of the CBEST fee. This flexibility is needed because the income used to finance the CBEST administration and development is derived solely from the CBEST test fees. There are no supplemental funds from other sources that are allocated for this expense. Even though the costs related to the development and much of the administration are constant, the number of individuals who participate in the CBEST, paying the CBEST fees, widely vary from year to year. There are numerous influences affecting the number of examinees, from legislative decisions to the availability of educational positions. The class-size reduction created an extreme jump in the number of individuals taking the CBEST, while possible instituting a voucher system that does not include a certification requirement may have the opposite affect. Because of these various influences, it is impossible to anticipate the future number of examinees, and in turn the CBEST fee revenue. the flexibility noted in the proposed amendment will allow the Commission to either maintain the current \$40 fee or either raise the fee to possibly \$41 or lower it to possibly \$39, as the need arises.

## Financial Impact

Commission on Teacher Credentialing: The proposed amendment will allow the Commission at a public meeting to adjust the CBEST fee, as needed, to maintain the solvency of the CBEST fund.

State Colleges and Universities: None.

Private Persons: The proposal would allow the Commission to adjust the CBEST fee, as needed, to maintain the solvency of the CBEST fund. CBEST registrants who are private persons pay this fee.

Mandated costs: None

## Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Mailing List and Responses

Mailing List

Members of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing

California County Superintendents of Schools

Credential Analysts at the California County Superintendent of Schools' Offices

Superintendents of Selected California School Districts

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

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

Presidents of Select Professional Educational Associations

The notice of proposed rulemaking was also placed on the Internet at  
"http://www.ctc.ca.gov".

#### Tally of Responses

At the time of this writing, the Commission has received no responses to the proposed amendment to Section 80487.

#### Staff Recommendation

The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed regulations.

---

### Division VIII of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations

#### Proposed Amendment to Section 80487 Pertaining to the CBEST Fee

#### INITIAL PROPOSED REGULATIONS

Section §80487. Fees.

- (a) For the purpose of this section, credential means any certificate, permit, authorization, or other certification document, which the Commission is empowered to issue.
  - (1) The fee for the issuance, reissuance, or renewal of credential shall be sixty-five dollars unless otherwise established by law. Effective January 1, 1995, this fee shall be seventy dollars.
  - (2) The fee for a duplicate credential shall be one-half the fee specified in (a)(1) or the credential fee established by law.
  - (3) Two hundred fifty dollars for a Board of Examiners' fee as provided in Section 80076.
  - (4) Thirty dollars for an examination processing fee as provided in Section 80077.
  - (5) Pursuant to Education Code Section 44252.5, Tthe fee for the state basic skills assessment examination pursuant to Education Code Section 44252.5 proficiency test shall be forty dollars for test dates through January 1, 2002, and, for test dates after January 1, 2002, shall be established and periodically reviewed by the Commission in a public meeting.**
  - (6) Fourteen dollars, or the actual fee if different from this amount, to reimburse the Commission for the actual amount charged by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for furnishing its summary criminal history information applicable to all credentials.
  - (7) Sixteen dollars and fifty cents, or the actual fee if it is different from this amount, to reimburse the Commission for the fee charged by the California State Department of Justice, Criminal Identification and Investigation Bureau, for furnishing its summary criminal history information on applicants for credentials.
  - (8) Thirty-eight dollars for each unit of the Bilingual-Crosscultural Competency Certificate examination if taken separately or a fee of one hundred dollars for the entire examination, (all three units of the examination) if taken at the same time. For persons who take only one section of the Language portion of the examination, a fee of thirty-five dollars will be charged.

- (9) A fee of one hundred dollars for the full language Development Specialist examination; thirty-five dollars for Part I, and seventy-five dollars for Part II, if taken separately.
- (10) A fee of one hundred dollars for the full Bilingual Certificate of Assessment Competence examination: a fee of thirty-seven dollars for either the oral production or case study section, and twenty-nine dollars for either the multiple choice or audio transcription section if taken separately.
- (11) The fee for the Certificate of Clearance as specified in Section 80028 shall be one-half the fee in (a)(1) or the credential fee established by law.
- (b) Except for the fee specified in (a)(5), (a)(8), (a)(9), and (a)(10), the fees shall accompany the application for issuance, reissuance or renewal, or the request for a duplicate credential; the fees shall be deemed earned upon receipt and shall not be refunded even though the applicant does not qualify for the credential or subsequently finds a reportedly lost or destroyed document.
- (c) The fee for examination administered by a contractor on behalf of the Commission, specifically (a)(5), (a)(8), (a)(9), and (a)(10), shall be paid directly to the testing contractor unless otherwise specified by contract.
- (d) The applicant shall receive either a credential or an evaluation which sets forth the requirements which have not been met.
- (e) Where an applicant has all the qualifications for a credential at the time the application therefor is submitted, but where required verification or documentation has been delayed, no new or additional fee shall be charged if such required verification or documentation is submitted within one year.
- (f) Where applicable, each application for a credential shall be accompanied by an examination processing fee pursuant to Section 80077 of these regulations.
- (g) The fee for a county or district to file a copy of a county-issued or district-issued certificate of completion of staff development in specially designed academic instruction delivered in English and/or in English language development in a self-contained classroom pursuant to Education Code section 44253.10(f)(2), including issuing a duplicate if requested, is twelve dollars (\$12). Each certificate must be accompanied by the form Request to File Certificate of Completion of Staff Development (form 41-CCSD, rev. 1/97). To request a duplicate of the certificate, the person to whom the original certificate was issued must submit the form Request for Duplicate Certificate of Completion of Staff Development (form 41-CCSD-DUP, rev. 1/97) to the Commission.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 44225 and 44252.5, Education Code. Reference: Sections 44235, 44252.5, 44253.5, 44253.10, 44280, 44289, 44298, 44332.5(b), 44339, 44340, 44341, 44352, 52134 and 52178, Education Code; and Section 11105(e), Penal Code.



[Return to April 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](#)