

---

# 5B

## Action

*Legislative Committee*

**Analyses of Bills**

---

### AGENDA INSERT

**Executive Summary:** Staff will present analyses of educator preparation or licensing bills introduced by Legislators. The analyses will summarize current law, describe the bills' provisions, estimate their costs and recommend amendments if applicable.

**Recommended Action:** Staff recommendation on agenda insert as needed.

**Presenters:** Mary Armstrong, Marilyn Errett, Administrator, and Anne Padilla, Consultant, Office of Governmental Relations

**Strategic Plan Goal: 4**

**Continue effective and appropriate involvement of the Commission with policymakers on key education issues.**

- ♦ Influence legislation regarding the preparation and certification of professional educators

April 2007

---

---

# LEGISLATIVE GUIDELINES OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING

Adopted February 3, 1995

---

---

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

---

## Possible Bill Positions for Commission Consideration

---

*The Commission may adopt a position on each bill considered for action. The following chart describes the bill positions. The Commission may choose to change a position on a bill at any subsequent meeting.*

**Sponsor:** Legislative concepts are adopted by the Commission and staff is directed to find an author for the bill and to aid the author's staff by providing background information and seeking support for the bill.

**Support:** The Commission votes to support a bill and directs staff to write letters of support to Legislative Committee members and to testify in support of the bill at Legislative Committee hearings. The Commission's support position will be recorded in the Legislative Committee's bill analysis. If the bill is successful in the Legislature, staff writes letters of support to the Governor.

**Support if Amended:** The Commission expresses support for the overall concept of a bill, but objects to one or more sections. The Commission votes to direct staff to contact the author with suggested amendments. If the bill is amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, the Commission's position automatically becomes "Support."

**Seek Amendments:** The Commission expresses concern over one or more sections of the bill and votes to direct staff to contact the author with suggested amendments. If the bill is amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, staff will inform the Commission at a subsequent meeting and ask if the Commission would like to adopt a new position.

**Watch:** The Commission expresses interest in the content of the bill but votes to direct staff to "watch" the bill for future amendments or for further movement through the Legislative process. Early in the Legislative session, the Commission may wish to adopt a "watch" position on bills that are not yet fully formed.

**Oppose Unless Amended:** The Commission objects strenuously to one or more sections of the bill and votes to direct staff to contact the author with suggested amendments. If the bill is not amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, the Commission may vote to adopt an "Oppose" position at a subsequent meeting. If the bill is amended to reflect the Commission's recommendations, staff will inform the Commission at a subsequent meeting and ask if the Commission would like to adopt a new position.

**Oppose:** The Commission expresses opposition to the overall concept of a bill and votes to direct staff to write letters of opposition to Legislative Committee members and to testify in opposition to the bill at Legislative Committee hearings. The Commission's "oppose" position will be recorded in the Legislative Committee bill analysis. If the bill is successful in the Legislature, staff writes letters of opposition to the Governor.

**No Position:** The Commission may choose to delay taking a position on a bill and may vote to direct staff to bring the bill forward at a subsequent meeting. The Commission may also choose to direct staff not to bring the bill forward for further consideration.

---

---

## BILL ANALYSIS

---

---

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Assembly Bill 469</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Assembly Shirley Horton</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>Author</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Credential Processing Time</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 20, 2007</b>
<b>Date Last Amended:</b>	<b>April 17, 2006</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Assembly Education Committee</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Support or Sponsor</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>April 18, 2007</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Mary Armstrong and Marilyn Errett</b>

### **Analysis of Bill Provisions**

AB 469, as amended, would require the Commission to process each application for a credential within 50 business days, with the exception of applications submitted by applicants who must undergo a Commission fitness review. In addition, the measure would require school districts, county offices of education, nonpublic schools, charter schools and institutions of higher education submitting applications for credentials, certificates, permits, or other documents to submit the applications to the Commission not more than three months after the issuance date of the each document. AB 469 also makes a minor, technical amendment to existing language regarding the signatures of the Commission's Executive Director and Chair.

### **Summary of Current Law**

Education Code section 44225 gives the Commission the authority to set the terms of credentials as long as documents are not valid for more than five years. Education Code section 44252 authorizes the Commission to establish standards and procedures for the

initial issuance and renewal of credentials. However, statute does not specify credential processing times for the Commission or for entities submitting applications on behalf of credential applicants.

Specific time limits regarding application submission and processing time are currently addressed in regulation.<sup>1</sup> Entities submitting applications on behalf of candidates, must submit each application to the Commission within four months from the issue date to be listed on the document. The Commission is required to process applications within seventy-five working days. An exception is made for applications from individuals who must undergo a Commission fitness review.

### **Commission Activity**

Over the past few years, the Commission has moved to the electronic submission and processing of credential applications. Currently, approximately 50% of all applications submitted to the Commission are submitted online. Electronic submissions include renewals, credential recommendations from institutions of higher education, and recommendations for clear multiple and single subject teaching credentials from school districts and county offices of education sponsoring accredited beginning teacher induction programs. Staff anticipates that by mid-summer 2007 an electronic submission process will be available to school districts and county offices of education for substitute permits, short term staff permits and provisional internship permits. The current turn-around time for all electronic submissions is less than ten days. Further innovations are being planned, including the implementation of a paperless system.

At the request of the author's office, the Commission's Executive Director has asked the Credential Counselors and Analysts of California (CCAC) to conduct a survey of its members to determine an appropriate turn-around time for school districts, county offices of education and institutions of higher education.

### **Fiscal Impact**

Minor/Absorbable impact for communication with the field.

### **Relevant Commission Legislative Policies**

Policy 5: The Commission supports legislation that strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms that it previously has adopted and opposes legislation that would undermine initiatives or reforms that it previously has adopted.

---

<sup>1</sup> 5Cal. Code Regs. Sections 80440 and 80443

## Organizational Positions

No organizations have registered their position on this bill, as amended, to date.

## Reason for Suggested Position

The Commission adopted an “oppose” position to the original version of AB 469 at its March 8, 2007 meeting. The original bill would have implemented recommendations in a report by the Legislative Analysts Office (LAO) to devolve the responsibility of the review and approval of credential applications from the CTC to institutions of higher education and county boards of education and to require CTC to develop procedures requiring applicants for teaching credentials to initiate all requests for criminal record summary information through the county office of education.

In response to the LAO Report, and as directed by language in the *Supplemental Report of the 2006 Budget Act*, the Legislature directed its education policy staff to form a working group to review the LAO report and make recommendations to the Legislature. Pursuant to the supplemental report language, the working group included staff representatives from the Senate Education Committee, Assembly Education Committee, Senate Budget Committee, Assembly Budget Committee, the Legislative Analyst’s Office, the Office of the Secretary for Education, the Department of Finance, Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and the Department of Education. The working group met and accepted testimony before submitting a set of recommendations, first to stakeholders for review and response, and then to Members of the Legislature. The working group report contained several recommendations that align with the Commission’s recent activities and policies and, in fact, help further the Commission’s goals for a streamlined production process, a user friendly credentialing system and an updated accreditation system. The *Report of the Legislative Working Group on Teacher Credential and Accreditation Reform* is available under “publications” at: <http://www.assembly.ca.gov/acs/newcomframeset.asp?committee=6>.

The Commission’s Executive Director and General Counsel met with Assembly Member Horton to discuss the Commission’s “oppose” position on AB 469 and to offer to work with the author and her staff to amend the bill. The current version of AB 469 is a result of that collaboration and implements recommendations from the Legislative working group’s report.

Assembly Member Horton suggested that the Commission might be interested in sponsoring AB 469. Staff recommends either a **Support** or **Sponsor** position as the Commission deems appropriate.

---

---

## BILL ANALYSIS

---

---

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Assembly Bill 1415</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Assemblymember Julia Brownley</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>EdVoice</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Administrator Preparation Programs</b>
<b>Date Last Amended:</b>	<b>April 12, 2007</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Assembly Education Committee</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Support</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>April 16, 2007</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Rod Santiago</b>

### **Analysis of Bill Provisions**

AB 1415 would require the Commission to adopt a data evaluation report capable of assessing the effectiveness of each accredited program of professional preparation that provides preparation for the administrative services credential. The bill would require the effectiveness of programs to be assessed on multiple measures, including but not limited to:

- (1) The ability to prepare candidates who improve student learning.
- (2) Program completion rates.
- (3) Placement of program graduates in administrative positions.
- (4) Employment retention rates of program graduates.

AB 1415 would also require the Commission to convene a group of stakeholders including representatives from the department, teachers, administrators, county office and district personnel, deans of education, and institutions of higher education, including the University of California, the California State University, and private postsecondary institutions, to recommend other outcome-based performance measures for inclusion in the data evaluation report, and to measure the effectiveness of the various routes for earning the administrative services credential.

The bill states that it is the intent of the Legislature that the data evaluation report adopted pursuant to the language of the bill be used to further the purpose of the new accreditation process and that it be embedded within the biennial accreditation report required by the commission so that the candidate assessment and performance data used for accreditation purposes maintains some consistency across all of the programs of professional preparation that offer the administrative services credential.

The bill further requires the commission to regularly review the performance of accredited programs of administrator preparation, as provided for in Article 10 (commencing with Section 44370). For programs that are deemed to be struggling, the commission shall either revoke their accreditation or provide assistance necessary to improve the quality of the program. Additionally, AB 1415 requires that each program of administrator preparation electronically submit all data in the data evaluation report adopted pursuant to the bill language when submitting the biennial accreditation report required by the commission

### **Summary of Current Law**

Education Code Sections 44370 through 44374 establish the accreditation in educator preparation system. In particular, Section 44372 gives powers and duties to the Commission to:

- (a) Adopt and implement an accreditation framework, which sets forth the policies of the commission regarding the accreditation of educator preparation in California.
- (b) Establish and modify credential-specific standards, experimental program standards, and alternative program standards, as defined in the adopted accreditation framework.
- (c) Rule on the eligibility of an applicant for accreditation when the applying institution has not previously prepared educators for state certification in California, pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 44227.
- (d) Appoint and reappoint the members of the Committee on Accreditation, in accordance with Section 44373, by selecting among nominees submitted by a panel of distinguished educators.
- (e) Review periodic accreditation reports by the Committee on Accreditation, and refer accreditation issues and concerns to the committee for its examination and response.
- (f) Hear and resolve appeals of accreditation decisions, pursuant to subdivision (e) of Section 44374.
- (g) Allocate resources annually for implementation of the accreditation system.
- (h) With the Committee on Accreditation, jointly design an evaluation of accreditation policies and their implementation, and jointly select an external evaluator to conduct the evaluation, in accordance with Section 8 of the accreditation framework that was in effect on June 30, 1993.



- (i) Modify the accreditation framework in accordance with Section 8 of the framework that was in effect on June 30, 1993.
- (j) Inform and advise the Legislature regarding statutory issues related to accreditation, and submit legislative recommendations, after considering the advice of the Committee on Accreditation, educational institutions, and professional organizations.

### **Commission Activity**

In June 2004 the Commission began work to review and revise the Commission's accreditation system. In July 2006 the Accreditation Study Work Group and the Committee on Accreditation made recommendations to the Commission and the Commission adopted six revisions. Seven more revisions were adopted in November of the same year. Among the numerous revisions adopted was a modification to the system such that accreditation becomes an ongoing activity instead of a once every six year event. The ongoing cycle will be focused on accountability, meeting standards, and data driven decision making.

Other revisions included:

- (a) Revising the accreditation cycle from a single site visit once every 6 years to a series of accreditation activities over the course of 7 years;
- (b) Revising the cycle from a 3-4 day comprehensive site visit conducted every six years to a system that includes annual data collection by the institution or program sponsor;
- (c) Requiring program sponsors to submit biennial reports to the COA
- (d) Retaining and revising the review of documents submitted by all credential programs in the 4<sup>th</sup> year of the 7 year cycle;
- (e) Retaining and revising a site visit in the 6<sup>th</sup> year of the cycle focusing on Common Standards and where needed, Program Standards; and
- (f) Using the 7<sup>th</sup> year in the cycle for required follow up.
- (g) Revising the system such that it addresses unit accreditation and enhances program review.

Under the revised accreditation system institutions will receive a single accreditation decision, in other words, unit accreditation. The individual programs will be approved within the process of coming to the institution's accreditation decision. One of the major ways in which the proposed system will enhance program review is that under the proposed system, findings for each standard of each credential program would be included in the accreditation report, rather than just findings on the common standards. In addition, the program review team would recommend whether review of a particular program should be part of a larger site visit at the institution or district office

There are various routes to obtain an Administrative Services Credential. At the preliminary level, the traditional method requires an individual to complete a

Commission-approved program at an institution of higher education. An alternative to the traditional route is the administrative services internship route. In recent years, the Legislature has taken a keen interest in the Administrative Services credential and, as such, has provided alternatives to the traditional method. One fairly recent change allows an individual administrative services credential candidate to successfully complete the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA), in place of a traditional program and an internship program.

For the Clear Administrative Services credential, in addition to the traditional route, an individual may choose to complete a State Board of Education-approved AB 75 Principal Training Program, or meet Mastery of Fieldwork Performance Standards through a Commission-approved program where colleges and universities with approved programs leading to the Credential may offer a streamlined assessment option to candidates to allow candidates to forego the course work component of the program. One other route now available is the completion of a Commission-approved alternative program based on Commission-adopted guidelines resulting in a formal recommendation from the program sponsor.

### **Fiscal Impact**

AB 1415 requires the Commission to convene a stakeholder group to recommend other outcome-based performance measures for inclusion in the data evaluation report and to measure the effectiveness of the various routes for earning the administrative services credential. Staff believes this would result in minor, absorbable costs.

### **Relevant Commission Legislative Policies**

Policy 1: The Commission supports legislation that 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.

### **Organizational Positions**

EdVoice is the Sponsor of the legislation.

### **Reason for Suggested Position**

The Legislature, in several policy discussions, has recognized the vital importance of effective school administrators in the overall success and academic achievement of students. In particular, strong, effective leadership appears to be key to improving student performance in low decile schools. By layering a data report into the biennial

report required by the Commission and by examining the effectiveness of the various routes to earning an Administrative Services credential, the Legislature establishes not only program accountability, but a means for program improvement.

The Commission has undertaken the very important and arduous work of revising the accreditation system. The revisions that have already been adopted are designed to strengthen the accreditation process. AB 1415 will contribute to that strengthening by addressing outcome-based performance measures for administrator preparation programs.

For this reason, staff is recommending a **Support** position on AB 1415.

---

---

## Bill Analysis

---

---

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Senate Bill 52</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Senator Jack Scott</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>Governor Schwarzenegger</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Career Technical Education</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>January 8, 2007</b>
<b>Date Amended:</b>	<b>April 9, 2007</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Senate Education Committee</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Support</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>April 17, 2007</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Anne L. Padilla</b>

### **Analysis of Bill Provisions**

As introduced, SB 52 (Scott) proposed several changes to the designated subjects vocational education credential:

- Change the name of the credential to the Designated Subjects Career Technical Education (CTE) Teaching Credential
- Repeal the authority to issue part-time CTE credentials
- Require the Commission to establish a list of authorized subjects for the CTE credential that reflects the 15 industry sectors identified in the California career technical education model curriculum standards adopted by SBE, by September 30, 2007.

In addition to the changes noted above, the bill was amended on April 9, 2007 in part to address the concerns about the deletion of the part-time credential. Specifically, the amendments would revise statutes governing the designated subjects vocational education credential as follows:

- Delete the requirement that candidates pass the state's basic skills test. Candidates are currently exempt from this requirement under Education Code section 44252(e).
- Delete the option for the Commission to test a candidate in the subject to be taught. As far as we know, this option has never been exercised.
- Require that programs of personalized preparation be consistent with full-time or part-time service
- Require the Commission to convene an advisory committee to review credential requirements and make recommendations for consolidating requirements for full-time and part-time service with a focus on streamlining the credential structure without increasing the requirements for part-time service
- Require the Commission to make recommendations to the Legislature on the minimum requirements for the credential by April 1, 2008.

SB 52 is an urgency bill and would take effect immediately upon the Governor's signature.

### **Summary of Current Law**

Education Code sections 44260 and 44260.1 define requirements for the full-time designated subjects preliminary and the professional clear vocational education credentials. The requirements for the full-time preliminary vocational education credential are:

- High school diploma (or GED);
- Five years vocational work experience or Combination of vocational work experience and education;
- Fingerprint clearance; and
- U.S. Constitution course or exam.

Within the first two years of classroom instruction, the teacher must complete a program of personalized professional development (Level I) which includes learning and instruction, classroom management, curriculum, and student evaluation.

The requirements for the professional clear vocational education credential are:

- Preliminary vocational education credential;
- Two years of successful vocational teaching;
- Completion of personalized Level I and II<sup>2</sup> professional development requirements;
- Health education.

Education Code section 44260.5 requires the Commission to establish minimum requirements for part-time designated subjects vocational education credential. It also

---

<sup>2</sup> Level II requirements build upon Level I requirements and provide the teacher with training in: foundations of education, advanced learning and instruction, program budgeting, needs assessment and integration of academic skills, program evaluation, and special needs students.

specifies that credentials issued for part-time service shall not authorize service for more than a half-time teaching assignment.

The requirements for the part-time designated subjects vocational education credential are similar to the full-time designated subjects vocational credential except that part-time holders are not required to complete a U.S. Constitution course or Level II requirements. (A complete list of requirements is included in Agenda Item 6C; pages PSC 6C-1 and PSC 6C-2.)

### **Commission Activity**

The Commission currently offers designated subjects vocational education credentials in 175 subjects ranging from accounting to welding. In 2003-04, the Commission awarded 3,221 vocational education credentials.

The designated subjects credential requirements and program standards were last revised in 1993. In 2001, the Commission authorized a task force to research the relevancy and appropriateness of the designated subjects vocational education credential requirements through statewide surveys of teachers and administrators. The task force conducted a study of vocational credentials over a period of six months and prepared a set of recommendations for changes to the credentials. Commission administration decided not to pursue changes at that time and no Commission action was taken.

At the November-December 2006 Commission meeting, the Commission directed staff to begin the process for reviewing the designated subjects vocational education credential requirements and program standards and consider possible modification to the requirements. Since that time, a review panel has been selected, held its first two meetings and begun work on recommendations to streamline the credential structure and requirements. To inform the panel's discussions, a survey of Regional Occupation Centers and Programs was undertaken to determine the current needs of the local career and technical education programs. A more detailed account of the panel's progress will be presented in Commission Agenda Item 6C.

### **Fiscal Impact**

Within current Commission budget.

### **Relevant Commission Legislative Policies**

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

## **Organizational Positions**

Organizations in Support: California School Boards Association, California Parent Teacher Association, California Coalition for Construction in the Classroom

Organizations in Opposition: No organizations have registered their opposition at this time.

## **Reason for Suggested Position**

The Commission has recognized the need to review and update credential requirements and program standards for vocational teachers. At the November-December 2006 meeting, the Commission directed staff to develop a plan for reviewing the designated subjects vocational education credential requirements and program standards and consider possible modification to the requirements. SB 52 calls for the Commission to convene an advisory committee to review credential requirements for career technical education credentials and make recommendations to the Legislature on the requirements for these credentials within the framework of the bill. SB 52 is consistent with the Commission's Career and Technical Education Advisory Panel's guiding criteria to recommend changes that will increase teacher supply, streamline credential requirements and improve the quality of preparation to teach California students.

The Commission discussed SB 52 at its February 2007 meeting. At that time, Commissioners and stakeholders expressed reservations about the deletion of the part-time credential. Recent amendments to the bill address this concern by specifying that: 1) programs of personalized preparation be consistent with full-time or part-time service; and 2) the Commission's advisory committee on career technical education credentials make recommendations for consolidating requirements for full-time and part-time service with a focus on streamlining the credential structure without increasing the requirements for part-time service.

For these reasons, staff is recommending a **Support** position on SB 52.

---

---

## BILL ANALYSIS

---

---

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Senate Bill 859</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Senator Jack Scott</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>Author</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Visiting Faculty Permit</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 20, 2007</b>
<b>Date Last Amended:</b>	<b>April 11, 2006</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Senate Education Committee</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Support if Amended</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>April 17, 2007</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Marilyn Errett</b>

### **Analysis of Bill Provisions**

SB 859 would authorize the commission to issue “visiting faculty permits” authorizing instruction in departmentalized classes to experienced California community college instructors who satisfy the requirements specified below.

- Minimum of six years of full-time teaching experience in an accredited California community college.
- Master’s degree or higher from a regionally accredited institution of postsecondary education in a subject area related to the subject he or she proposes to teach.
- Evidence of two years of rigorous performance evaluations while teaching in an accredited California community college in which the applicant received ratings of satisfactory or higher based on criteria determined by the Commission.
- Meets the requirements for teacher fitness in accordance with the statutes pertaining to character and identification clearance.

The “visiting faculty permit” would be requested by an employing school district able to meet employment justification requirements as follow.



- Annual documentation that the school district has implemented a process for conducting a diligent search that meets specified criteria.
- A declaration of need for fully qualified certificated teachers based on the documentation above in the form of a motion adopted by the governing board of the school district or the county board of education at a regularly scheduled meeting as specified.

The Commission would have the authority to deny a request for a “visiting faculty permit” if the employing school district did not comply with the justification requirements.

SB 859 would also add a new section, 44274.3, to the Education Code requiring the Commission to issue a clear, single subject teaching credential based on the following requirements.

- Valid “visiting faculty permit.”
- Two years of satisfactory or better performance evaluations while teaching on the basis of a “visiting faculty permit.”
- Preparation to teach English learners in accordance with Education Code section 44259.5 which specifies that the commission may not initially issue a professional clear teaching credential to an applicant unless the applicant has earned an authorization to provide services to English learners.
- Verification by the employing school district that the individual has completed an individualized professional development plan tailored to the needs of the individual teacher and the district that includes mentoring, support, and assistance provided by experienced teachers who teach the same subjects.

In addition, the measure specifies that an applicant for the clear, single subject teaching credential may participate in a beginning teacher induction program (BTSA). Further, SB 859 would exempt applicants applying for the credential through this route from meeting the basic skills proficiency requirement.

### **Summary of Current Law**

Current law authorizes the Commission to issue various types of teaching and services credentials, including preliminary and clear multiple and single subject teaching credentials.<sup>3</sup> The commission is also authorized to issue emergency teaching and specialist permits that correspond to specified credential types.<sup>4</sup> School districts applying for emergency permits must provide justification that diligent recruitment efforts were completed and provide an annual declaration of need to the Commission before the Commission staff will issue permits for use in the district. The Commission currently issues short-term staff permits and provisional intern permits as replacements for the previously issued emergency permits.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Education Code sections 44225, 44256 and 44259

<sup>4</sup> Education Code section 44300

<sup>5</sup> 5 Cal. Code Regs. Sections 80021 and 80021.1

Among the optional routes for earning a teaching credential, the Commission issues an eminence teaching credential to individuals who can verify outstanding accomplishments in their profession related to the credential being requested on their behalf by an employing school district.<sup>6</sup> The initial eminence credential is issued for two years. The employing school district may apply on behalf of the individual for a three-year extension. Upon completion of the full five-year sequence, with satisfactory performance evaluations, the individual qualifies for a clear credential.

Another optional route for earning a teaching credential is intended for individuals who have taught for six or more years in an accredited private school.<sup>7</sup> A result of Commission-sponsored legislation, this route allows the six or more years of experience to satisfy the requirement for completion of a teacher preparation program as long as the individual can provide at least two satisfactory performance evaluations earned while teaching in the private school. Applicants must also meet other specified criteria established by the Commission.<sup>8</sup>

### **Commission Activity**

The Commission has taken an active interest in teacher supply issues including hosting a presentation by the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning regarding current and projected teacher shortages and hosting representatives from California State University to discuss their annual survey of teacher candidates and supervisors (agenda item 2K)<sup>9</sup>. In addition, the Commission submits an annual report to the Legislature entitled "Teacher Supply in California." The 2005-06 report, item 2J in the current Commission meeting agenda<sup>10</sup>, indicates a downward trend in the number of multiple subject and single subject teaching credentials issued, as well as a downward trend in teacher preparation program enrollment.

The Commission provides several optional routes, or pathways, for individuals who wish to earn a teaching credential, including internships, the early completion internship option, undergraduate integrated teacher preparation and baccalaureate degree programs, the traditional course work and student teaching route, options for teachers prepared in other states and other countries, as well as the eminence and private school experience options noted in the summary of current law above. There is not currently a pathway for individuals who have experience as community college instructors.

---

<sup>6</sup> Education Code section 44262

<sup>7</sup> Education Code section 44259.2

<sup>8</sup> SB 57 Scott, Chap. 269, Stats. 2001

<sup>9</sup> April 25-26, 2007

<sup>10</sup> April 25-26, 2007

## **Fiscal Impact**

Minor/Absorbable impact for computer programming, informational leaflets and communication with the field.

## **Relevant Commission Legislative Policies**

Policy 1: The Commission supports legislation that 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.

Policy 5: The Commission supports legislation that strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms that it previously has adopted and opposes legislation that would undermine initiatives or reforms that it previously has adopted.

## **Organizational Positions**

No organizations have registered their position on this bill, as amended, to date.

## **Reason for Suggested Position**

For the past several years, the Legislature has expressed concern over teacher supply issues and has examined innovations to increase the supply of teachers in California. The balance between maintaining teacher quality and effective preparation with recognizing previous experience and subject matter expertise has been at the forefront of this discussion.

SB 859 strives to address that balance by recognizing experience teaching in a California community college while requiring a careful sequence of service restricted to the employing school district, mentoring and support, individualized professional development in accordance with school district guidelines, and preparation to teach English learners. The credentialing pathway outlined in SB 859 is also restricted to departmentalized classes – most commonly found in high schools and middle schools. Subject matter expertise is addressed through the requirement for a master's degree or higher and through the requirement that the individual provide verification of at least six years of experience teaching the subject in a California community college.

In discussing this bill with the author's staff, Commission staff was informed that Senator Scott envisions the measure to meet staffing shortage areas such as mathematics and science. However, the Senator felt that school districts had varying needs for departmentalized staff, especially in schools considered difficult to staff. Thus, the bill

provides a pathway, with verified district staffing needs, for all of the single subject authorizations.

The Commission has sponsored bills to remove credentialing barriers and to help increase the teacher supply in California. As noted in the Current Commission Activity section of this analysis, a Commission-sponsored bill provided an experience-based route for private school teachers. The same measure also established the early completion route for teaching interns.

As with many legislative measures, SB 859 would most likely need further clarification through the regulatory process. It incorporates current permit and credentialing processes, such as in the use of the declaration of need and requiring the Commission to establish criteria for the content of performance evaluations pursuant to earning the permit or the credential. However, Commission staff suggests additional clarity in the bill itself in the following two areas.

- Limit the number of renewals allowable for the “visiting faculty permit.” Staff suggests two renewals in addition to the initial issuance. This sequence would parallel the sequence of short-term staff permit and the provisional intern permit.
- Require, as part of the individualized professional development and classroom support, that the district provide the teacher with information on California’s K-12 academic content standards and /or frameworks related to the subject area authorized by the permit.

For this reason, staff recommends a **Support if Amended** position on SB 859.