
4B

Action

Legislative Committee

Analyses of Bills

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

Recommended Action: Staff will recommend a position in each bill analysis submitted for the Commission's consideration.

Presenter: Mary Armstrong, Director, Marilyn Errett, Administrator, and Anne Padilla, Consultant, Office of Governmental Relations

Strategic Plan Goal: 2

Support policy development related to educator preparation, conduct and professional growth

- ◆ Inform key legislators and policy makers on issues and ideas relevant to the Commission's scope of action

Bill Analysis

Bill Number:	Senate Bill 1186
Author:	Senator Jack Scott
Sponsor:	Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Subject of Bill:	Teacher Quality
Date Introduced:	February 12, 2008
Date Last Amended:	April 16, 2008
Status in Leg. Process:	Moved to the Assembly
Recommended Position:	Move from “Sponsor” to “Support”
Date of Analysis:	May 12, 2008
Analyst:	Marilyn Errett

Background

In its introduced version, SB 1186 included the Commission’s proposal for a Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) for candidates earning an Education Specialist Credential. Due to funding issues related to program level implementation of the TPA for Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credentials, Senator Scott determined that the success of SB 1186 could be hampered by retaining the Education Specialist Credential TPA language. The amended version of the bill does not include this section.

While the amended version of SB 1186 does not include the language related to the Commission’s sponsorship, it does address several issues relevant to the Commission’s work and areas of concern.

Analysis of Bill Provisions as Amended

SB 1186 has now become Senator Scott’s 2008 Teacher Quality Omnibus Bill and accordingly contains numerous provisions related to teachers and credential requirements. Specifically, SB 1186 would do the following:

Recruitment of Fully Prepared Teachers to School Sites

- Clarify that a school district may fill a teaching position on the basis of a credential waiver or emergency-type permit only after the governing board of the district annually resolves that the district has made reasonable efforts to recruit a fully prepared teacher for the assignment, that is school site specific, and, if a fully prepared teacher is not available, has made reasonable efforts to recruit an individual for the assignment in accordance with a specified “hierarchy” of hiring criteria. (Would amend CA Education Code §44225.7)

Basic Skills Requirement

- Exempt from the basic skills test requirement an applicant who possesses a master’s degree or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education. (Would amend CA Education Code §44252)
- Exempt from the basic skills test requirement an applicant who achieves scores on the writing, reading, and mathematics sections of the College Board SAT Reasoning Test, the enhanced ACT Test, or the California State University Early Assessment Program that are sufficient to waive the English placement test and the entry level mathematics examination administered by the California State University. (Would amend CA Education Code §44252)
- Clarify that the basic skills requirement does not apply to an applicant for an eminence credential. (Would amend CA Education Code §44252)
- Delete from current law the basic skills test exemption for an applicant who achieves a passing score, as determined by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, on either the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE) General Test, the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) Reasoning Test, or the ACT Plus Writing. (Would amend CA Education Code §44252)

Certification to Teach English Learners

- Authorize the holder of a valid California teaching credential to provide instructional services to students who are English learners, if the teacher has earned certification issued by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in “English as a New Language” at either the “Early and Middle Childhood” level or the “Early Adolescence through Young Adulthood” level. (Would add CA Education Code §44253.12)

Grant Application Criteria (Alternative Certification and Certificated Staff Mentor Programs)

- Adds to the grant application selection process for alternative certification (intern) programs the criteria that the program demonstrate the capacity to provide “mentoring support and assistance” including the number of teachers serving as certificated staff mentors for each school site where interns will be assigned. (Would amend CA Education Code §44385)
- Adds to the grant application selection process for the certificated staff mentor program the criteria that the school district assures that “each experienced teacher receiving a stipend as a certificated staff mentor is providing mentoring and support services to candidates participating in alternative certification programs or to beginning teachers participating in the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program. (Would amend CA Education Code §44560 and §44561)

SB 1186 also contains amendments affecting the California Peer Assistance and Review Program for Teachers, technical clean-up and Education Code conformance language.

Summary of Current Law

Recruitment of Fully Prepared Teachers to School Sites

- Current law¹ requires an annual governing board resolution verifying that the school district has made reasonable efforts to recruit fully prepared teachers and, when none are available, to subscribe to the “hiring hierarchy” as specified. The law does not currently focus attention at the school site level.

Basic Skills Requirement

- Current law requires passage of a basic skills exam for all initial issuances of credentials and permits,² but enumerates specific exemptions to the requirement,³ such as an exemption for an applicant for a Designated Subjects Adult Education Credential if the credential subject area does not require a baccalaureate degree, an exemption for an applicant who earned a credential prior to the implementation date of the basic skills requirement, and an exemption for an applicant who is credentialed in another state who has passed a basic skills proficiency examination administered by the state in which the person is credentialed. Current law⁴ is silent regarding the basic skills requirement for the eminence credential.

Certification to Teach English Learners

- Current law⁵ delineates the requirements and authorization for Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) certification and a route for holders of Designated Subjects Credentials or Service Credentials with a Special Class Authorization for certification to teach English learners.⁶ In addition, current law⁷ requires the Commission to include preparation and authorization to teach English learners in Multiple Subject and Single Subject preparation programs and to issue this certification as of July 1, 2000.
- Currently, teachers credentialed to teach in elementary, middle school, secondary and special education classes in other states may qualify for a clear California credential if they have earned certification in the subject area from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.⁸
- California teachers who hold a preliminary Multiple Subject, Single Subject or Special Education Teaching Credential may qualify for a clear California credential if they have earned certification in the subject area from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.⁹

¹ CA EC Sec.44225.7

² CA EC Sec 44242

³ CA EC Sec. 44252

⁴ CA EC Sec 44262

⁵ CA EC Sec 44253.3

⁶ CA EC Sec 44253.11

⁷ CA EC Sec 44259.5

⁸ CA EC Sec 44398

⁹ CA EC Sec 44399

Grant Application Criteria (Alternative Certification and Certificated Staff Mentor Programs)

- Current law specifies criteria for approving grant applications for state funded alternative certification programs (intern).¹⁰ This program is administered by the Commission.
- The California Department of Education administers the certificated staff mentor program.¹¹

Current Commission Practice

The Commission adheres to the laws governing the issuance of waivers and emergency-type permits, the basic skills requirement and to the issuance of English learner authorizations. Current regulations¹² for the Eminence Credential include a basic skills requirement. The Commission issues clear Multiple Subject, Single Subject and Special Education credentials in accordance with the laws related to National Board Certification.

Fiscal Impact

Minor/absorbable impact to the Commission.

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

Support

Public Advocates

Opposition

None noted at this time.

Reason for Suggested Position

SB 1186 targets several worthwhile issues in the area of teacher recruitment, teacher quality and teacher retention. It begins to address the difficult problem of the maldistribution of fully prepared teachers, as identified by the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning,¹³ by focusing on hiring practices at individual school sites and on ensuring that each school site that

¹⁰ CA EC Sec 44385

¹¹ CA EC Sec 44561

¹² T5 Cal. Code Regs. Sections 80043-80045

¹³ www.cftl.org (Multiple publications on this topic)

hires intern teachers is able to provide the support and assistance necessary for successful professional development. SB 1186 addresses additional proxies for the basic skills requirement to respond to what some members of the Legislature have considered redundant and overly bureaucratic credential requirements. Further addressing considerations of redundancy, it recognizes national certification for teachers of English learners.

For these reasons, staff recommends a **Support** position on SB 1186.

Bill Analysis

Bill Number: Senate Bill 1643

Author: Senator Tom Torlakson

Sponsor: Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger
Office of the Secretary of Education

Subject of Bill: Eminence Credentials

Date Introduced: February 22, 2008
Date Last Amended: May 8, 2008

Status in Leg. Process: Senate Appropriations Committee

Recommended Position: Seek Amendments

Date of Analysis: May 9, 2008

Analyst: Anne L. Padilla

Analysis of Bill Provisions

SB 1643 would authorize a county board of education, upon the recommendation of a school district, to authorize a county superintendent to issue an eminence credential to a person who has demonstrated subject matter competence through an examination, college degree or work experience. The subject or service in which the person demonstrates eminence must be one that the governing board wishes to have taught in the district's schools.

The decision to issue an eminence credential would be required to be based on a recommendation from the governing board of the school district, a statement of employment and verification of the eminence qualifications of the individual.

The bill defines an "eminent individual" as a person who is recognized as eminent beyond the boundaries of his or her community, has demonstrably advanced his or her field and has been acknowledged by his or her peers beyond the norm for others in the specific endeavor.

Verification of eminence qualifications is required to include personal and professional recommendations and documentation of achievement.

The county board of education would be required to provide public notice regarding the issuing of eminence credentials and would be authorized to charge a fee not to exceed the cost incurred for processing eminence credential applications.

The eminence credential would authorize teaching in the public schools of the issuing county in the subject or subject area and at the level approved by the county superintendent of schools. The credential would be issued initially for a two-year period and renewed for a three-year period upon recommendation of the sponsoring school district and acceptance by the county office of education.

The holder of an eminence credential would be eligible to apply to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) for a clear eminence teaching credential upon completion of the three-year renewal period and a written statement of support from the school district governing board adopted at a public meeting.

Summary of Current Law

Education Code section 44262 authorizes the Commission to issue an eminence credential upon recommendation of a school district to any person who has achieved eminence in a field taught in the public schools. This credential authorizes the holder to teach or perform services at the level or levels approved by the Commission.

Each credential is issued initially for a two-year period and renewed for three years upon the request of the recommending school district. Upon completion of the three-year renewal period and a written statement of support from the school district governing board adopted at a public meeting, the holder is eligible to apply to the Commission for a clear teaching credential.

Title 5 regulations (5 CCR, sections 80043-80045) define an eminent individual as a person recognized as eminent beyond his or her community, has demonstrably advanced his or her field and has been acknowledged by his or her peers beyond the norm for others in a specific endeavor.

Further, these regulations specify that verification of eminence qualifications include:

- Recommendations, which may be from (but need not be limited to) professional associations, former employers, professional colleagues and other individuals or groups whose evaluations would support eminence; and
- Documentation of achievement, which may include (but need not be limited to) advanced degrees earned, distinguished employment, evidence of related study or experience, publications, professional achievement, and recognition attained for contributions to his or her field of endeavor.

In addition, these regulations require the Commission to provide public notice of individuals for whom it is considering Eminence Credentials (as specified) and outline the procedure for staff review of initial applications.

Finally, the regulations echo statute in setting the terms of the credential; two-year initial issuance, renewal for three years and after five years the Commission issues a professional clear credential.

Current Commission Practice

Over the last six years (2001-2007) the Commission has considered 27 applications for either initial, renewal or clear Eminence Credentials. Nine of those applications were for initial issuance of Eminence Credentials. Of those nine applications for initial issuance, the Commission approved six, one was sent back for more information, one is pending and one application was denied.

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impact on the Commission. The county office of education may charge a fee to applicants to cover the expense incurred in processing the county eminence credential applications.

Relevant Commission Legislative Policies

Policy 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.

Policy 6: The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.

Organizational Positions

None noted at this time.

Background

Prior Legislation:

Last year the Commission supported SB 859 (Scott) which created a new Visiting Faculty Permit (VFP) for college instructors who wish to teach in a K-12 *departmentalized* setting. In addition, the measure establishes a new route toward earning a single subject teaching credential with the VFP as the first step. The program sunsets July 1, 2015.

Governor's Advisory Committee on Educational Excellence:

In November 2007, the Governor's Advisory Committee on Education Excellence issued their report "*Students First*" at the conclusion of their two-year exploration of changes and reforms in education (<http://www.everychildprepared.org/>). The advisory committee focused on four areas in education: governance, finance, teachers and administrators. The advisory committee also published a technical report. One of the recommendations in this report addressed county superintendents' ability to grant exceptional candidates an exemplary credential. SB 1643 is the result of this recommendation.

Impact of Federal Legislation:

At least two provisions of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act would impact the proposed county issued credential:

- Federal law requires teachers to hold state certification to meet the "highly qualified" teacher requirements. SB 1643 proposes that the initial credential and renewal credential be issued by the county office of education;
- Federal law requires that all elementary teachers pass a state test to meet the "highly qualified" teacher requirements. In California, this test is the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET), Multiple Subjects. This same law requires single subject teachers to obtain subject matter competence through a degree in the subject that they are teaching or pass a state subject matter exam. SB 1643 allows eminence candidates to meet subject matter by examination, college degree or work experience.

California Department of Education (CDE) staff has indicated that the proposed county issued credential may not be in compliance with NCLB. This non-alignment with federal requirements may have the effect of limiting the granting of county eminence credentials to non-core academic areas.

Reason for Suggested Position

Substantive Amendments

SB 1643 would authorize a county board of education, upon the recommendation of a school district, to authorize a county superintendent to issue an eminence credential. Currently these credentials can only be authorized by the Commission.

The bill's proposed credential granting process closely mirrors the Commission's process for review of candidates for eminence credentials. For example, the criteria for determining eminence is identical, the documentation required is similar and the terms of the initial, renewal and clear documents are also similar. The difference is that the county superintendent and county office of education would be issuing the initial and renewal documents. The Commission would be authorized to issue the clear document, but is not required to do so.

The movement of the initial and renewal document from the state to the county raises some interesting issues. For example, the background and fitness checks conducted by the counties are less thorough than those conducted by the Commission. The bill contains no provisions for these

eminence candidates to undergo the same level of background and fitness review that all other teachers in California are subject to unless and until they are granted a state credential---five years after they have been in the classroom. The bill does not include any provision for monitoring the eminence credential holder's conduct nor does it include a process to take adverse action and revoke the credential if serious misconduct or a subsequent conviction occurs. Staff understands from conversations with the sponsor that it was not their intent to initiate a different level of background and fitness check for these eminent teachers.

Staff recommends that the bill be amended to require that these candidates obtain a certificate of clearance from the Commission before the county is authorized to issue an initial eminence credential and maintain the certificate of clearance for the entire time that the candidate is serving students on the county issued credential.

Technical Amendments

The bill describes the process of verifying eminence qualifications of an applicant and lists the types of recommendations that "shall" be included, and then suggests "any" of the following listed. The Commission's regulatory requirement is more permissive in this regard and allows recommendations from other groups or individuals who may not be listed. A technical amendment is needed if the sponsor wishes that this process mirror the Commission's process in this regard.

The sponsor intends that during the initial issuance and renewal term of the credential, the teacher be able to serve in any district served by the county office of education. (Service under the state issued Eminence Credential is tied to the requesting school district for the first five years.) This intent should be clarified in the bill.

Upon issuance of the state credential, it is unclear whether the authorization is still tied to service in the district or county or whether the authorization is statewide. The authorization for the clear document should be clarified in the bill.

Finally, there may be sections of the education code referencing employment of certificated personnel that require corresponding amendments to authorize service for teachers on county issued eminence credentials.

Staff is recommending a "**Seek Amendments**" position on SB 1643, proposing both substantive and technical changes to the bill as described above.

Bill Analysis

Bill Number:	Assembly Bill 2517
Author:	Assembly Member Anthony Portantino
Sponsor:	Governor Schwarzenegger Office of the Secretary of Education
Subject of Bill:	Educator Preparation Programs
Date Introduced:	February 21, 2008
Date Last Amended:	April 22, 2008
Status in Leg. Process:	Senate Appropriations Committee Suspense File
Recommended Position:	Watch
Date of Analysis:	May 15, 2008
Analyst:	Marilyn Errett

Analysis of Bill Provisions

AB 2517 would allow the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to approve for educator preparation program accreditation purposes the following entities in addition to institutions of higher education:

- School Districts
- County Offices of Education
- Community-Based or Nongovernmental Organizations

The measure stipulates that all programs must meet the Commission's standards and would also require all accredited programs to submit recommendations for credentials electronically.

Summary of Current Law

California Education Code section 44227 states that the Commission may approve any *“institution of higher education to recommend to the Commission the issuance of credentials to persons who have successfully completed a teacher education program of the institution if the program meets the standards approved by the Commission.”*

In addition, California Education Code sections 44325-44329.5 allow the establishment of intern programs offered by school districts. These programs can be offered for multiple subject and single subject credentials as well as for education specialist credentials for students with mild to moderate disabilities. Subsection (e) of section 44325 establishes a pilot program for district intern programs wishing to offer preparation for an education specialist credential in any of the special education credential disability areas.

In 2002, the Commission sponsored SB 1655 (Chap. 225) to add alternative routes for earning administrative services credentials. One of the options, in California Education Code section 44270.5, allows a candidate for the clear credential to complete a program “accredited by the Commission,” but does not specify that the program need be offered by an institution of higher education. California Education Code section 44253.10 authorized a staff development program for a certificate authorizing the instruction of English learners, to be offered by, “any school district, county office of education, or regionally accredited college or university that meets the standards included in the guidelines established pursuant to this subdivision or any organization that meets those standards and is approved by the Commission.” This certificate option sunset on January 1, 2008.

Title 5 regulations (CCR, sections 80034-80042) specify that, in addition to institutions of higher education, local educational agencies may offer personalized preparation programs for designated subjects credentials such as career technical education credentials and adult education credentials.

The Commission’s Preconditions for initial institutional accreditation include the following reference related to institutional viability:

Pursuant to Education Code Section 44227(a), each program of professional preparation shall adhere to the following requirements of the Commission.

(1) Accreditation and Academic Credit. To be granted initial institutional accreditation by the Commission to become eligible to submit programs or to be granted initial program accreditation or continuing accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation, the program(s) must be proposed and operated by an institution that (a) is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges or another of the six regional accrediting associations, and (b) grants baccalaureate academic credit or postbaccalaureate academic credit, or both. (This provision does not apply to professional preparation programs offered by school districts.) For school districts wishing to offer a professional preparation program, the Superintendent of the district shall submit verification of the governing board’s approval of sponsorship of the program.

Current Commission Practice

The Commission is responsible for determining the initial accreditation of institutions. Most recently, at its April 9-10, 2008 meeting, the Commission approved Hebrew Union University. The institution may now submit educator preparation programs to the Committee on

Accreditation. The Commission's Committee on Accreditation is responsible for the initial and ongoing accreditation of educator preparation programs.

There were 94 institutions/program sponsors approved to offer educator preparation in the 2003-04 year. Now, with the inclusion of Designated Subject programs in the accreditation system and approval of additional sponsors, there are 140 institution/program sponsors currently approved to offer educator preparation in California.

The Commission allows some service credential programs to use alternative standards for California program accreditation, such as those for the pupil personnel services credential in school counseling, to meet the standards set by the national professional organization to accredit programs for professional licensure.

Fiscal Impact

Unknown.

The costs related to AB 2517 depend on the number of new entities that apply for institutional and program accreditation. These programs, if initially accredited, would become part of the ongoing accreditation system. Appendix A includes an estimate of accreditation costs per institution based on the seven year accreditation cycle.

Relevant Commission Legislative Policies

Policy 6: The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.

Organizational Positions

Support

Association of California School Administrators
California Association of Private School Organizations
California Catholic Conference

Opposition

California Federation of Teachers
Californians Together
Public Advocates

Reason for Suggested Position

In November 2007, the Governor's Advisory Committee on Education Excellence issued their report "*Students First*" at the conclusion of their two-year exploration of changes and reforms in education (<http://www.everychildprepared.org/>). The advisory committee focused on four areas in education: governance, finance, teachers and administrators. The advisory committee also published a technical report. One of the recommendations in this report addressed expanding opportunities for credential programs by allowing multiple pathways including alternative program providers. AB 2517 is the result of these recommendations.

Currently, school districts are authorized by law to offer district intern programs for specified teaching credentials as long as the program meets Commission program standards and meets all accreditation requirements. Some of these programs are part of a consortium coordinated by a county office of education. In addition, school districts and county offices of education are authorized through regulation to offer programs of professional preparation for designated subjects credentials. These programs must also meet the Commission's standards and are now included in the accreditation process. Further, school districts are authorized to offer Tier II programs for the administrative services credential if they meet guidelines adopted by the Commission and, prior to the January 1, 2008 sunset date, programs to prepare veteran teachers to teach English learners could be offered by professional organizations such as the California Teachers Association.

AB 2517 would expand the authority of local educational agencies to offer educator preparation programs including traditional teacher preparation and service credential preparation. Nongovernmental agencies, such as professional organizations or private professional development agencies, would also be authorized to offer educator preparation programs as long as all Commission standards and accreditation requirements are met.

The Commission would need to address changes in the law through the regulatory process. In particular, the Commission would need to address the fiscal and institutional viability of nongovernmental organizations interested in providing an educator preparation program through a revision of Title 5 regulations and of the Preconditions for initial institutional accreditation. Under current regulations, the Commission requires regional accreditation for institutions of higher education offering educator preparation programs and relies on the California Department of Education to ensure the viability of school districts and county offices of education.

Policy makers within the Administration have expressed the need to address impending K-12 educator shortages by broadening the range of possible educator program sponsors. On the other hand, some education organizations question this direction and feel that the current sponsorship limitations provide greater assurance of continued professionalism in the field. The Administration, in sponsoring AB 2517, ensures that all programs would be required to meet the Commission's standards, including the Common Standards, Program Standards and Preconditions. The accreditation process would ensure that programs would continue to meet the Commission's requirements. If AB 2517 becomes law, the Commission could define requirements, other than regional accreditation, that could establish the institutional viability of alternative providers.

Discussion by members of the Assembly Education Committee, before the bill passed unanimously, complimented the Commission's standards and accreditation system. Members expressed the opinion that the Commission's standards and accreditation system would be strong gatekeepers and would prevent sub-standard programs from providing educator preparation. As AB 2517 begins its review in the Senate, state policy makers will have further discussions about the need for the bill and the ability of the Commission to ensure quality.

For these reasons, staff recommends a **Watch** position on AB 2517.

AB 2517 (Portantino)
Appendix A

Accreditation Costs

For every 12 approved program sponsors/institutions, the Commission needs about 1 FTE consultant staff to focus on accreditation. Staff provide technical assistance to support the initial application for approval, review the Biennial Reports (Program Data), facilitate the review of the Program Assessment documents, provide technical assistance prior to an Accreditation Site Visit and facilitate the site visit and, if necessary, the institution's process to address stipulations or facilitate the re-visit.

There were 94 institutions/program sponsors approved to offer educator preparation in the 2003-04 year. Now, with the inclusion of Designated Subject programs in the accreditation system and approval of additional sponsors, there are 140 institution/program sponsors currently approved to offer educator preparation in California. (Three additional consultant positions will revert to the Professional Services Division for the increased accreditation purposes as of July 1, 2008.)

For the additional costs incurred in accreditation activities when peer reviewers are utilized (initial approval, program assessment and site visits), please see the table below:

Activity	Cost *
Technical Assistance prior to Initial approval (one time cost)	Calculated in the 1 FTE consultant per 12 approved program sponsors
Initial Approval -Staff review of Preconditions and Common Standards, and peer panel review of program proposal. 2 Volunteers—travel and per diem (one time cost—repeated for each approved program proposed by the sponsor)	\$1,000/per proposed program
Biennial Reports —staff review of Biennial Reports (submitted 3 out of every 7 years)	Calculated in the 1 FTE consultant per 12 approved program sponsors
Program Assessment —Peer readers. 2 volunteers (per program) — travel and per diem/per approved program.	\$1,000-\$8,000 depending on the number of programs a sponsor offers.
Technical Assistance prior to Site Visit-Consultant visits the sponsor for one full day at a minimum. Additional time and contact through phone and email (once every 7 years)	\$700 Additional activities calculated in the 1 FTE consultant per 12 approved program sponsors
Site Visit costs -Dependent on the size of the institution/program sponsor. Smallest team size of 3 plus a staff member to the largest team size of 10 plus a staff member or two. Site visit consists of 4 days and 3 nights at the site, travel and per diem for the volunteers (once every 7 years)	\$3,000-\$14,000
Address Stipulations/Re-Visit - Dependent on the stipulations, but a re-visit would be 2-3 people for 2 nights, travel and per diem. About half of the site visits would have stipulations to address and about half of these would involve a re-visit. (once every 7 years)	\$2000

*Costs are calculated beginning with the 2009-2010 year and the revised accreditation site visits

Reference

Legislative Guidelines And Possible Bill Positions

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.