



[CCTC Home](#) | [California Home Page](#) | [Governor's Home Page](#)

[About the Commission](#) | [Credential Information](#) | [Credential Alerts](#)

[Coded Correspondence](#) | [Educational Standards](#) | [Examination Information](#)

[Reports-on-Line](#) | [Committee on Accreditation](#) | [Troops to Teachers](#) | [Other Sites of Interest](#)

November Commission Agenda

November 7-8, 2001
Commission Offices, 1900 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95814

Web-Posted October 18, 2001

Wednesday, November 7, 2001 - Commission Office

1. General Session (Chairman Bersin)

1:00 p.m.

The Commission will immediately convene into Closed Session

Closed Session (Chairman Bersin/Vice Chairman Madkins)

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

2. Appeals and Waivers (Committee Chairman Madkins)

- A&W-1 Approval of the Minutes
- A&W-2 Waivers: Consent Calendar
- A&W-3 Waivers: Conditions Calendar
- A&W-4 Waivers: Denial Calendar

Thursday, November 8, 2001 - Commission Office

1. General Session (Chairman Bersin)

8:00 a.m.

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

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

- LEG-1 Status of Legislation of Interest to the Commission
- LEG-2 Analyses of Bills of Interest to the Commission

3. Credentialing and Certificated Assignments Committee of the Whole (Committee Chair Fortune)

- C&CA-1 Review of Eminence Criteria and Proposed Changes to the Eminence Appeal Process

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

- PREP-1 Recommended Approval of Grant Awards for Early Adoption of California's New Credentialing Standards Under SB 2042
- PREP-2 Recommended Award of Grants to Develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

- PREP-3 Recommended Approval of Interagency Agreements for Policy Studies Under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant
- PREP-4 Sixth Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation
- PREP-5 Discussion of Options for Restructuring the Administrative Services Credential

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

- PERF-1 Results of the CBEST Validity Study and Recommended CBEST Specifications

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

- FPPC-1 Update on the Teacher Credentialing Service Improvement Project
- FPPC-2 Update on the Fiscal Status of the Commission's Local Assistance Programs

7. Commissioner Celebration

1:30 p.m.

8. Reconvene General Session (Chairman Bersin)

- GS-10 Report of Appeals and Waivers Committee
- GS-11 Report of Closed Session Items
- GS-12 Commission Member Reports
- GS-13 Audience Presentations
- GS-14 Old Business
 - Quarterly Agenda for Information
 - November, and December 2001, January 2002
- GS-15 New Business
- GS-16 Nominations of the California Commission On Teacher Credentialing's Chair and Vice Chair for 2002
- 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, California, CA 95814; telephone, (916) 445-0184.

NEXT MEETING:

**December 3 - 4, 2001
California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95814**

**BILLS FOLLOWED BY THE
CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
October 19, 2001**

SPONSORED BILLS

Bill Number – Author – Version Summary	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
SB 57 – Scott – Amended 8/30/01 Provides a “fast track” credential option for private school teachers and others who can demonstrate their knowledge, skills and abilities in the classroom.	Sponsor – Introduced version – (Dec. 2000)	Signed by the Governor. Chapter 269, Statutes of 2001.
SB 299 – Scott – Amended 8/30/01 Clarifies the Education Code Sections related to the Committee of Credentials and makes numerous non-controversial, technical and clarifying changes to the Education Code.	Sponsor – Introduced version – (Dec 2000)	Signed by the Governor. Chapter 342, Statutes of 2001.

ASSEMBLY BILLS OF INTEREST TO CCTC

Bill Number – Author – Version Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
<p>AB 75 – Steinberg – Amended 8/28/01 Creates a voluntary program to provide training to California’s principals and vice-principals to include academic standards, leadership skills, and the use of management and diagnostic technology. This is a Governor’s Initiative and the Governor’s Budget includes \$15 million for this program.</p>	<p>Watch – Introduced – (Feb 2001) Support – 2/22/01 – (March 2001)</p>	<p>Signed by the Governor. Chapter 697, Statutes of 2001.</p>
<p>AB 272 – Pavley – Amended 7/18/01 Would make a holder’s first clear multiple or single subject teaching credential valid for the life of the holder after two renewal cycles, if the holder meets specified requirements.</p>	<p>Oppose – Introduced version – (March 2001) Watch – 5/31/01 (July 2001)</p>	<p>Vetoed.</p>
<p>AB 401 – Cardenas – Amended 5/01/01 Requires the SPI to contract with an independent evaluator to determine if there is a difference in the distribution of resources (including credentialed teachers and pre-intern, intern and paraprofessional programs) between low-performing schools and high-performing schools within school districts. The report would be due by January 1, 2004 and subject to funding through the Budget Act.</p>	<p>Watch – Introduced version – (April 2001)</p>	<p>Senate Appropriations suspense file.</p>
<p>AB 721 – Steinberg – Amended 4/17/01 The CCTC could award grants to teacher preparation programs to develop or enhance programs to recruit, prepare and support new teachers to work and be successful in low performing schools.</p>	<p>Support – 3/29/01- (April 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Appropriations suspense file.</p>
<p>AB 833 – Steinberg – Amended 7/18/01 Requires the SPI to calculate a teacher qualification index measuring a student's access to experienced credentialed teacher for each school.</p>	<p>Watch – 3/29/01 – (April 2001)</p>	<p>Vetoed.</p>

Bill Number – Author – Version Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
<p>AB 961 – Steinberg, Vasconcellos, Ortiz, Diaz et. al. – Amended 9/14/01</p> <p>Establishes the High Priority Schools Grant Program to allocate \$200 million to low performing schools in API deciles one through five, with a priority for funding on the first and second deciles.</p>		<p>Signed by the Governor.</p> <p>Chapter 749, Statutes of 2001.</p>
<p>AB 1148 - Wyland – Amended 4/17/01</p> <p>Would require the Legislative Analyst’s Office to identify the variables that account for significant differences in test performance in elementary and high schools where the schools have similar resources.</p>	<p>Watch – Introduced version – (April 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Appropriations suspense file.</p>
<p>AB 1232 – Chavez – Amended 5/17/01</p> <p>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, pre-internship or internship program would be eligible for a bonus payment.</p>	<p>Seek Amendments – Introduced version – (March 2001) Support – 5/01/01 (May 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Appropriations suspense file.</p>
<p>AB 1241 – Robert Pacheco – Amended 8/22/01</p> <p>Would require the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to submit a written report on the feasibility of the development of a uniform teacher preparation program.</p>	<p>Seek Amendments – Introduced version – (April 2001) Watch – 4/05/01 – (May 2001)</p>	<p>Signed by the Governor.</p> <p>Chapter 714, Statutes of 2001.</p>
<p>AB 1307 – Goldberg – Amended 8/28/01</p> <p>Would require the CCTC to adopt regulations that provide credential candidates with less than 24 months to complete the program to not meet new requirements under specified conditions.</p>	<p>Oppose, Unless Amended – Introduced version – (April 2001) Approve – 6/27/01 (July 2001)</p>	<p>Signed by the Governor.</p> <p>Chapter 565, Statutes of 2001.</p>
<p>AB 1431 – Horton – Amended 9/7/01</p> <p>Creates a pilot program, in a minimum of three districts, to provide a 3-day training program for substitute teachers in low performing schools. Requires Los Angeles Unified to be one if the three participants in the pilot program.</p>	<p>Watch – Introduced version – (April 2001)</p>	<p>Vetoed.</p>
<p>AB 1662 – R. Pacheco – Amended 4/30/01</p> <p>Would require a master's degree for the Pupil Personnel Services Credential.</p>	<p>Oppose – 5/02/01 – (May 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Committee on Appropriations suspense file.</p>

SENATE BILLS

Bill Number – Author – Version Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
<p>SB 321 - Alarcon – Amended 7/18/01 Would allow school districts to provide a 30-day training program for teachers they hire on an emergency permit. Provides \$2 million for implementation to be dispersed to LAUSD after Commission approval of training program. Provided \$125K to Commission for administrative costs.</p>	<p>Seek Amendments – Introduced version – (April 2001)</p>	<p>Signed by the Governor. Chapter 576, Statutes of 2001. Deleted \$2 million for implementation.</p>
<p>SB 508 – Vasconcellos – Amended 7/17/01 Omnibus bill to improve California's lowest performing schools. One section would allow low-performing schools with 10% or more of their teachers serving on an emergency permit eligible to receive \$30,000 for a credentialed teacher to advise those teachers serving on emergency permits. Another section would expand the teaching requirement for Cal Grant T recipients to include any California public school, not just low-performing schools.</p>	<p>Watch – 4/23/01 (May 2001)</p>	<p>Senate unfinished business. (Content included in AB 961, Steinberg, Vasconcellos et.al.)</p>
<p>SB 572 – O’Connell – Amended 5/03/01 Prohibits school districts from limiting the years of service credit used to determine the salary of a teacher coming from another school district.</p>	<p>Support, If Amended – Introduced version – (April 2001) Watch – 5/03/01 – (May 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Education Committee. Not yet scheduled for hearing.</p>
<p>SB 688 - O’Connell – Amended 6/4/01 Would make beginning teachers in regional occupation centers and programs eligible for BTSA.</p>	<p>Approve – Introduced version – (April 2001)</p>	<p>Assembly Appropriations Committee suspense file.</p>
<p>SB 743 – Murray – Amended 8/23/01 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 of SB 79– (Feb 2001) (Content of SB 79 was amended into SB 743.)</p>	<p>Vetoed.</p>

Bill Number – Author – Version Subject	Previous and Current CCTC Position Version (Date Adopted)	Status
SB 792 – Sher – Amended 7/03/01 Would require the CCTC to issue a two-year subject matter credential after earning a baccalaureate degree and passage of CBEST and a clear credential after completion of 40 hours of preparation and professional development, if any, and passage of the teacher preparation assessment.	Oppose – Introduced version – (March 2001) Oppose – 4/5/01 – (April 2001)	Assembly Education Committee. Failed passage.
SB 837 – Scott – Amended 9/5/01 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.	Support – Introduced version – (March 2001)	Signed by the Governor. Chapter 585, Statutes of 2001.
SB 900 – Ortiz – Amended 3/28/01 Would increase efficiency in processing information requests by grouping those agencies with similar standards and information needs together.	Support, If Amended – 3/28/01 – (April 2001)	Senate Committee on Public Safety Committee. Two-year bill at request of the author.

Revised on October 19, 2001

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

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

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

Bill Number:	Senate Bill 743 (previously SB 79)
Authors:	Senator Kevin Murray
Sponsor:	Senator Kevin Murray
Subject of Bill:	Emergency Permits
Status in Leg. Process:	Vetoed by the Governor
Current CTC Position:	Watch
Date of Analysis:	October 22, 2001
Analyst:	Dan Gonzales and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Current law allows the Commission to issue or renew emergency teaching permits if the applicant possesses a baccalaureate degree and some units in the subject to be taught from a regionally accredited institution of higher education.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

Assembly Bill 471 (Scott, Chapter 381, Statutes of 1999) requires the Commission to annually report to the Legislature and Governor on the number of classroom teachers who received credentials, internships, and emergency permits in the previous fiscal year. The Commission must also make this report available to school districts and county offices of education to assist them in the recruitment of credentialed teachers. Commission staff submitted the 1998-1999 report to the Commission at the January 2001 Commission meeting.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This bill would require the Commission to:

- Develop a plan that requires a school district to address the disproportionate number of teachers serving on emergency permits in low-performing schools in low-income communities as compared to schools that are not low-performing or not in low-income communities.

- Prepare the plan in consultation with a broadly representative and diverse advisory committee including representatives from the Office of the Secretary of Education, Department of Education, postsecondary institutions, schools, school districts, parents, and other interested parties. The plan must identify programs currently in place that address the disproportionate number of teachers serving on emergency permits in low-performing schools. Low-performing school is defined as those ranked below the 50th percentile on the most recent Academic Performance Index.
- Include in the plan information for those districts on how to access and utilize federal, state and local programs and address how best to establish long-term teacher recruitment and retention policies in the schools that have the greatest difficulty getting and retaining credentialed teachers.
- Prepare the plan by June 30, 2002 and distribute the plan to the appropriate legislative policy committees and the Governor no later than July 1, 2002.

This bill would appropriate \$32,000 from the General Fund to the Commission to prepare and distribute the plan.

Comments

This bill is almost identical to SB 1575 which Senator Murray introduced last year. The only difference between the bills are the two deadlines, which were extended one year. The Commission had a watch position on SB 1575.

Similar bill vetoed last year. Governor Davis vetoed SB 1575 last year. He stated in the veto message (attached) that he had included in the 2000 Budget funding for several new teacher recruitment programs to reduce the number of emergency-credentialed teachers serving in low-performing schools and provide the districts with greater flexibility to address their most urgent teacher recruitment and retention needs. Governor Davis stated that state resources are best used ensuring that this investment gained results.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

The potential cost to the Commission would be approximately \$32,000, the amount appropriated. Costs would include travel expenses and background materials for a twelve-member panel - meeting approximately three times, printing costs for the report, and the services of an outside consultant to advise and support the panel and Commission staff.

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.

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.

Reason for Suggested Position

Commission staff recommends a watch position because this bill was vetoed last year.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Senate Bill 837, Chapter 585
Author:	Senator Scott
Sponsor:	Senator Scott
Subject of Bill:	Diligent Search for Credentialed Teachers
Date Introduced:	February 23, 2001 Amended in Assembly September 5, 2001
Status in Leg. Process:	Signed by the Governor, October 5, 2001 Filed with the Secretary of State, October 7, 2001
Commission Position:	Support
Date of Analysis:	October 19, 2001
Analyst:	Marilyn Errett and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

Current law authorizes the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to issue or renew emergency teaching or specialist permits in accordance with regulations adopted by the Commission. Certain conditions must be met by school districts requesting approval to submit applications for emergency permits including that the district has made a diligent search for, but is unable to recruit, a sufficient number of credentialed teachers.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission currently requires all school districts using emergency permit teachers to estimate the number of emergency permits needed in the upcoming school year. This estimate must be made public at the local school board meeting. The school board must approve the use of emergency permit teachers. The estimate and school board approval are sent to the Commission in an annual "Declaration of Need for Fully Qualified Educators." If a current "Declaration of

Need” is not on file with the Commission, no emergency permits will be issued for use in the school district for that year.

The Commission has encouraged school districts to apply for funds to support a district Pre-Intern Program for individuals who would otherwise serve on emergency permits. The Commission was recently awarded a federal grant to conduct a pilot program with San Diego City Unified School District and Oakland Unified School District to reduce, and potentially eliminate, the use of emergency permits. The pilot program features an aggressive campaign by participating districts of recruitment, establishment or expansion of a Pre-Intern Program, and a thorough examination of credentialing options available to move individuals off of an emergency permit.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

SB 837 specifies the documentation that a school district must provide the Commission to justify a request for an emergency permit. It requires school districts to submit annual evidence of ongoing efforts to search for qualified credentialed teachers, interns, or pre-interns if the districts are requesting emergency teaching permits such as:

- Distributing job announcements
- Contacting college and university placement centers
- Advertising in local newspapers
- Exploring the incentives included in the Teaching As A Priority Block Grant
- Participating in the state and regional recruitment centers
- Participating in job fairs in California

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

No fiscal impact.

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.

Operational Implications

Most school districts currently conduct a thorough and diligent search for credentialed teachers. Under SB 837, districts will be asked to verify their efforts on the annual "Declaration of Need" form already in use for emergency permits.

The focus of SB 837 is recruitment. Districts will be encouraged to work with their regional recruitment center to recruit a pool of qualified teachers. SB 837 does not impact district hiring discretion. After following an organized and good faith recruitment effort, districts may continue to maintain the prerogative of hiring the most suitable individual for the position.

Why the need for SB 837? In testimony before the Legislature it was asserted that a small number of school districts are still choosing to hire emergency permit holders over credentialed teachers because they are "cheaper."

For the majority of school districts, the verification on the "Declaration of Need" will suffice. However, for school districts unable to verify a diligent search for credentialed teachers, or for districts with a high percentage of emergency permit teachers or an increase in emergency permits, the Commission may want to provide technical assistance and advice toward achieving a well-organized and coordinated recruitment effort. A few school districts may need more serious assistance. For these districts, assistance from California's County Office Fiscal Crisis Management and Assistance Teams (FCMAT) will be recommended per SB 1331 (Alpert, 2000).

Governor Davis' Veto Message
SB 1575

To Members of the California State Senate:

I am returning Senate Bill No. 1575 without my signature.

This bill would require the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to develop a plan by June 30, 2001 for school districts to address the disproportionate number of teachers serving on emergency permits in low performing, low income schools.

I included in the 2000 Budget funding for several new teacher recruitment programs designed to reduce the number of emergency-credentialed teachers serving in low-performing schools, including the Teacher Recruitment Incentive Program, which is funded at \$9.4 million, and the Teaching as a Priority Block Grant Program, which is funded at \$118.7 million.

With this unprecedented public investment in teacher recruitment, there is greater flexibility at the district level to address the most urgent teacher recruitment and retention needs. I believe that state resources are best used ensuring that this investment gains results.

Sincerely,

GRAY DAVIS

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 75
Authors:	Assembly Member Steinberg
Sponsor:	Governor Davis
Subject of Bill:	Principal Training Program
Status in Leg. Process:	Signed by Governor Chapter 697, Statutes of 2001
Current CTC Position:	Support
Date of Analysis:	October 22, 2001
Analyst:	Leyne Milstein and Linda Bond

Summary of Current Law

No one may be employed as principal of a school of six or more certificated employees unless he or she holds a valid school administration credential based upon a teaching credential or a services credential with a specialization in pupil personnel, health, clinical, rehabilitative, or librarian services.

Currently, the Commission issues the Administrative Services Credential in two phases. The Preliminary Credential, the first phase, is a one-time, nonrenewable credential and is valid for five years. It requires a valid teaching credential, passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) and three years of full-time work as a teacher in a public or private school. The Professional Clear Credential, the second phase, is renewable, valid for five years and requires a Preliminary Credential, two years in a full-time administrative position and completion of an individualized program at a California college or university with a Commission-approved program.

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

Commission staff were directed to hold five forums on the nature and structure of the Administrative Credential between December 2000 and February 2001. The sessions were organized to provide participants the opportunity to discuss the structure of the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credentials: the content of professional preparation programs, induction and support for new administrators,

alternative program options and recruitment and retention of site and district office administrators.

Several common themes were observed:

- Beginning administrators need support, mentoring, and assistance.
- School districts should be allowed to “grow their own” administrators.
- The complexity and demands of an administrative job and the level of compensation are a disincentive for individuals to seek administrative positions.
- Better collaboration is needed between institutions of higher education and school districts in preparing administrators.
- The field experience component of existing preparation programs is inadequate. This component does not provide candidates with a realistic picture of an administrator’s responsibilities, because candidates typically are unable to obtain release time for this purpose.
- Theory and practice in administrator preparation should be better integrated.
- School districts need to do a better job of professional development for administrators.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

This measure establishes the Principal Training Program, to provide school-site principals and vice-principals with instruction and training. The measure specifies that training areas shall include, but are not limited to: school finance, personnel management, core academic standards, pupil assessment, instructional technology, and curriculum frameworks, instructional materials aligned to the state academic standards, the extension of the knowledge, skills and abilities acquired in the preliminary administrative preparation program and areas that may be considered to improve pupil learning and achievement.

Specifically, this measure provides for the following:

- Allows any local education agency (LEA), individually or in partnership with one or more institutions of higher education or other education entities to submit a program proposal to the State Board of Education (SBE) for funding. The proposal must include an expenditure plan, specify how the proposed training addresses the training areas identified above, and how the local education agency will continue administrator professional development.
- Training programs designed for this purpose must offer a minimum of 80 hours of instruction and training. At the local level, training can be tailored to meet the needs of individual administrators. The program must also include an additional 80 hours of continuing support and professional development that may be completed over the two years after the training starts.

- Requires the SBE, in consultation with the Commission, to develop criteria for the approval of state-qualified training providers.
- Requires LEAs to use a state-qualified provider to offer training that has been approved by the SBE.
- Authorizes the Commission to approve a program developed pursuant to this measure as meeting a portion or all of the requirements to fulfill the standards for a professional clear administrative services credential.
- Provides state funding up to \$3,000 per school-site administrator; LEAs must contribute \$1,000 in matching funds. (Matching funds for the local contribution for principal training have been secured through a grant from a charitable foundation.)
- Funding is intended to serve one-third of the principals and vice-principals in each year of a three-year program and is awarded on a first-come-first-served priority. States it is the Legislature's intent that LEAs give the highest priority to training administrators assigned to and practicing in low-performing or hard-to-staff schools. If all of the statewide funding is not expended in any fiscal year it may be redistributed on a pro-rata basis to LEAs that have served more than one-third of their schoolsite administrators in that fiscal year.
- Requires the State Department of Education to develop, and the SBE to review and approve, an interim report on the status of the program by July 1, 2004. The report must include: a comparison of the school's Academic Performance Index scores the year before the administrator was trained and the year after the administrator completed the training; the number of principals and vice principals who received training; and the entities that received funding and the number of participants trained by each entity.
- Requires the State Department of Education to develop, and the SBE to review and approve, a final report on the status of the program by June 30, 2005. The final report must include all of the elements of the interim report as well as information detailing the retention rate of principals and vice principals who participated in this training.
- Becomes inoperative on July 1, 2006 and sunsets on January 1, 2007.

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

The 2001-02 Budget Act included \$15 million for this initiative. The number of local programs that may seek Commission approval as an alternative route to certification is unknown.

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.**

- 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.**

Comments

As California places more emphasis on academic standards and student performance, the need for dynamic leaders prepared in administration and curriculum leadership grows. AB 75 will provide needed funding for administrator training, mentoring, support and assistance and provide an opportunity to develop an alternative certification route for candidates to fulfill the requirements for a Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential.

Bill Analysis

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 961
Authors:	Assemblymember Steinberg and Senator Vasconcellos, et al.
Subject of Bill:	Additional Assistance to Low-Performing Schools
Status in Leg. Process:	Signed by Governor Chapter 749, Statutes of 2001
CTC Position:	None
Date of Analysis:	October 22, 2001
Analyst:	Leyne Milstein

Summary of Current Law

Current law provides for the Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA), which applies to all public schools in the state, including charter schools. The PSAA includes the Academic Performance Index (API), an Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP), and the Governor's High Achieving/Improving Schools Program (HA/ISP). These programs are administered by the California Department of Education (CDE).

Summary of Current Activity by the Commission

The Commission is responsible for issuing and renewing emergency teaching permits and for the administration of the alternative teacher preparation programs including the Para-Professional, Pre-Internship Teaching Program (Pre-Intern Program), and Intern Program.

Analysis of Bill Provisions

The 2001-02 Budget contains \$200 million to provide an intensive improvement program in schools in the bottom deciles of the Academic Performance Index (API). This bill implements the new High Priority Grant Program for Low-Performing Schools (HPGP), providing funding to schools in the bottom five deciles in the API, with priority for funding given to those schools in deciles 1 and 2. There are approximately 1,335 schools that rank in deciles 1 and 2 (948 elementary schools, 164 secondary schools) representing approximately 1.4 million children. The \$200 million will provide funding of \$200 per pupil. In order to be eligible for funding under the High Priority Grant Program for Low-

Performing Schools, AB 961 requires schools to participate in the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program. In concert with the \$200 per pupil provided by the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program, participation in the High Priority Grant Program for Low-Performing Schools will provide \$400 additional dollars per pupil.

The core of the High Priority Grant Program for Low-Performing Schools program is the preparation of an action plan by each participating school. The measure specifies the following:

Development of the School Level Action Plan

- District and school site must develop the plan jointly with broad-based representation including parents.
- District must sign off on the plan after consultation with teachers.
- Annual public reporting and a hearing at the district board meeting of progress made toward improving the API ranking and annual benchmarks as delineated in the action plan.

Elements to be Considered in the School Level Action Plan

- Pupil literacy and achievement
- Quality of staff (teachers/administrators/site personnel)
- Parental involvement
- Facilities, curriculum, instructional materials and support services
- English Language Learners (must be addressed throughout the plan)
- Quantifiable benchmarks (i.e. credentialed teachers vs. non-credentialed teachers, textbooks and instructional materials aligned to the state content standards, experienced administrators versus novice administrators.

In efforts to support the planning process, the measure provides \$50,000 planning grants to school districts, on behalf of eligible schools, for technical assistance in the development of the school action plan.

School Districts are required to submit an annual report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction (SPI) that includes the following:

- The academic improvement of pupils within the participating school as measured by the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program and the English Language Development Test;
- The improvement of the distribution of teachers holding a valid California teaching credential across the district;
- The availability of instructional materials in core content areas that are aligned with the academic content and performance standards, including textbooks, for each pupil, including English language learners;
- The number of parents and guardians presently involved at each participating school-site as compared to the number participating at the beginning of the program;
- The number of pupils attending after school, tutoring, or homework assistance programs; and,
- For participating secondary schools, the number of pupils who are enrolled in and successfully completing advanced placement courses as specified.

Among other things, the measure also requires a school to certify that the eligible teachers and administrators assigned to a participating school participate in specified in the California Professional Development Institutes (AB 466, Chapter 737, Statutes of 2001) and the new Principal Training Program (AB 75, Chapter 697, Statutes of 2001) as a condition of receiving funds for this program.

Schools participating in the program that do not meet annual growth targets after the first two years of participation are subject to review by the State Board of Education. Schools that meet growth targets after three years in the program may be provided additional funding. Schools that have not met their growth targets or do not show improvement after the first three years are required to continue participating in the program and may be subject to the following sanctions:

- SPI assuming all legal rights, duties and powers of the local governing board with respect to the school.
- Reassignment of the school principal.
- Revise attendance options for pupils.
- Allow parents to apply to the SBE to establish a charter school.
- Assign the management of the school to another, such as a college or university, the county office of education, or other appropriate entity.
- Reassign other certificated employees of the school.
- Renegotiate a new collective bargaining agreement at the termination of the existing agreement.
- Reorganize the school.
- Close the school.
- Take any action considered appropriate, such as appointment of a new superintendent and suspension of the authority of the school board.

Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission

The following Legislative policies may apply to this measure:

- 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.**
- 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.**

Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill

This measure does not impact the Commission's budget.

Review of Eminence Criteria and Proposed Changes to the Eminence Appeal Process

October 22, 2001

Summary

At the September 2001 Commission meeting, the Commission requested that staff review the criteria used to evaluate eminence applications and present proposed changes that will reflect a more structured approach to this process. This agenda item presents criteria to guide staff when reviewing an eminence credential and it also outlines three proposed alternatives to the current denial and appeal process.

Fiscal Impact

There is no fiscal impact resulting from this agenda report.

Policy Issues to be Resolved

Should the Commission direct staff to utilize the proposed eminence application criteria as presented in this agenda item? Should the Commission provide staff direction on one of the proposed alternatives pertaining to the staff denial and appeal process?

Background

At the September 2001 Commission meeting, staff presented two eminence application requests for Commission consideration. Staff had reviewed both applications and had determined that one clearly appeared to meet the Commission's definition of eminence. The other, previously denied by staff, clearly did not meet the Commission's definition of eminence and was presented to the Commission based solely on the employing school district's request. Although the evidentiary documentation submitted with these applications differed vastly, staff was required to present both items, as each of them met the current criteria and regulations governing the review of eminence application requests.

This prompted the Commission to discuss the current process pertaining to the evaluation and denial of eminence credential applications. This discussion brought to light the need for a more thoroughly delineated set of criteria and the need to explore alternatives to the current denial and appeal process.

This agenda item presents proposed criteria to guide staff when reviewing an eminence credential. Based on the proposed criteria, staff will update the Eminence Credential leaflet that is utilized by employers when preparing an eminence application. This agenda item also proposes three alternatives to the current denial and appeal process.

Criteria

With the understanding that the eminence process includes a high degree of subjectivity, the following criteria will be used to assist staff in reviewing and preparing eminence applications for presentation and will help staff to

communicate to the districts, the documentation that is needed for the Commission's review.

For those applications where it is clearly apparent that the application provides sufficient evidence to support eminence, the application will be brought to the Commission for review. If staff determines that an application for an Eminence Credential does not fulfill the Commission's definition of eminence as outlined in the proposed criteria, staff will deny the application for an eminence credential and issue a letter to the requesting district identifying the basis for denial.

Evaluation of Eminence Credential Applications

Purpose and Guidelines

The purpose of the Eminence Credential, as codified into law under section 44225 of the Education Code, is to provide for the issuance of a teaching credential in the unusual circumstance where an individual who is so eminent in their field that they will compensate for their lack of a teacher preparation program by their exceptional knowledge and renown in the subject matter of their expertise.

Implied in the statute is the employing school district's responsibility to validate the individual's ability to teach during the first two years of the individual's assignment. During that time, the individual is only authorized to teach for the requesting school district and such employment must be in the field where the individual has established their expertise.

Title 5, Section 80043, defines eminence as 1) an individual who is recognized as such beyond the boundaries of his or her community; 2) has demonstrably advanced his or her field; and 3) has been acknowledged by his or her peers beyond the norm for others in the specific endeavor.

The judgment of whether an individual merits the awarding of an Eminence Credential will always include a degree of subjectivity, however, both the statute and regulation set a high bar, requiring the individual applicant to have reached a position of prominence within their field. The Commission is the final authority in granting an eminence credential and an eminence application that appears to meet the criteria does not guarantee that the Commission will award the eminence credential. These guidelines and criteria assist the staff in reviewing an

eminence application and assist the employing district and applicant in preparing an eminence application.

Criteria and Documentation

The following criteria will be used to consider whether or not an individual has achieved eminence in their field. *Sufficient documentation of evidence must be presented in each of the following areas:*

- 1.) *The individual is recognized as eminent beyond the boundaries of his or her community;*

This area is considered to mean renown outside of the individual's geographic community. More weight will be placed on international and interstate renown in their area of endeavor than exposure within the individual's state or residence. The fact that the individual has moved their residence from place to place, whether within the same state or from country to country, will be given no weight. Applications that are submitted where the notoriety is confined to the geographic location of the local community will be returned to the district. The individual's professional reputation and influence should also be considered in the review process and should extend beyond the boundaries of the local community.

- 2.) *Demonstrably advanced his or her field; and*

To verify that the applicant for eminence demonstrably advanced his or her field the applicant must provide documentation of advanced degrees, distinguished employment, and evidence of research activities substantially contributing to their field of endeavor, or authorship of highly regarded publications demonstrating the individual's high degree of expertise. A person with exceptional knowledge in a particular field is not necessarily eminent in that field. When the eminence is for work in the arts, distinguished employment is verified with evidence that the individual received top billing in films, productions, televised events, or exhibitions.

- 3.) *Acknowledged by his or her peers beyond the norm for others in the specific field of endeavor.*

The applicant should meet at least three of the following to establish recognition within their field:

- a. Letters from former employers, professional colleagues and other experts in the field, relating to the individual's recognized expertise or position of prominence in their field.
- b. Documents evidencing an extraordinary ability worthy of distinction, such as written advisory opinions from a peer group, national or international organization representing the field.
- c. Evidence of a major, nationally or internationally recognized award. These awards should be of the type recognizing uncommon achievement in and advancement of a particular field of endeavor.
- d. Evidence of any extremely significant contribution made to their field.

- e. Authorship of a new or unusually successful method of educating children or members of the public in the individual's field of endeavor.
 - f. Extraordinary commercial success in their field.
- 4). Documentation used in support of an application for eminence, as outlined in the above criteria, *must be from*:
- Professional Associations;
 - Former and Current Employers;
 - Professional Colleagues (beyond those he / she currently works with); or
 - Other
- 5) A letter from the applicant describing his or her accomplishments that support a claim of eminence.

Validity of Eminence Credential

The first Eminence Credential is valid for two years. The second issuance is valid for three years. The first five years of the Eminence Credential are restricted to the employing school district that requested the Eminence Credential. After five years, the holder qualifies for a professional clear credential that is valid throughout California.

If there are no objections from the Commission, staff will use the above criteria when reviewing eminence applications.

Proposed Alternatives for Eminence Appeals

When staff evaluates an eminence application and concludes that the individual did not meet the Commission's definition of eminent, the application is returned to the district with a denial letter. The denial letter outlines the materials that were submitted with the eminence application and identifies the specific areas that lacked sufficient evidentiary documentation. Although the individual and the requesting district are informed of the specific basis(s) for denial, current regulation and procedures provide the opportunity for the applicant district to appeal staff's determination solely upon request and not based on the merits of the denial.

The Commission has requested that staff explore alternatives to the current eminence denial and appeal process. An effective denial and appeal process coupled with the proposed eminence criteria will provide staff with a comprehensive tool that can be used not only for effectively evaluating eminence applications, but will also give the applicant districts clarification of the Commission's eminence credential requirements.

The following are three alternatives to the current eminence denial and appeal process for consideration by the Commission:

1. Denial of an Eminence Application by Consent

Staff will prepare a consent calendar action item for eminence application requests that, based on staff's evaluation, did not meet the Commission's

definition of eminence. The Commission could then take action to deny the application, or request that the application be presented in its entirety at the next available Commission meeting. If denied, the district may then request reconsideration of the denial if it submits new and relevant materials that were not available at the time of the Commission denial.

2. Appeal of a Denial of an Eminence by the Commission Chair or Designee

An applying school district may appeal a staff denial of an eminence credential application to a Commission Chair or his or her designee, to review the merits of the denial and determine if the application should be presented for review by the entire Commission.

3. Appeal of a Denial of an Eminence Credential Based on Merit

An applying school district may appeal a staff denial of an eminence credential if additional supporting evidence can be presented to staff for review. The new evidence must be relevant to the reasons for denial and not have been available at that time of the denial. If staff determines that the new information now supports the applicant's request for eminence, staff will present the application for Commission review. If the additional information does not support the definition of eminence the application will be returned to the requesting district with a final staff denial.

Based on Commission direction, staff will present an agenda item with proposed language to change the eminence appeal process in Title 5 regulations.

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of
November 7-8, 2001*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PREP - 1**

COMMITTEE: **Preparation Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Recommended Approval of Grant Awards for Early
Adoption of California's New Credentialing Standards
Under SB 2042**

 X **Action**

 Information

 Report

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

- Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**
- Develop candidate and program standards that guide our local communities in the education of their children
 - Develop processes for and monitor program accreditation

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** _____
Phyllis Jacobson, Ed.D.
Consultant, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** _____
Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director

**Recommended Approval of Grant Awards for Early Adoption of California's
New Credentialing Standards Under SB 2042**

Professional Services Division

November 4, 2001

Executive Summary

At its meeting of September 6, 2001, the Commission approved new Standards under SB 2042 for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs, and an Implementation Timeline for transitioning to these new sets of Standards. In the interest of assisting those institutions that want to make an early transition to the new Standards, an RFP was issued to use funds from the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant to support the planning for program transition for up to 32 "Early Adopters." Proposals for these grant funds were received and reviewed, and staff is recommending approval of 32 grants under Title II for Early Adoption of California's New Credentialing Standards under SB 2042.

Fiscal Impact Summary

The resources of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant will be used to fund the 32 "Early Adopter" grant awards. No Commission funds are needed to carry out the recommended grant awards.

Policy Issues To Be Decided

Should the Commission award the 32 grants for Early Adoption of California's New Credentialing Standards Under SB 2042?

Recommendation

That the Commission award the 32 grants for Early Adoption of California's New Credentialing Standards under SB 2042 from the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant to the programs and/or institutions listed in the attached report.

Recommended Approval of Grant Awards for Early Adoption of California's New Credentialing Standards Under SB 2042

Professional Services Division

October 17, 2001

Background Information

At its meeting of September 6, 2001, the Commission approved the adoption of new Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. The Commission also approved an Implementation Plan that provides for a two-year transition, including an "early adoption" phase, for currently approved programs to rewrite and resubmit their program applications for approval under the new SB 2042 Standards to the Commission.

Several considerations relative to this two-year implementation timeline prompted a decision to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) for "Early Adoption" of the new Standards. First, institutions/programs undergoing accreditation during 2002-03 expressed an interest in using the new Standards when rewriting their program documents. Second, other institutions/programs that may not be undergoing accreditation during 2002-03, but which nevertheless were already working to modify their programs in alignment with the new standards, wanted the opportunity to submit program documents on an accelerated schedule. Third, staff felt it was appropriate and important to have a group of programs/institutions working with the new standards as soon as possible in order to identify any unforeseen issues that might arise during the transition to the new Standards. This information could be used to improve the technical assistance that would be provided to the rest of the field following the "early adoption" phase.

Funding was approved under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant for awarding up to 32 grants for Early Adoption of the new Standards. An RFP was developed and issued to the field (and was also posted on the Commission's web site) on September 6, 2001. Proposals were due to the Commission on October 15, 2001. Each applicant could apply for a maximum grant award of \$30,000.

Selection of the Grant Recipients

Intents to submit a grant application for early adoption of the new credentialing standards were received from a total of 31 institutions/programs. The number of actual grant applications received by the submission deadline was 34.

A panel of readers consisting of staff from the Commission and from the California Department of Education was assembled and met on October 16, 2001, to review and rate the proposals. Training was provided for the readers on the selection criteria specified in the RFP. These criteria are reprinted below for reference:

Criteria for the Evaluation of “Early Adopter” Proposals		Maximum <u>Score</u>
(1)	<u>Project Rationale for the becoming an "Early Adopter" of the new SB 2042 Standards.</u>	20
(2)	<u>Project Development Team.</u> The proposal demonstrates that the applicant (a) has experience and expertise in the development of responses to program standards; (b) sufficient resources to conduct the planning process with high quality within the proposed timeline, and (c) a sound plan for managing and staffing the project. The proposal includes a sound, feasible plan to organize managers and staff members to carry out the review and Standards responses process efficiently and with high quality. Key duties would be assigned to individuals with essential expertise, experience, and time to complete their responsibilities.	35
(3)	<u>Description of the Planning Process.</u> The proposal includes a well-organized, properly sequenced, and feasible planning schedule that (a) efficiently integrates all tasks, and (b) is likely to result ultimately in the development of responses to the new Standards and/or the development of a self-study document within the specified time frame.	30
(4)	<u>Project Costs.</u> The costs proposed by the applicant are reasonable in relation to the review and document-development processes.	5
(5)	<u>Presentation.</u> The proposal is clearly written, to the point, and well-organized. Ideas are presented logically and all requested information is presented skillfully and without redundancy.	10
Maximum Possible Score		100

List of Recommended Grant Awards:

Based on the review of the proposals according to the above criteria, the following are recommended to receive grants for early adoption of California's new credentialing standards under SB 2042:

Institution

UC Riverside
LAUSD Intern
Univ. of San Diego
UC San Diego
CSU Bakersfield
CSU Fullerton
Cal Lutheran
San Joaquin COE
Univ. of Pacific
Dominican
CSU Long Beach
CSU San Marcos
Notre Dame de Namur
Mount St. Mary's
CSU Northridge
Santa Clara U
Vanguard U. So. CA
Holy Names College
Humboldt State
UC Santa Cruz
Sonoma State
Stanford
CSU Stanislaus
USC
CSU Hayward
Univ. of La Verne
Cal Poly Pomona
National Univ.
CSU Fresno
Antioch U Santa Barbara
Ontario-Montclair District Intern
CSU Dominguez Hills
Univ. of San Francisco
San Diego State

Standards Addressed

Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation & ESM
Elem. Subject Matter Prep.
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation & ESM
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation & ESM
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation & ESM
Elem. Subject Matter Prep.
Teacher Preparation & ESM
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Elem. Subject Matter Prep.
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation (SS)
Teacher Preparation & ESM
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Elem. Subject Matter Prep.
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation
Teacher Preparation

Initial training and technical assistance for the grant recipients will be held in Sacramento on November 15, 2001. The grant recipients will be expected to submit their program applications under SB 2042 to the Commission by April 30, 2002.

**California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

**Meeting of
November 7-8, 2001**

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PREP - 2**

COMMITTEE: **Preparation Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Recommended Award of Grants to Develop Blended
Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation**

 X **Action**

 Information

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

Goal 6: Provide leadership in exploring multiple, high quality routes to prepare professional educators for California's schools

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** _____
Betsy Kean, Ph.D.
Consultant, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** _____
Sam Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director

Recommended Award of Grants to Develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

Professional Services Division

October 15, 2001

Executive Summary

California's Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, which the Commission administers on behalf of the Governor's Office, includes a budget item of \$500,000 in 2000-2001 for the purpose of funding additional Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation in public and/or private colleges and universities. This agenda report provides background information about Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation; the funding history of Blended Program grants; the procedures used to solicit proposals for new planning grants for Blended Programs; the proposal review process, and a recommendation for five new planning grant awards for the development of Blended Programs to be funded under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant.

Policy Issue to be Considered

Should the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award five new planning grants for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation?

Fiscal Impact Statement

The costs for funding the new planning grant awards for Blended Programs would be paid entirely from the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant funds.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award planning grants for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation to the five institutions identified in the attached report.

Recommended Award of Grants to Develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

Professional Services Division

October 17, 2001

Background

The Commission's 1998-99 budget included \$350,000 to provide grants to public colleges and universities seeking to develop blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation. The list below indicates the institutions that received grant funding from the Commission during 1998-99:

- California State University, Dominguez Hills
- California State University, Long Beach
- California State University, Bakersfield
- Sonoma State University
- University of California, Davis
- California State University, Sacramento
- California State University, Stanislaus

As part of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, additional funds were allocated for a grant process to expand this initial effort to develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation. The guidelines for the Title II planning grant application process remained essentially the same as before, except that the application process was extended to both public and private institutions of higher education. Below are the guidelines relating to the issuance of grants to postsecondary institutions to develop programs that blend subject matter and professional preparation programs for prospective teachers:

1. Funds granted to institutions through this program must be used to support the development of blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation. Only institutions with approved subject matter and accredited teacher education programs may participate in this program.
2. Grants should be used to support faculty release time to develop programs that meet the Commission's Standards. Participating institutions will have up to twelve months from the award of the grant to submit a proposed program to the Committee on Accreditation for initial accreditation.
3. Institutions should use funds granted under this program to blend professional preparation programs with either existing liberal studies programs for multiple subject credential candidates, or existing single subject programs for single subject credential candidates.

4. Campuses may apply for up to \$50,000 under this program to cover the costs of release time for faculty from Colleges/Schools of Arts and Sciences and Colleges/Schools of Education to collaborate in the development of a program that meets the Commission's Standards.
5. Institutions that previously received funding from the Commission to develop a Blended Program are not eligible to apply for funding under the Title II grant process, even for a different credential area.

Grants Funded under Title II, 2000:

An RFP under Title II was issued on February 5, 2000 for public and private institutions with teacher preparation programs interested in planning a Blended Program of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation. A review panel comprised of experts in the field from colleges and universities as well as several Commission staff met initially to review these proposals on April 6, 2000. Readers participated in a training process that included a review of the RFP, a review of the proposal evaluation criteria, and several calibration exercises applying the criteria in common to proposal samples. Readers were paired off and assigned three proposals each to read and score over the course of the next week. Recommendations were subsequently made to the Commission and approved to fund proposals from the eleven institutions listed below:

- St. Mary's College (Multiple Subject, B/CLAD)
- San Diego State University (Multiple Subject, BCLAD)
- California Polytechnic State University, Pomona (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- California State University, Northridge (Single Subject, English; Single Subject, Mathematics)
- Dominican College (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- San Jose State University (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- California State University, Los Angeles (Single Subject, Science)
- Humboldt State University (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- California State University, San Bernardino (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- Stanford University (Single Subject, English)
- University of California, Riverside (Multiple Subject, B/CLAD)

Table 1 beginning on the next page provides the scoring criteria the readers applied to each grant application.

Table 1
Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Proposal Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Score: Each Criterion
(1) <u>Credential Type(s) and Number of Participants.</u> The proposal provides a strong rationale for offering particular credential type(s) in the program. The plan targets school subject(s) and credential specialty(ies) in which teacher shortages occur in local area schools (K-12). The proposal provides a credible basis for anticipating comparatively large numbers of enrolled students during the first three years of the program’s availability.	3 Points
(2) <u>Support and Articulation.</u> The proposal offers a credible prospect that candidates will be supported and retained as they move through the program. Articulation agreements with local community colleges are a credible part of the plan to provide a potentially seamless preparation program for transfer candidates.	7 Points
(3) <u>School Placements.</u> Candidates are likely to be placed with teachers who will provide relatively strong models for candidates, in schools with comparatively high need for qualified teachers, including (but not limited to) schools with teacher shortages.	5 Points
(4) <u>Subjects of Anticipated Blending.</u> Within each credential type to be offered to candidates in the program, the proposal offers a credible prospect that subject matter and professional preparation will be blended in multiple significant subject areas that have been selected by the institution.	8 Points
(5) <u>Institutional Readiness for a Blended Program.</u> The proposal provides strong evidence that the requested grant would yield relatively significant “gains” in terms of the institution’s capacity to plan, develop and offer a program that will meet all of the <i>Interim Standards for Blended Programs</i> .	10 Points
(6) <u>Program Planning Leadership and Participation.</u> Leadership roles as well as planning and development duties would be assigned to individuals who are well-qualified for the roles/duties.	9 Points

(7) <u>Program Planning Organizational Chart</u> . The plan for program development is clear and well-organized with sound responsibilities and clear lines of accountability.	10 Points
(8) <u>Intramural Collaboration</u> . The plan for intramural collaboration is sound, and includes appropriate roles and responsibilities for each intramural participant.	10 Points
(9) <u>Extramural Collaboration</u> . The plan for extramural collaboration with K-12 practitioners and community college representatives is sound, and will draw on the expertise of personnel in the schools/colleges most affected by the program.	10 Points
(10) <u>Institutional Commitment</u> . The proposal includes credible evidence of comparatively broad and high levels of administrative, fiscal and faculty support and commitment by the participating intramural units and extramural partners.	10 Points
(11) <u>Program Planning Timeframe</u> . The proposal includes a credible timeframe that promises to yield a strong program plan that will be submitted on or before March 1, 2001 for accreditation on the basis of the nine <i>Interim Standards</i> .	8 Points
(12) <u>Program Planning Budget</u> . The proposal includes a complete budget. The sponsors would add to the effectiveness of the Commission's grant with appropriate contributions from local (institutional) resources and other (federal, private, etc.) sources.	10 Points
Total Possible Score for a Grant Award Proposal	100 Points

RFP Process for 2001

In February, 2001, an RFP was sent to the field inviting applications for a Blended Program planning grant. The same directions and criteria were used as during the Year 2000 grant process, except for permitting institutions that had previously received a planning grant to reapply in order to establish a Blended Program in a new subject area or credential program. A

total of four Blended Program grant applications were received. An expert panel was assembled at the Commission's offices on April 17, 2001, to read and review the grant applications, using the process and criteria described above.

The following institutions were recommended by the panel to receive Blended Program planning grants, and the Commission approved those grants at its May, 2001 meeting:

- California State University, Chico (Single Subject, Physical Education)
- California Lutheran University (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- California State University, Monterey Bay (Multiple Subject, B/CLAD; Education Specialist)
- San Francisco State University (Multiple Subject, CLAD)

Because additional Title 2 funds were available for Blended Program planning grants, another competition was held during Fall, 2001. An RFP was sent to the field in June, and a total of eight grant applications were received. Three of those applications were judged to be ineligible because they sought funds to revise existing Blended Programs rather than to plan for new programs. An expert panel was assembled on October 15, 2001 to read and review the eligible applications, using the process and criteria described above. The following institutions are recommended by the panel to receive Blended Program planning grants:

- California State University Los Angeles (Single Subject, Art; Single Subject, Music)
- Concordia University (Multiple Subject)
- Mount St. Mary's College (Multiple Subject, CLAD/BCLAD)
- University of California, Riverside (Single Subject, Mathematics)
- California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo (Education Specialist)

Transition to the Recently Adopted Blended Program Standards

Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation were adopted by the Commission on October 4, 2001, replacing the Interim Standards that had been in effect since August, 1998.

The new Blended Program Standards will be appended to the newly adopted standards for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. They are being kept as a distinct set, and focus only on attributes not addressed in the Elementary Subject Matter Preparation and the Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards. Meeting these standards is required for institutions seeking accreditation of Blended Programs. All Blended Programs must also have approved programs of Elementary Subject Matter and Professional Teacher Preparation.

Institutions that have received planning grants in response to the RFPs described above have committed to writing responses to the Interim Standards, as those were the Blended Program Standards in effect when the RFPs were issued. They will also have the option of writing instead to the revised standards and will be encouraged to do so.

Blended Programs that link Elementary Subject Matter and Professional Teacher Preparation Programs will be required to transition to all of the revised standards by January, 2004, the transition time adopted by the Commission for those programs. Blended Programs linking Professional Teacher Preparation Programs with subject matter preparation programs that do not yet have revised standards, e.g., Single Subject Mathematics Programs, will be allowed to transition as those new standards are adopted or when their institution enters their next accreditation cycle.

*California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of
November 7-8, 2001*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PREP - 3**

COMMITTEE: **Preparation Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Recommended Approval of Interagency Agreements for
Policy Studies under the Title II Teacher Quality
Enhancement State Grant**

 X **Action**

 Information

 Report

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- Develop candidate and program standards that guide our local communities in the education of their children
- Develop processes for and monitor program accreditation

Prepared By: _____ **Date:** _____
Phyllis Jacobson, Ed.D.
Consultant

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.
Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ **Date:** _____
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ **Date:** _____
Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director

**Recommended Approval of Interagency Agreements for Policy Studies
Under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant**

Professional Services Division

October 17, 2001

Executive Summary

At its meeting of September 6, 2001, the Commission approved new Standards under SB 2042 for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Programs and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. A central theme in both of these sets of Standards is ensuring that teacher candidates have the knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to help K-12 students meet California's K-12 academic content standards. In order to ensure that California's teacher preparation programs are providing candidates with appropriate coursework and related field experiences so that candidates are well-qualified to help students meet the K-12 academic content standards, the California State University and the University of California are proposing to conduct policy studies to review the alignment of subject matter preparation with California's K-12 student academic content standards. The conduct of these types of policy studies is within the approved work plan for the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant.

Fiscal Impact Summary

The resources of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant will be used to fund the proposed Policy Studies. No Commission funds are needed to carry out the recommended Interagency Agreements.

Policy Issues To Be Decided

Should the Commission approve the two Interagency Agreements to carry out Policy Studies under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant?

Recommendation

That the Commission approve the two specified Interagency Agreements to carry out Policy Studies under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant.

Recommended Approval of Interagency Agreements for Policy Studies Under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant

Professional Services Division

October 17, 2001

Background Information

At its meeting of September 6, 2001, the Commission approved the adoption of new Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. A central theme of both of these documents is ensuring that teacher candidates have the knowledge, skills, and abilities to help students meet the K-12 academic content standards.

Institutions providing Elementary Subject Matter Preparation programs will need to review their program content, including coursework and field experiences, against the K-12 academic content standards in order to assure the necessary alignment and congruence with the K-12 academic content standards. In developing the original Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, the Title II Advisory Committee foresaw the need for this type of policy study to be conducted once the new Standards under SB 2042 were developed and adopted. Funding for policy studies has been allocated in the approved Title II federal budget.

Two proposals to conduct policy studies under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant have been presented to, and were approved, by the Title II Advisory Committee at its regularly-scheduled meeting of October 18, 2001. The two policy studies are proposed by the Chancellor's Office of the California State University, and by the President's Office of the University of California, respectively. The outcomes of both studies will be: (a) to review the alignment and congruence of the subject matter preparation provided to teacher candidates throughout both higher education systems, with particular respect to the K-12 academic content standards for students; and (b) to recommend appropriate modifications to the subject matter preparation of teacher candidates as necessary to ensure that candidates are well-prepared to help students meet California's K-12 academic content standards for students.

Copies of the two proposals are attached to this agenda report.

The amount of the Interagency Agreement with the California State University will be \$600,000 in Title II funds; the amount of the Interagency Agreement with the University of California will be \$400,000 in Title II funds.

Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the two Interagency Agreements for Policy Studies under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant.

Concept Paper: CSU Implementation of Subject Matter Policy Studies Under California's Title II Teacher Quality Grant

In 1999 the United States Department of Education awarded a Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant to the State of California. As the principal sponsor of this grant, Governor Gray Davis invited the California State University (Office of the Chancellor) and other interested institutions to serve as co-sponsors and be represented on a Title II Grant Steering Committee. The Governor also invited the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to manage the various activities to be funded by the grant. One activity in the Governor's grant application was a set of Subject Matter Policy Studies for the purpose of investigating the degree of congruence and alignment between (1) the Academic Content Standards for California Public Schools (K-12) of the State Board of Education and (2) undergraduate programs of subject matter preparation in which prospective teachers meet the State's subject matter requirement for teaching credentials.

Since the Governor received the Title II Grant for the State of California, several new developments have made the Subject Matter Policy Studies even more urgent and important than previously. The Academic Content Standards (K-12) have become the basis for (1) a comprehensive accountability system for K-12 students, teachers and schools; (2) grade-to-grade promotion and retention decisions in many schools and districts, and (3) a high school exit examination to be required for all California diplomas beginning in 2004. Even more recently, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing adopted new accreditation standards for university-based subject matter programs (K-8) that call for alignment and congruence with the Academic Content Standards beginning in 2003. Now the most urgent and important issues to be resolved by the CSU are either to demonstrate that subject matter programs for teachers *are* aligned and congruent with the Content Standards or to achieve alignment and congruence where it does not already exist.

The 21 campuses of the CSU prepare more than 60 percent of the newly-certified K-12 teachers for California schools. Of these teachers (numbering more than 10,000 per year), 57 percent meet the subject matter requirement by completing CSU programs of subject matter preparation or the equivalent. It is estimated that each annual cohort of these CSU teaching graduates serve as subject-matter teachers for 11,250 elementary students and 225,000 secondary students in only the first year of their professional careers in California schools. It can be seen that the success of many students in California's school accountability system depends very substantially on the effectiveness of subject matter preparation in the California State University.

In this context, *the CSU Office of the Chancellor hereby requests an opportunity to implement the Subject Matter Policy Studies of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant.* The CSU would like to carry out these studies in conjunction with the CCTC, and in consultation with the members of the Title II Steering Committee. The CSU plans to investigate the congruence and alignment of two sets of programs in two phases. First, Liberal Studies Programs (K-8) and Single Subject Programs in Mathematics (7-12) will be examined during the 2001-02 academic year, which is the third year of the three-year Title II Grant. In 2002-03, the CSU will continue the effort by evaluating Single Subject Programs in English, Science, History-Social Science, Art

and Music. This element of the plan requires an extension by the United States Department of Education, which appears to be feasible.

The Office of the Chancellor is proposing to conduct these investigations on all 21 CSU campuses that prepare teachers in accredited programs. On all 21 campuses, approved subject matter programs have very large enrollments, so the planned investigations will involve large numbers of faculty and administrative staff on all 21 campuses. To accomplish the Title II Grant's objectives, the CSU plans to ask each of its campuses to examine the Academic Content Standards (K-8 and 7-12) and provide specific information about the congruence and alignment of every high-enrollment course in each program of subject matter preparation. The Chancellor will expect every department and every professor who offers such a high-enrollment course to participate in the study and provide the needed information using a standard "matrix" format to be developed by subject-matter faculty and accepted and distributed by the Chancellor's staff. The Chancellor will also ask that a syllabus for every high-enrollment course be attached to the matrix when each campus returns it to the Chancellor's Office. All CSU campuses will be asked to fulfill these data requests by February 15, 2002 and February 15, 2003 for the two sets of programs.

To initiate and oversee the data-collection process systemwide, the CSU Chancellor has appointed a 17-member Subject Matter Studies Advisory Group consisting of faculty members and academic administrators from subject matter departments, arts and sciences schools, and education schools. This Group will advise the Chancellor's Office regarding the questions to be asked, the tasks to be accomplished, and the coordination of tasks (including timelines) on the 21 campuses. Several members of this Group were selected by the Systemwide Academic Senate to represent the Senate, while other members are serving to represent campus administration and credential preparation programs. Appointment of this Group underscores the extent to which the Chancellor will pursue the planned studies with a consultative, collaborative approach.

Early in the planning phase, the Chancellor's Office staff and Subject Matter Studies Advisory Group will confer with K-12 curriculum specialists from California districts and counties who have intimate knowledge of the Content Standards for California Public Schools. These consultations will enable the Advisory Group to pose data questions that address the alignment-and-congruence issue directly.

While the Advisory Group prepares the data questions and the campuses respond to them, the Chancellor's staff will solicit contract bids from external organizations that specialize in education evaluation and research, such as WestEd, SRI, etc. Respondents to the Request for Proposals will be required to describe how they would screen, analyze, summarize and interpret the subject-specific information to be provided by the 21 CSU campuses. To make these determinations, respondents will be required to employ specialists in the California K-12 curriculum, particularly professionals who participated actively in developing and/or implementing the Content Standards in Reading-Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, History-Social Science, and the Visual and Performing Arts. The Chancellor's staff will select the most cost-effective bid; the selected contractor will have independent authority to report sound conclusions pertaining to the degree of K-12 alignment and congruence by each program in each discipline at each CSU campus.

Under the independent direction of the contractor, the K-12 curriculum specialists will examine the matrices provided by the 21 campuses, will screen the matrices in relation to the course syllabi, and will evaluate the veracity of the campus data based on the specialists' intimate knowledge of the K-12 standards. In summarizing the CSU data, the contractor will be required to report the reliability of the campus data, and to identify courses, programs and campuses that have achieved high, medium and low levels of alignment and congruence with the K-12 standards. The CSU estimates that the contractor's reports of this work could be produced by July 1, 2002 and July 1, 2003 for the two sets of programs. The reports will then be transmitted for review and evaluation by the Office of the Chancellor, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the other members of the Title II Grant Steering Committee.

Proposed Budget. The CSU Office of the Chancellor wishes to emphasize the collaborative nature of this request. The CSU would like to confer regularly with the Office of the Secretary for Education, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and the other co-sponsors of the Title II grant for the purpose of reviewing and assessing the findings and conclusions of the planned policy studies. The CSU Office of the Chancellor hereby requests an allocation of \$600,000 from the Title II Fund to the CSU to cover the necessary costs of (1) preparing 21 campuses to collect the needed data quickly and reliably, (2) managing and coordinating the large-scale data collection effort on 21 campuses, and (3) sponsoring the analytical and interpretive work of an independent contractor that employs K-12 curriculum specialists to produce valid judgments based on the campus-provided data.

Additional Activities and Associated Costs. This study is complex and will involve high numbers of individuals in the information-collection process. Each of the 21 campuses within the CSU adds to the complexity. The CSU is requesting \$400,000 for 21 campus director-liaisons. Each Director-Liaison will be responsible for working directly with the campus vice president for academic affairs, the deans of the involved schools or colleges, the coordinators of Liberal Studies Programs, the chairs of affected departments, and faculty members who are asked to provide information. The Director-Liaison's responsibilities will be to (1) explain the purpose of the study, (2) conduct meetings with participating faculty members, (3) distribute the necessary matrices and other materials, (4) insure that the tasks are completed on each campus and in each department, (5) participate in the collection of course syllabi from individual faculty members, (6) serve as a campus resource and link between the faculty, the contractor and the Chancellor's staff, and (7) conduct meetings to disseminate the findings and conclusions on the respective campuses once the results have been completely analyzed.

Involvement of Community Colleges. Cooperation with California's community colleges in the preparation of undergraduate students to become K-12 teachers is an extremely high priority for the California State University System. This commitment is based on the fact that the great majority of CSU-prepared teachers for grades K-8 complete most or all of their lower division studies in community colleges. In order to contribute to a "seamless" system of preparation, articulation and transfer of prospective teachers from two-year colleges to CSU campuses in California, it would be beneficial to include, as a pilot portion of the Subject Matter Policy Studies, two to three community colleges. At an additional cost of \$50,000 to the Title II Fund, the Office of the CSU Chancellor is prepared to work with the Office of the CCC Chancellor in an effort to identify a few local colleges to be invited voluntarily to collaborate with nearby CSU campuses (one CC paired with one CSU) in providing local data about high-enrollment courses

offered by both the CC and the CSU. Most of the additional funds would go to the participating community colleges to defray their costs of coordination and data collection. These data will then be included in the external contractor's analysis and conclusions about alignment-congruence between post-secondary content preparation and pre-collegiate teaching in California's public education system.

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SUBJECT MATTER PREPARATION PROGRAM POLICY
STUDY FOR CALIFORNIA’S TITLE II TEACHER QUALITY
ENHANCEMENT GRANT**

As part of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, California proposed a series of policy studies related to the “quality and adequacy” of the subject matter preparation of teacher candidates. The overarching question guiding the proposed studies was,

To what extent should the Commission change the subject matter program standards and examinations in each subject area, and for each type of teaching credential, to ensure that future teachers are well-prepared to help every student achieve the state’s K-12 Content and Performance Standards?

In order to meet this particular goal of the Title II Grant, the University of California proposes a comprehensive review of its subject matter preparation (SMP) programs. This review, concurrent with the California State University review of its programs, is intended to inform statewide policies related to subject matter preparation as well as internal program development to ensure alignment with the state’s K-12 Content Standards.

It is clear that this review will require significant involvement of faculty in both teacher education programs as well as in the other academic disciplines. UC is committed to engaging faculty on all eight undergraduate campuses in a focused review of existing SMP programs to assess the degree of alignment with Standards. UC also views this initiative as an opportunity to identify and/or create models of SMP programs that are grounded in discipline research and pedagogical theories. Building on the Education Minor, current research, and strong undergraduate instruction, UC can make a significant contribution to addressing the critical issue of subject matter preparation for future teachers.

UC proposes a two-pronged approach to reviewing the existing SMP programs and building quality programs that are aligned with teaching and learning, K-12. UCOP will take the administrative lead in support of this alignment process. Grants will be provided to each campus to host one or more campus forums and/or provide other faculty incentives (e.g., course buy-out, mini-grants, stipends, bookstore accounts) to engage Teacher Education and discipline faculty in reviewing the quality, relevance, and alignment of existing SMP programs on their campus. This review will include a systematic assessment of all courses that are part of the approved Programs and the K-12 Content Standards. Adjustments, as needed, will be made in order to comply with the new 2042 standards for SMP programs. Discussions about Program alignment may include faculty from those local community colleges where collaborations already exist. This review process will provide campuses with an opportunity to connect research related to teaching in the content areas and the development of teacher leadership. An ancillary consequence will likely be a discussion about enhancing undergraduate instruction.

Year one will focus on a review of the multiple subjects programs. All but two of the UC undergraduate campuses currently have CTC-approved multiple subjects SMP programs. The two who do not (UCB and UCI) will explore the development of a program. Year two will focus on single subject SMP programs with an initial emphasis on mathematics. All but one campus

(UCI) currently has a CTC-approved SMP program in mathematics. Year two will provide some flexibility whereby campuses with strengths in a particular subject matter area may take the lead on behalf of the system and/or subject matter areas identified as a priority by CTC.

In addition to campus forums, UCOP will also sponsor one two-day systemwide Symposium in each year of this two-year review process for campuses to begin identifying the essential characteristics of high quality SMP programs and a process for building programs across disciplines and teacher education programs. These two critical pieces will allow UC to build research-based SMP program models. These models will hopefully speed the approval process and allow more campuses in all segments (i.e., UC, CSU, and independents) to develop high quality SMP programs. By the conclusion of the second year, UC will provide documentation of the review and any necessary realignment to meet the new standards as well as the models identified through this process.

As part of the systemwide support, UCOP will establish and staff an Advisory Committee/Working Group to help guide, support, and plan the review and documentation process. The Committee will be composed of teacher education and discipline faculty with representation from each of the eight undergraduate campuses.

BUDGET

Year 1:

Campus Support @ \$50,000 per campus = \$400,000

Systemwide Symposium = \$10,000

Total 2001-02 Request = \$410,000

Year 2:

Campus Support @ \$50,000 per campus = \$400,000

Systemwide Symposium = \$10,000

Documentation = \$5,000

Total 2002-03 Request = \$415,000

TOTAL TWO YEAR REQUEST = \$825,000

The assumption here is that each campus has some flexibility to structure the review process in ways that make the most sense for the local context. However, the Advisory Committee/Working Group will provide the leadership to ensure a consistent and rigorous process as well as cull out the characteristics essential to a high-quality SMP model program. In addition, during year two, if there are budget constraints to reviewing all single subject programs, campuses may choose to take the lead in one content area using the Systemwide Symposium to share findings. This will allow us to maximize the Title II funds as well as build on the strengths of each campus.

Throughout this two-year review process UC will report to the Title II Steering Committee on the progress. In addition, appropriate CSU, CTC, Governor's Secretary of Education Office, K-12 and Independent Colleges and Universities representatives will be invited to participate in the Systemwide Symposia.

UCOP SYSTEMWIDE COORDINATOR AND CONTACT:

Nina Moore
Director, Educational Outreach
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, 7th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607
(510) 987-9423
nina.moore@ucop.edu

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

*Meeting of
November 7-8, 2001*

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: **PREP - 5**

COMMITTEE: **Preparation Standards Committee**

TITLE: **Discussion of Options for Restructuring the
Administrative Services Credential**

 Action

 X **Information**

 Report

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators

- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators
- Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates

Prepared By: _____
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division

Date: _____

Authorized By: _____
Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director

Date: _____

**Discussion of Options for Restructuring the Administrative Services
Credential**

Professional Services Division

October 19, 2001

Executive Summary

At the direction of the Commission, Commission staff have been conducting a focussed review of the Administrative Services Credential during 2001. Forums and a statewide survey conducted in the winter and spring of 2001 suggest that the Commission should consider significant revisions to the current structure of administrator preparation and licensure. This report provides an overview of the input received from the field through these early efforts, and poses a series of policy questions for the Commission's consideration.

Policy(s) Issue to be Considered

How should school administrators be prepared and licensed in California?

Fiscal Impact Statement

Activities related to the review and potential revision of this credential are covered under the Commission's base budget.

Recommendation(s)

That the Commission engage in a substantive discussion of the policy questions in this report and provide staff direction regarding next steps.

Discussion of Options for Restructuring the Administrative Services Credential

Professional Services Division

November 8, 2001

Overview

The expertise of school administrators is essential to the success of the reforms that have been initiated in California because school administrators have a direct influence on the quality of teaching and learning in California's public schools. In every school improvement program, school administrators play a key role. The school administrator's interactions are crucial to the success of teachers and students. In the current era of standards and accountability, it is both timely and important to examine how school administrators are prepared, supported and licensed.

Growing concerns about the effectiveness of administrator preparation and licensure led the Commission to direct staff to conduct a focused review of the Administrative Services Credential. A series of public forums held during the winter of 2001 provided an opportunity for interaction on these issues among stakeholders, including existing administrators, administrators in training, higher education faculty and administration, parents and business community representatives. Participants discussed the current structure of the Administrative Services Credential, the content of professional preparation programs, the need for induction and support for new administrators, alternative program options, and recruitment and retention of site and district office administrative positions.

Forum participants discussed what is working well, what is not working well and made suggestions for improvement in the overall system of administrator preparation and licensure. Common themes emerging from the forums included the following:

- The credential structure should ensure that all new administrators receive support, mentoring and assistance during the early years of employment as an administrator.
- The new administrator is so heavily involved with the demands of their new position that additional course requirements for the second tier (Professional level Credential) are difficult to complete and in many cases duplicative and irrelevant.
- Alternative delivery systems should be developed to facilitate the recruitment and training of administrators in "hard to staff" schools or to help districts "grow their own" administrators.
- The complexity of the job of the administrator, the demands of the responsibilities and the level of compensation are a disincentive for individuals to seek administrative positions.
- The current structure of the Administrative Services Credential may also be a barrier that discourages individuals from applying for an administrative position.
- The second tier (Professional) Credential needs to be drastically redesigned or eliminated.
- There is a need for better dialogue between institutions that prepare administrators and employing school districts.

- There is often redundancy in content between the Preliminary and Professional levels of credential preparation.
- Field experiences during preliminary preparation are often offered part time because candidates are not able to obtain release time to participate more extensively. Thus many administrators do not get an adequate sense of the scope of administrative responsibilities prior to employment.
- There needs to be a better blend between theory and practice.
- The content of preliminary preparation needs to be updated to better reflect the current demands of administration.
- The content of professional development after employment of an administrator needs to be monitored by the employing school district.

During the spring of 2001, Commission staff joined with faculty at California State University, Stanislaus to conduct a survey of recent graduates of administrator preparation programs. The survey focussed on the perceptions of recent graduates regarding the adequacy of their preparation for the role of administration. Approximately 7500 surveys were sent to candidates completing Administrative Services Credential programs over the past three years. Of the 7500 sent out, 2468 were completed and returned, 532 were undeliverable and 130 completed surveys were returned after the deadline. Respondents written comments were consistent with the themes emerging from the Commission sponsored forums.

In addition to concerns regarding the nature of preparation and the structure of the credential, there are growing concerns both nationally and within the state regarding the supply of administrators. A 1998 study by national school administrator organizations showed that 50% of surveyed school districts reported a shortage of school administrators. These shortages exist in urban, rural and suburban districts. The Bureau of Labor Statistics anticipates an increase in the need for school administrators of up to 20% through the year 2005. A study submitted for the Association of California School Administrators showed that over 98% of the California school district superintendents surveyed had experienced a shortage of qualified administrators applying for principal positions. Though California colleges and universities enroll close to 2,000 individuals each year in preparation programs, half to two-thirds of the graduates of “Tier 1” administrative credential programs are issued “Certificates of Eligibility” because they do not immediately obtain employment as administrators and complete their second phase of preparation for the credential. Meanwhile, administrative positions in many schools remain unfilled. Interviews with potential administrators indicate that increasing complexity of the position coupled with challenges in some schools make the job unattractive.

The forums and survey conducted in the winter and spring identified a number of issues that need resolution. A Task Force appointed by the Executive Director has been reviewing the outcomes of these activities and discussing options for reform and restructuring in this credential area. As the Commission turns its attention to future preparation and licensure of administrators, a number of key policy issues need to be addressed. The following questions are intended to provide a framework for Commission review.

Policy Question One: What does the 21st Century school require in terms of management at each level?

Policy Question Two: Which school management positions should require a credential?

Policy Question Three: What should be the content of administrator preparation?

Policy Question Four: Which entities should be authorized to provide administrator preparation?

Policy Question Five: Which decisions about administrator preparation should be left to local school districts to decide?

Policy Question Six: What should the structure of administrator preparation involve?

Policy Question Seven: What does an appropriate "Learning to Lead" continuum look like for school and district administrators?

Policy Question Eight: What is an appropriate accountability system for administrator preparation program?

