
7B

Action

Legislative Committee

Analyses of Bills

Executive Summary: Staff will present analyses of current bills impacting the Commission's work, including educator preparation and licensing bills, for the Commission to determine what, if any, position is appropriate. The analyses of each bill 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: Joshua Speaks, Legislative Representative, Office of Governmental Relations

Strategic Plan Goal

III Communication and Engagement

- e) Advise the Governor, Legislature, and other policy makers as appropriate regarding issues affecting the quality, preparation, certification, and discipline of the education workforce.

April 2016

Bill Analysis

Assembly Bill 1756 (Bonilla)

Teacher credentialing: integrated programs of professional preparation

Recommended Position: Seek amendments

Sponsor: None

Bill Version: Amended March 29, 2016

Summary

AB 1756 authorizes postsecondary institutions to offer 4 or 5-year integrated teacher preparation programs, which would allow students to earn a baccalaureate degree and their preliminary teaching credential simultaneously. The bill would also, contingent upon appropriation of funds in the annual Budget Act, require the Commission to develop and implement a program to award 40 grants of \$250,000 each to postsecondary institutions for the development of transition plans to create a 4-year integrated preparation program, or to adapt an existing program. The bill also makes findings and declarations related to the importance of undergraduate credentialing programs.

Background

An integrated program of undergraduate teacher preparation enables candidates for teaching credentials to engage in general education coursework, subject matter preparation, and professional preparation concurrently, thereby completing all requirements for both a preliminary teaching credential and a baccalaureate degree simultaneously. The integrated teacher preparation model is beneficial for undergraduates who have decided relatively early that they want to be teachers, because it allows them to enter the workforce sooner, and with reduced overall educational expenses. Though California law has never explicitly barred institutions from offering an integrated program of preparation, there was a perception that the Ryan Act of 1970, which stated that undergraduate education degrees could not be used to qualify for a preliminary credential, did precisely that.

While SB 2042 (Chap. 548, Stats. 1998) identified integrated programs of teacher preparation as an appropriate form of professional preparation for a credential, these programs have not become widespread. Currently, a number of institutions offer integrated teacher preparation programs which allow part or all of a candidate's preparation to be completed during their undergraduate education. However, these programs are small and prepare a limited number of teachers each year. While the Commission does not currently track these programs on an ongoing basis, the author's office has indicated that the California State University (CSU) system, which prepared 6,992 candidates in 2013-14, only had 323 students enrolled in an integrated program. This is a significant reduction from the Commission's last comprehensive survey of integrated programs, which indicated that there were 6,221 candidates enrolled in an integrated/blended program in the 2003-04 school year. This is partially reflective of the overall decline in enrollment in teacher preparation programs. In 2003-2004, the CSU system had a total

enrollment of 15,012 candidates in teacher preparation programs. However, program sponsors indicate that the decline in enrollment in integrated programs has been far more precipitous.

Analysis

This bill explicitly defines integrated programs as allowing a student “to earn a baccalaureate degree and a preliminary multiple or single subject teaching credential, including student teaching requirements, concurrently and within four or five years of study.” Education Code Section 44259.1 already defined integrated programs and directed the Commission to encourage their development. This bill amends that language by referencing the length of time to eliminate any perceived ambiguity over whether or not the *entire* program can be completed during the course of a four year undergraduate course of education. The bill also includes education specialist credentials, which were previously not addressed by this section.

The bill calls for teachers in integrated programs to have access to student teaching early in their coursework. However, student teaching requirements call for the candidate to have demonstrated subject matter competence prior to taking over a classroom. Therefore staff recommends that the language be changed to call for “field work” which encompasses a broad array of classroom activities.

The bill requires the Commission to develop and implement a program to award 40 grants of two hundred and fifty thousand dollars each to postsecondary institutions for the development of transition plans to guide the creation of, or modifications to, four or five-year integrated programs of professional preparation. While both four and five-year programs are eligible, the bill prioritizes grants to programs that can be completed during the four years of undergraduate study. The Commission would also be authorized to reserve some of the funds for an additional year, potentially allowing half as many programs to instead receive up to two years and five hundred thousand dollars of funding for this purpose. As a condition of the grant funding, programs must report program and outcome data for at least three years after receiving the grant. The bill provides very little specific guidance, leaving the Commission with broad discretion to design and administer an effective process for evaluating grant proposals. The program and the grants are contingent upon the appropriation of funds in the annual budget act. No funds are appropriated by this bill. The bill also makes no provision for the Commission to receive fiscal support for doing the work of developing and administering the program.

The bill will also require the Commission to collect information about integrated programs of professional preparation, including “which institutions offer integrated programs and the number and type of credentials the programs produce.” While the Commission does not currently collect this information, it has already been identified for collection as part of the Strengthening and Streamlining Accreditation Project. This is discussed in greater detail in [Item 5B](#) on the Commission’s agenda.

The bill’s goals must also be considered in light of California’s current teacher shortage. While there is not unanimity on the precise extent of the shortage, there is substantial evidence that California is not producing enough teachers to meet its demand. Increasing the availability and visibility of undergraduate teacher preparation programs can address this shortage by making more efficient use of the time students must spend on their undergraduate and credential

studies, leading them into a classroom sooner. Furthermore, this reduces the need for financial assistance, loans, and the overall cost of earning a teaching credential. The reductions in time to credential and cost for credential may also have the added effect of increasing the overall candidate pool as lower barriers to entry make the prospect of teaching a more attractive career path.

Prior Legislation

In 2001, Assembly Member Jackie Goldberg authored AB 1307 (Chap. 565, Stats. 2001) which required the Commission to report on the number of students who have been admitted to, taken coursework in, and graduated from integrated (blended) programs by June 30, 2004. This legislation also required that the Commission allow candidates extended time periods to complete credential requirements, and to present data on the number of extensions requested and granted in blended programs. Based on these requirements, the Commission surveyed the colleges and universities which had been approved for blended programs and published the report¹.

The Commission took a “Support” position on AB 1307.

In 1998, Senator Deirdre Alpert authored SB 2042 (Chap. 548, Stats. 1998) which, among other provisions, provided that integrated programs of subject matter preparation and professional preparation met the statutory requirement for professional preparation. In response to this bill, the Commission created an incentive for the development of blended undergraduate programs of preparation. This incentive program was funded via the federal Title II funding that was available at the time. The Commission provided a total of 34 “early adopter” grants for \$30,000 each, provided over the course of two years.

The Commission took a “Support” position on SB 2042.

Fiscal Impact

Creating and administering a grant program would require the participation of staff in both the Professional Services Division and the Fiscal and Business Services Division. Professional Services Division would require the participation of an education programs consultant as well as the assistance of support staff members to develop and disseminate the Request for Proposals, provide technical assistance as institutions prepare responses to the RFP, score the responses once they are received, and provide technical assistance during the initial year of operation. Fiscal and Business Services support and managerial staff would need to provide guidance as the RFP is developed, execute contracts with all institutions selected through the RFP process, and disseminate the funds. The grant program would have an expected life cycle of six years, consisting of: an initial year spent on developing the program, soliciting grant applications, and making award determinations; two years of grant administration and technical support; and three years recording the program and outcome data provided by grant recipients and reporting on the overall results. Administrative costs for both divisions would be approximately 2.5% of the total grant amount. As noted above, the current bill language does not include any provisions for

¹ <http://www.ctc.ca.gov/reports/ABITPP-2004.pdf>

providing fiscal support to CTC. While these activities could potentially be supported by the Teacher Credentials Fund, the Commission would need new budget authority to do so.

Relevant Commission Legislative Policies

The Commission has adopted a set of legislative policy guidelines in order to provide staff with a consistent framework for evaluating legislation and providing recommendations to the Commission.

- 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.
- 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.
- Policy 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

Support

California Catholic Conference, Inc.

Opposition

None noted at this time

Reason for Suggested Position

AB 1756 builds on past attempts to expand the use of integrated programs of undergraduate teacher preparation. Expanded use of these programs contributes to a thoughtful and cohesive approach to the preparation of new teachers by treating the undergraduate years as an integrated part of the candidate's preparation for teaching, maximizing the use of the candidate's time in their program. However, as currently written, the bill lacks an appropriate source of funding for the work required of the Commission for implementation. Further, by using the term "student teaching" the bill refers to only narrow subset of the possible field experiences available to a teaching candidate.

For these reasons, staff is recommending a "**Seek amendments**" position on AB 1756.

Analyst: Joshua Speaks

Date of Analysis: April 8, 2016

Bill Analysis

Assembly Bill 2122 (McCarty) California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program

Recommended Position: Support if Amended

Sponsor: California Federation of Teachers

Bill Version: Introduced February 17, 2016

Summary

AB 2122 would revise the provisions of the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program (PTTP), renaming it the California Classified School Employee Teacher Credentialing Program (Program). The Program would be open to all classified school employees who pass a background check and have either attained an associate's degree or completed two years of postsecondary education. The Commission would be required to issue a request for proposals to all school districts and county offices of education in the state, in order to solicit applications for funding. Applications would be reviewed by the Commission, which is authorized to adopt criteria for that purpose. The bill requires the Commission to contract with an independent evaluator to evaluate the success of the program once every 5 years, beginning on or before July 1, 2021. The Commission must, on or before January 1 of each year, report specified information about the program to the Legislature. The bill does not allocate funding, but states the Legislature's intent that each fiscal year, funding for the program be allocated for up to 1,000 new participants per year and provide no more than \$4,000 per participant per year.

Background

The PTTP was established in 1990 by SB 1690 (Chap. 1444, Stats. 1990) to provide academic scholarships and other related academic support services to individuals recruited from paraprofessional job classifications and seeking a preliminary California Single Subject, Multiple Subject, or Education Specialist teaching credential. Programs were sponsored by local school districts, county offices of education and/or consortia that applied to the Commission for program funding based on a competitive grant application process. Participating districts were responsible for local recruitment and enrollment, as well as monitoring the progress of participants, providing supplementary academic support services as needed, assigning mentors, and expending state program funds. Participants did not receive funds directly. Rather, all funding was directed through the local program. The amount of funding allocated to participants changed over time, reaching a maximum of \$3,500 per participant annually.

Due to changes in how funds for education programs were allocated, in the 2008-09 fiscal year, funding for the program was reduced, and the program was reclassified to allow local school districts wide latitude in the use of these funds, including for purposes completely unrelated to the PTTP. In the 2013-14 budget act, sweeping changes were made to the way that schools receive funding as the Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) was implemented. Under LCFF,

categorical programs, including PTP, were included in LCFF, essentially eliminating any distinct source of state funding. The Commission's only remaining responsibility in regard to PTP is fund recovery efforts for those participants who did not satisfy their obligations under the program. While the Commission is aware of some districts that have retained their programs locally, these programs are no longer receiving dedicated state funding, nor are they reporting any information to the Commission.

The PTP was established to address local employer needs, particularly in identified shortage areas. Over the lifetime of the program, it produced more than 2,200 credentialed educators for the State of California. Importantly, these teachers were more racially and socioeconomically diverse than the overall teaching population of the state. For example, in program year 2011-2012, the final year of operation, 14 percent of participants were African American, 37 percent were Hispanic, and 28 percent identified their annual household income as less than \$20,000.

Analysis

As California simultaneously grapples with its teacher shortage and seeks to diversify its teaching workforce in order to better reflect the diversity of California's students, the track record of the paraprofessional program indicates that an expanded and revitalized program open to all classified school employees holds significant promise for the state.

As currently written, the bill requires the Commission to issue a request for proposals to all districts and county offices of education soliciting applications. The Commission is authorized to adopt appropriate criteria, which must include: the extent to which the applicant demonstrates the capacity and willingness to accommodate the participation of classified school employees in teacher training programs conducted at institutions of higher education, the extent to which the applicant's implementation plan involves the active participation of one or more local institutions of higher education in the development of coursework and teaching programs for participants, the extent to which the applicant's recruitment plan attempts to meet the demand in shortage areas, the extent to which a developmentally sequenced series of job descriptions leads from an entry-level classified school employee position to an entry-level teaching position in that school district or county office of education, and the extent to which the applicant's plan for recruitment attempts to meet its own specific teacher needs.

The participant must pass a background check, have already attained an associate's degree or two years of postsecondary study, and commit to completing the requirements to earn a credential and serving as a teacher in the sponsoring district one year for each year of participation in the Program. Unlike the PTP, there is no provision requiring repayment in cases where a participant fails to fulfill their commitments.

The bill also requires annual reports containing specified information to the legislature, and calls for that the Commission contract with an independent evaluator every 5 years beginning on or before July 1, 2021, to determine the success of the Program.

While the bill indicates the intent of the legislature to provide funding for 1,000 grants of up to \$4,000 per participant each year, the bill is silent on the issue of administrative costs for the Commission and local agencies. While the Commission may be able to seek support for its

administrative costs through the annual budget process, which is the intended funding mechanism for the bill, lack of any mechanism for local districts and county offices to use some of the allocated funding for their administrative costs is likely to hinder any effort to solicit proposals for participation. The bill also makes no provision for funding the required independent evaluation. While any estimates of the cost of an evaluation at this time are highly speculative, similar projects have cost approximately \$250,000, which may serve as a baseline estimate for this evaluation.

The bill currently recognizes service as a teacher in California schools as the only method of meeting the service requirement for participants. Participants who fail to attain a credential, or after earning a teaching credential subsequently cannot find employment as a teacher, have no way of fulfilling this obligation. Recognizing any service in California public schools would allow classified employees to continue to work in their current capacities while still meeting their obligations. Likewise, the Commission may want to consider if the bill should be amended to recognize service for a different school employer in cases where their sponsoring employer had no appropriate teaching positions available.

The bill excludes private colleges from participation. While private colleges can, at times, be more costly than public institutions, they were valuable participants under the PTTTP program. The Commission might wish to consider if the bill should be amended to include private not-for-profit institutions that offer Commission-approved preparation programs. Similarly, the definitions provided in the bill exclude district intern programs not associated with an institution of higher education. These programs are valuable participants in the teacher preparation process, and the Commission may wish to recommend amending the bill with more inclusive language.

Prior Legislation

In 2007, Assembly Member Jack Scott authored SB 193 (Chap. 554, Stats. 2007), amended the law to include a mandate for common entry and participation criteria for new PTTTP participants.

The Commission was the sponsor of SB 193.

In 1997, Assembly Member Jack Scott authored AB 352, and Assembly Member Scott Wildman authored AB 353 (Chaps. 737 and 831, Stats. 1997). These bills expanded the PTTTP and renamed the expanded program the “Wildman-Keeley-Solis Exemplary Teacher Training Act of 1997.” AB 353 also required the Commission to consult also with the President of the University of California and the chancellors of private institutions of higher education with approved teacher training programs and permitted those universities to participate.

The Commission took a “Support” position on AB 352 and AB 353.

In 1990, Senator David Roberti authored SB 1690 (Chap. 1444, Stats. 1990) which enacted the PTTTP, creating a local career ladder for school paraprofessionals.

Fiscal Impact

Creating and administering a grant program would require the participation of staff in both the Professional Services Division and the Fiscal and Business Services Division. Professional Services

Division would require the participation of an education programs consultant as well as the assistance of support staff members to develop and disseminate the Request for Proposals, provide technical assistance as districts and county offices prepare responses to the RFP, score the responses once they are received, and provide technical assistance during the course of program operations. Fiscal and Business Services support and managerial staff would need to provide guidance as the RFP is developed, execute contracts with all districts and county offices selected through the RFP process, and disseminate the funds. The grant program would be ongoing, contingent upon continued appropriations in each annual budget act, with no end date identified in the bill. Administrative costs would be approximately 2.5% of the total grant amount. In addition, the independent study identified by the bill would create an additional cost. While the exact cost of the study will be contingent upon the size and complexity of the program as it develops, staff estimate that \$250,000 would be a reasonable mid-range estimate of the expected cost. As noted above, the current bill language does not include any provisions for providing fiscal support to CTC. While these activities could potentially be supported by the Teacher Credentials Fund, the Commission would need new budget authority to do so.

Relevant Commission Legislative Policies

The Commission has adopted a set of legislative policy guidelines in order to provide staff with a consistent framework for evaluating legislation and providing recommendations to the Commission.

- 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.
- 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.
- Policy 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

Support

California Federation of Teachers (Sponsor), Advancement Project, Association of California School Administrators, California Catholic Conference, Inc., California Labor Federation, California School Employees Association, LIUNA Locals 777, Los Angeles Unified School District Superintendent, Public Advocates, Riverside County Superintendent of Schools, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Opposition

None noted at this time

Reason for Suggested Position

AB 2122 creates a career ladder for classified school employees, opening a new pathway for the preparation and credentialing of qualified teachers. It requires districts to assess their own

staffing needs and to work in tandem with one or more local institutions of higher education to create a coherent pathway to credentialing, and provide each candidate with appropriate support. It builds on the previous successes of the PTP and addresses California's current teacher shortage. However, if the legislature chooses to move forward with reinstating the program, the Commission should consider recommending the following amendments to address funding and programmatic concerns:

- Language addressing administrative costs
- Recognize any type service as fulfilling a participants obligations
- Allow service to be expanded to any California public school if the sponsoring employer has no appropriate positions available
- Include private colleges
- Include district intern programs

For these reasons, staff is recommending a **"Support if Amended"** position on AB 2122.

Analyst: Joshua Speaks

Date of Analysis: April 8, 2016

Bill Analysis

Assembly Bill 2336 (Olsen)

Teacher credentialing: emergency substitute teaching permits: special education

Recommended Position: Watch

Sponsor: Association of California School Administrators

Bill Version: Amended March 29, 2016 (additional amendments pending)

Summary

AB 2336 would require the Commission to authorize service as a special education substitute teacher for up to 40 days for any one teacher during the school year, provided the employing agency has completed a Statement of Need, as specified. The bill contains a sunset date of January 1, 2022.

Background

School districts have a variety of tools at their disposal for staffing classrooms when a fully-credentialed teacher is unavailable. The most common options are an Emergency 30-Day Substitute Teaching Permit (30 Day Permit), Short-term Staffing Permits (STSPs), and Provisional Internship Permits. (Appendix A contains a full list of the permits offered.) Currently, most school districts and other local educational agencies rely on 30 Day Permit holders to cover the vast majority of short and medium term teacher vacancies and absences. However, present restrictions limit an Emergency Substitute Teaching Permit holder's service to no more than 20 cumulative days for any one teacher of record during the school year in special education classrooms [Education Code §56061(a)]. When a teacher is on an extended leave of absence or a position becomes vacant, needs can often extend beyond this 20 day service limitation, especially in light of the current teacher shortage, which makes filling vacant positions difficult and time-consuming. In such extended vacancy situations, schools must rely on a series of rotating substitute teachers to cover the assignments of the absent teacher or vacant position. While the Commission has recently begun rulemaking for a new Teaching Permit for Statutory Leave (TPSL), which would allow for a longer-term interim teacher of record in cases of statutory leave, the TPSL cannot be used in cases of non-statutory leaves or vacancies.

Analysis

To qualify for an Emergency Substitute Teaching Permit, a substitute must have a bachelor's degree, pass the CBEST, and have fingerprint clearance through the California Department of Justice and the FBI. The holder of this permit may substitute for no more than 30 days for any one teacher per school year in a general education setting, and no more than 20 days for any one teacher per school year in a special education setting. The reason for this limitation is to minimize the length of time students are taught by a substitute with a short term credential, because they are the least-prepared teachers in the classroom. If a substitute teacher remains in a classroom, they must begin preparing lesson plans and undertaking other activities of a regular classroom teacher, but for which they have no training or preparation. If a substitute is needed for more

than 20 days and no more appropriate candidate can be found, schools will replace the first substitute with another, rotating substitutes in order to remain in compliance with the terms of their permit. While this practice does avoid violating the “letter of the law”, it does not resolve the issues raised by having unprepared individuals performing long-term teaching duties such as lesson preparation and implementing IEP’s. In fact, it creates an additional problem by ensuring constant disruption as teachers are removed from a classroom just as they begin to develop relationships and routine with their students. These problems are particularly acute in special education settings where students may be less equipped to deal with disruption to their routines. Since special education teachers have historically been difficult to produce in sufficient numbers, these classrooms also have more need to fill long-term vacancies. This bill attempts to address that concern by creating a more stable substitute presence in special education classrooms. As currently written, it would create a new permit that would double the time a substitute is allowed to serve for any one teacher per year in a special education setting. This extended timeframe would remain in effect until 2022.

In discussions with the author and bill sponsor, it became clear that it was not the author’s intention to create an entirely new permit. Creating a new permit would serve to limit employer flexibility, raise the cost for substitutes by requiring them to apply for two substitute permits, and create additional Commission workload and expense. Rather the intent was to double the length of time a teacher could serve in a special education setting on the existing Emergency Substitute Teaching Permit.

The bill does not offset the longer stay in a classroom by requiring anything beyond the very minimal requirements that qualify an individual for an Emergency Substitute Teaching Permit. Moreover, it doesn’t place any limits on when or how these extended permits would be used, raising concerns that school districts may act less quickly to fill vacancies or move to other, better supported options like interns, STSPs, or the new TPSL. However, Assembly Education Committee staff recommended, and the author accepted, the following amendments to address these concerns:

- Allow the 40 day option for special education substitutes only for vacancies, and not absences
- Require the hiring agency to file a Statement of Need and comply with the hiring hierarchy required in existing law
- Require the hiring agency to provide at least six hours of training at the time it has reason to believe the substitute will be needed for more than 20 days, but no later than the 20th day of the assignment
- Require the training to include classroom management, developing and implementing lesson plans, implementing the requirements of each pupil's individual education plan, and other areas deemed necessary by the district
- Require the hiring agency to assign a credentialed teacher or teachers to provide ongoing support to the substitute
- Require the hiring agency to report to the Commission regarding the number of substitutes employed pursuant to these provisions and the length of their employment
- Provide for a sunset date of January 1, 2022

These amendments are clearly focused on limiting the use of these extended permits and providing an additional measure of support and training for the teachers serving on them. In addition the language was re-drafted in order to ensure that a separate new permit is not unintentionally created by the bill. As the language has not yet been provided in a final form, it is difficult to assess the final result. However, staff would welcome guidance from the Commission as to whether or not these amendments strike an appropriate balance between providing a new tool to combat shortages, and protecting the state's most vulnerable student populations when a fully-credentialed teacher is not available.

Prior Legislation

None identified.

Fiscal Impact

None identified, based on the amendments recommended in the Assembly Education Committee analysis and accepted by the author.

Relevant Commission Legislative Policies

The Commission has adopted a set of legislative policy guidelines in order to provide staff with a consistent framework for evaluating legislation and providing recommendations to the Commission.

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.

Policy 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

Support

Association of California School Administrators (Sponsor), California Association of School Business Officials, California Catholic Conference, Kern County Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles Unified School District, Riverside County Superintendent of Schools, Small School Districts Association

Opposition

Public Advocates

Reason for Suggested Position

This bill presents significant policy questions regarding the balance between providing a stable presence in special education settings and requiring appropriate preparation to serve in such a setting. Without precise language, the Commission may be able to engage in the policy questions raised by the bill, but cannot assess the bill itself appropriately.

For these reasons, staff is recommending a **“Watch”** position on AB 2336.

Analyst: Joshua Speaks

Date of Analysis: April 8, 2016

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.

APPENDIX A

List of Emergency Permits issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Permit Name	Initial Requirements*	Authorization	Renewal Requirements
Emergency 30-Day Substitute Teaching Permit	Bachelor's degree and Basic Skills.	30 days for any one teacher per school year, except in a special education classroom, where the holder may serve for no more than 20 days for any one teacher per school year.	Renewable annually
Emergency Career Substitute Teaching Permit	Bachelor's degree and Basic Skills. 3 consecutive years of at least 90 days per year day-to-day substitute teaching in the California school district or county substitute consortium requesting the permit. The 3-year period must immediately precede the date of the application. Staff development activities offered to the regular teaching staff will be made available to the applicant.	60 days for any one teacher per school year, except in a special education classroom, where the holder may serve for no more than 20 days for any one teacher per school year.	Renewable annually with verification that staff development activities were made available to permit holder
Emergency Substitute Teaching Permit for Prospective Teachers	90 semester units. Current enrollment in a regionally-accredited 4-year California college or university. Meet Basic Skills.	30 days for any one teacher for a maximum of 90 days per school year. In a special education classroom the holder may serve for no more than 20 days for any one teacher per school year.	Valid for one year and may be renewed only once.
Emergency Designated Subjects CTE 30-day Substitute Permit	High school diploma. 3 years of work experience directly related to an industry sector.	Substitute teaching shall be part of a program of technical, trade, or vocational education. 30 days for any one teacher per school year.	Renewable annually
Provisional Internship Permit	Bachelor's degree and Basic Skills. Completion of course work for the permit type requested: Multiple or Single Subject; Education Specialist	Allows employing agency to fill an immediate staffing need by hiring an individual who has not yet met the subject matter competence requirement needed to enter an intern program.	Non-renewable

APPENDIX A

List of Emergency Permits issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

Short-Term Staff Permit	Bachelor’s degree and Basic Skills. Completion of course work for the permit type requested: Multiple or Single Subject; Education Specialist	Allows employing agency to fill an <i>acute staffing need</i> when local recruitment efforts have been made but a fully-credentialed teacher cannot be found.	Non-renewable
-------------------------	---	---	---------------

*Fingerprint clearance through the California Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is required for every applicant as a prerequisite to the Commission’s issuance of a credential, permit, or certificate.

Permit Name	Initial Requirements*	Authorization	Renewal Requirements
(Proposed) Teaching Permit for Statutory Leave	Bachelor’s degree and Basic Skills. Completion of course work for the authorization type(s) requested: Multiple Subjects, Single Subject; and/or Education Specialist. 45 hours of initial preparation that is locally designed and aligned with specified content areas of study as defined in regulations. Orientation, mentoring, and support provided by the local employing agency.	The proposed TPSL would authorize service as the interim teacher of record for the full length of leave for any contracted teacher on a statutory leave as defined in regulations. Service would be limited to the specific setting indicated in the document’s authorization statement(s).	1 st and 2 nd : 45 additional hours of locally-designed preparation. 3 rd and subsequent: Local employer’s professional learning activities; mentoring and guidance.

*Fingerprint clearance through the California Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is required for every applicant as a prerequisite to the Commission’s issuance of a credential, permit, or certificate.

EMERGENCY 30-DAY SUBSTITUTE TEACHING PERMIT - The Emergency 30-Day Substitute Teaching Permit authorizes the holder to serve as a day-to-day substitute teacher in any classroom, including preschool, kindergarten, and grades 1-12 inclusive, or in classes organized primarily for adults. The holder may serve as a substitute for no more than 30 days for any one teacher during the school year, except in a special education classroom, where the holder may serve for no more than 20 days for any one teacher during the school year.

EMERGENCY CAREER SUBSTITUTE TEACHING PERMIT - The Emergency Career Substitute Permit authorizes the holder to serve as a day-to-day substitute teacher in any classroom, including preschool, kindergarten, and grades 1-12 inclusive, or in classes organized primarily for adults. The holder may serve as a substitute for no more than 60 days for any one teacher during the school year, except in a special education classroom, where the holder may serve for no more than 20 days for any one teacher during the school year. The permit is valid for one year and is renewable.

EMERGENCY SUBSTITUTE TEACHING PERMIT FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS - The Emergency Substitute Teaching Permit for Prospective Teachers authorizes the holder to serve as a day-to-day substitute teacher in any classroom, including preschool, kindergarten, and grades 1-12 inclusive, or in classes organized primarily for adults. The holder may serve as a substitute for no more than 30 days for any one teacher and may only serve for a maximum of 90 days during the school year. In a special education classroom the holder may serve for no more than 20 days for any one teacher during the school year. The permit is valid for one year and may be renewed only once.

APPENDIX A

List of Emergency Permits issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

EMERGENCY DESIGNATED SUBJECTS CAREER TECHNICAL EDUCATION (CTE) 30-DAY SUBSTITUTE TEACHING PERMIT - Such substitute teaching shall be part of a program of technical, trade, or vocational education. However, the holder shall not serve as a substitute for more than 30 days for any one teacher during the school year.

PROVISIONAL INTERNSHIP PERMIT - The Provisional Internship Permit (PIP) was created in response to the phasing out of emergency permits and became effective on July 1, 2005. It allows an employing agency to fill an immediate staffing need by hiring an individual who has not yet met the subject matter competence requirement needed to enter an intern program. Prior to requesting a PIP, the employing agency must verify that a diligent search has been made, and a fully-credentialed teacher cannot be found.

SHORT-TERM STAFF PERMIT - The Short-Term Staff Permit (STSP) became available on July 1, 2005. Created in response to the phasing out of emergency permits, it allows an employing agency to fill an *acute staffing need* when local recruitment efforts have been made but a fully-credentialed teacher cannot be found.

TEACHING PERMIT FOR STATUTORY LEAVE - Proposed regulations were approved by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing at its February 11-12, 2016, meeting for submittal to the Office of Administrative Law in order to schedule a public hearing following the required 45-day response period.