
3D

Information

Educator Preparation Committee

AB 1119 Implementation Plan: Dual Credentialing

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an update on implementation of Assembly Bill 1119 (Patel), which requires the Commission, by March 1, 2027, with input from the education field, to develop and establish efficient routes to dual credentialing across general education and special education. This item provides background and statutory context, describes the approach staff are using to carry out this work, and presents the work plan, engagement structure, and anticipated next phases aligned to the statutory timeline.

Recommended Action: For information only

Presenters: Erin Sullivan, Director; William Hatrick and Michelle Fennell, Consultants, Division of Standards, Accreditation, and Workforce Investment

Strategic Plan Goal

Educator Preparation and Advancement

- **Goal 2.** Prospective educators have multiple pathways to explore and access careers in education and advance in the profession.
- **Goal 3.** California’s educators reflect the diversity of the students they serve.
 - D. Increase accessibility of the credentialing process by eliminating unnecessary barriers for prospective educators
 - E. Provide clear information and guidance about how to enter and advance in the education profession

AB 1119 Implementation Plan: Dual Credentialing

Introduction

Assembly Bill 1119 (Patel) requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission), with input from the education field, to develop and establish efficient routes to dual credentialing across general education and special education through the regulatory process by March 1, 2027. In doing so, the bill directs the Commission to examine current pathways through which candidates and credential holders may add an authorization, identify areas of overlap in preparation, consider options such as supplementary authorizations, assess barriers and opportunities affecting candidates and preparation programs, review approaches used in other states, and determine whether statutory changes may be needed.

This item describes the structure and approach staff are using to carry out this work and the activities currently underway. This item does not propose specific policy changes or regulatory language.

Background

California's credentialing system includes multiple pathways and authorization types that allow candidates to earn initial credentials and practicing educators to add credentials over time. Preparation programs reflect this structure, with different entry points, program models, and sequences of coursework and clinical practice. Recent reforms have also introduced greater alignment across credential areas, including shared or foundational preparation experiences.

Even with those developments, pathways to additional credentials continue to vary in structure, sequencing, and expectations. Candidates and practicing educators may encounter differences in coursework, clinical practice, and assessment requirements depending on the credential held, the credential sought, and the preparation model through which they are moving. These differences shape how programs are designed and experienced and can affect the time, cost, and clarity of progression for candidates.

Assembly Bill 1119 reflects the Legislature and Commission's shared interest in improving access to dual credentialing as part of broader efforts to support inclusive practice and better prepare educators to serve students with and without disabilities. That interest is consistent with broader work on inclusive educational environments, including the Thompson Policy Institute on Disability's recent report, [Creating Inclusive Educational Environments for Students With and Without Disabilities](#). The bill builds on recent Commission-led reforms that established a common trunk of preparation across general and special education credential areas, creating an opportunity to examine where preparation may be aligned more efficiently while maintaining rigor. The bill also responds to ongoing workforce needs in special education and the role that preparation pathways may play in supporting a more stable and prepared workforce.

Consistent with that direction, AB 1119 requires the Commission to develop efficient routes to dual credentialing across general education and special education and identifies the areas that must be examined in doing so. These include current routes to additional credentials and supplementary authorizations, areas of overlap in preparation, barriers and opportunities affecting candidates and programs, approaches used in other states, and any statutory changes that may be necessary to establish such routes. The bill applies both to candidates seeking dual preparation and to currently credentialed educators seeking to add an authorization in the other area. The bill requires the Commission to establish these routes by March 1, 2027 through the regulatory process.

Taken together, these provisions position the work as both an examination of the current system and an opportunity to consider how preparation across general and special education may be more coherently organized, where appropriate, while maintaining expectations for educator preparation.

Approach, Work Plan, and Engagement

To carry out this work within the time and scope established by the bill, staff are using a Focused Policy Review (FPR) organized around a core project team. In this case, the work is being co-led by the Executive Director and Commission Chair and the project team includes teachers, policy leaders, administrators, faculty and staff ([Appendix A](#)) who bring multiple forms of expertise to the work in a collaborative and flexible structure.

The project team is not intended to function as a closed body that develops conclusions independently of the field. Rather, it serves as the working structure through which inquiry is organized, evidence is gathered, and emerging findings are tested and refined through broader engagement. In the inquiry phase, this means the project team is expected to listen and learn from other interest holders before settling problem framing or design considerations. The same general approach applies in later phases, as potential solutions and implementation considerations are informed by continued engagement and Commission discussion over time.

The work is therefore designed to proceed through ongoing interaction among the project team, other interest holders, and the Commission so that inquiry, engagement, and Commission consideration inform one another over time. Engagement with interest holders is integrated into the inquiry and solution development phases through one-on-one interviews, small group discussions, and a broader field survey, with ongoing synthesis used to refine the work as it develops. The work is being carried out through a series of connected phases that move from inquiry to policy development and, ultimately, to regulatory work aligned to the statutory timeline.

Implementation of the AB 1119 FPR is organized into a series of connected phases that move from inquiry to policy development and, ultimately, to regulatory action.

Phase 1: Inquiry (January–April 2026)

The inquiry phase is intended to clarify how current pathways between general education and

special education credentials function in practice and where opportunities for greater coherence or efficiency may exist. Key questions in this phase include where coursework and clinical practice overlap, how pathway structures vary across programs, and what factors most affect candidate access and progression, including time to completion, cost, clinical placement expectations, pathway clarity, and how current pathways relate to inclusive practice and preparation of educators to serve diverse learners. The primary output of this phase is an initial set of problem framing statements and design considerations.

Phase 2: Solution Development (Spring–Summer 2026)

The solution development phase is intended to translate inquiry findings into potential approaches to more efficient pathways. Key questions in this phase include what types of route structures are most viable, what degree of integration may be appropriate across credential areas, and what tradeoffs different approaches may present for candidates, preparation programs, and system alignment. This phase is expected to produce a set of policy options and associated implementation considerations.

Phase 3: Design and Synthesis (Summer 2026)

The design and synthesis phase is intended to bring together analysis, engagement findings, and policy development to further develop leading approaches. Key questions in this phase include which approaches appear most coherent, rigorous, and feasible and what additional implementation considerations they raise. This phase is expected to produce materials that synthesize findings, policy options, and potential directions for Commission consideration.

Phase 4: Regulatory Development (Fall 2026 and Beyond)

Later phases of work are intended to translate policy direction into regulatory form and implementation planning. Key questions in these phases include what statutory or regulatory changes may be needed, how proposed changes align with existing standards and accreditation expectations, and what implementation issues should be addressed as the work moves forward. These phases are expected to support development of proposed regulations and related implementation materials.

Table 1: Timeline

Phase / Quarter	Focus of Work	Anticipated Commission Item
<p>Inquiry Q1–Q2 2026</p>	<p>Examine current pathways between general and special education credentials, including overlap, variation in structure, and factors affecting access and progression. Develop initial problem framing/design considerations.</p>	<p>April 2026 – Information item on implementation of AB 1119, including background, statutory context, work plan, and initial problem framing</p>

<p>Solution Development Q2 2026</p>	<p>Develop and refine potential approaches to more efficient pathways, including pathway structure, integration across credential areas, and key tradeoffs for candidates and programs.</p>	<p>June 2026 – Information item on emerging policy options, tradeoffs, and areas for further development</p>
<p>Design and Synthesis Q3 2026</p>	<p>Further develop leading approaches and synthesize findings, policy options, and implementation considerations into a more coherent set of potential directions.</p>	<p>August 2026 – Information/Action item on recommended approaches and implementation considerations</p>
<p>Regulatory Development Q3–Q4 2026 and Beyond</p>	<p>Translate policy direction into regulatory concepts and related implementation planning, including alignment with existing standards and accreditation expectations.</p>	<p>October 2026 – Action item on proposed regulations and implementation planning</p>

The phased work described above provides the structure for carrying out the requirements of Assembly Bill 1119 and for advancing the work through inquiry, policy development, and later regulatory action. Based on that work plan, staff provide the following next steps.

Next Steps

Staff will continue the inquiry phase of work through spring 2026, including analysis of current pathways, structured engagement with interest holders, and refinement of initial problem framing and design considerations. Staff expect to return to the Commission in June 2026 with an information item focused on the emerging problem framing for the work and the key questions that will guide subsequent phases.

Following the inquiry phase, staff will continue development of potential approaches to more efficient pathways between general education and special education credentials. Later phases of work will focus on refining policy options, synthesizing findings and implementation considerations, and supporting development of proposed regulations aligned to the statutory timeline.

Appendix A

Focused Policy Review Project Team

Name	Affiliation
Marquita Grenot-Scheyer	CTC, Commission Chair
Mary Vixie Sandy	CTC, Executive Director
Adam Ebrahim	CTC, Chief Deputy Director
Erin Sullivan	CTC, Director
William Hatrick	CTC, Consultant
Michelle Fennell	CTC, Consultant
Kristin Wright	Sacramento County Office of Education - Executive Director, Inclusive Practices, Prevention & Early Intervention
Megan Gross	Supporting Innovative Practices - Program Support Specialist
Nat Hansuvadha	California State University, Long Beach - Special Education Professor & Department Chair