
3A

Action

Certification Committee

Assignment Monitoring Sanctions: System of Identification, Support, and Improvement

Executive Summary: This agenda item builds on previous proposals related to sanctions for assignment monitoring by proposing a new intervention system of identification, support, and improvement. This system will provide support to all California public schools, at an appropriate level based on the percentage of their assignments that are uncorrected misassignments. Schools will not only receive tiered support, but differentiated training based on the school type or level.

Recommended Action: Approve components of the refined proposal and accompanying regulations for transmission to the Office of Administrative Law.

Presenters: Erin Henderson, Deputy Director, Ann Harris, Assignment Monitoring Program Manager, and Gianna Barlupi, Assignment Monitoring Analyst, Division of Licensure Certification

Strategic Plan Goal

Professional Licensure

- **Goal 5.** Educators are appropriately licensed based on the preparation they completed and the services they will provide.

Assignment Monitoring Sanctions: System of Identification, Support, and Improvement

Introduction

This agenda item expands on previous discussions at the December 2025 Commission Meeting in item [3A: Certificated Education Assignment Monitoring Sanctions](#) which introduced training and support in response to local educational agencies (LEAs) who continually misassigned certificated educators, and refines the April 2026 item [5B: Assignment Monitoring Sanction Program Decision Points](#) which outlined the core facets of the program. The Commission took action to approve portions of the proposal at each meeting, while also seeking additional refinement for some details of the program.

Background

The catalyst for exploring sanctions related to assignment monitoring was the 2024 Highlands Community Charter and Technical Schools Report, which included a recommendation from the State Auditor's office that recommends the Commission explore sanctions for schools that consistently misassign educators. At the December Commission meeting, a sanction plan was approved that focuses on supporting schools with assignment of educators through administering training. At the April Commission meeting, staff proposed details of the program, including but not limited to utilizing a targeted approach to trainings, determining sanctions based on the proportions of uncorrected misassignments to all assignments, and establishing the individuals who would be subject to mandatory training. Most facets of this plan were approved; however, the Commission also requested that staff continue to conduct outreach efforts with interest groups to refine the threshold percentages for intervention and to identify if school board members should be mandated to complete any training.

In regard to the proportional threshold for intervention, staff proposed establishing a 25% proportion as a threshold for mandatory training in the April item, and though this was approved by the Commission, Commissioners also considered whether those schools that fell within a 10%-25% proportion of misassignments should also be subject to some interventions. Discussion also centered around ensuring adequate reporting and public noticing was memorialized in regulations. And, Commissioners considered whether or not school board members should be required to complete mandated training when a school they oversee was identified as requiring sanctions.

Outreach Efforts

At the direction of the Commission, staff held several feedback sessions to solicit input on a finalized proposal that addressed the three remaining aspects of the sanctions plan. Staff met with education partners from various segments of the field, including the Association of California School Administrators, the California Teachers Association, the California School Boards Association, Children Now, and Public Advocates.

Assignment Monitoring Interventions: System of Identification, Support, and Improvement

After reviewing and analyzing the feedback from various education partners, staff developed a proposal for an interventions system built upon a system of identification, support, and improvement. This system will provide support to all California public schools, at an appropriate level based on the percentage of assignments that are uncorrected misassignments. Schools will not only receive tiered support, but differentiated training based on the school type or level.

This system is structured around training, public noticing, reporting, plan for improvement, and governing board involvement. The first component is the Assignment Monitoring Program (AMP) training program, which will be comprehensive but narrowed down to the types of learning environments at the school, and will focus on the various grade levels, settings or student populations in the school. Training will be differentiated depending on the type of school identified for interventions. The following training pathways will be curated to serve individuals and school types they oversee:

- AM for Practitioners: Elementary
- AM for Practitioners: Middle
- AM for Practitioners: Secondary
- AM for Practitioners: K-12
- AM for Practitioners: Special Education School

Additional components include reporting and public noticing. The Commission will contact those legally responsible for assignments – the district superintendent, the school site administrator, and the overseeing governing board members when a school exceeds established misassignment reporting thresholds. Additionally, the Commission will provide notice to the public through established reporting platforms, like the Assignment Workforce dashboards.

The final component is governing board reporting. For the majority of schools, this is the district governing board, but county authorized charters and other county run schools would report to their county governing board. Though governing board members were identified as legally responsible for educator assignments in the previous items, the proposed system of identification and support would not require them to take assignment training. However, the proposed reporting structure would require school boards to be informed when a school they oversee reaches specific misassignment thresholds.

Tiers of intervention

The system of interventions will have three tiers. Schools in each tier are supported through the Assignment Monitoring Program's (AMP) training program, regardless of their percentage of misassignments. However, as misassignment proportions rise support escalates from offered, to suggested, to required. In the latter two tiers, the Commission notices the individuals of their position in the tier system, their misassignment percentage, and the need or requirement for training. Additionally, regardless of tier, assignment proportion percentages shall be reported on the Commission's data dashboards along with intervention status. And finally, those schools

in the final two tiers shall report to their governing board as either an information or action item.

Tier one (**T1**) is for those schools under 10% proportional misassigned. These schools will have voluntary access to all training for any individual interested in broadening their credential assignment knowledge. Completion of training is completely optional at this tier. Their misassignment proportion will be reported on the Commission dashboards, as is aligned with current practice. Nothing additional is required of these schools, which comprise around 95% of all California schools (based on evaluation of the 2024-25 school year assignment data).

The next tier (**T2**) is for schools with proportional misassignments above 10% and below 25%. The AMP will send these schools and their governing board a letter outlining their misassignment percentage and recommending that those legally responsible for assigning educators take the training, though it will not be mandatory. These schools will also have to report to their governing board as an information item, and to their monitoring authority. Finally, these schools will have their misassignment proportion reported on the Assignment Workforce dashboard and will be noted as being in this intervention tier. Based on estimates, this tier would comprise 3.6% of schools (406 in total).

The third and final tier (**T3**) is for schools with 25% or more of their assignments misassigned. For this tier, the school site administrator and the district superintendent responsible for assigning educators must complete required assignment training that is most suited to their school, as identified by the AMP. These individuals are also able to nominate credentialing staff to take the training should they feel it is beneficial to their staff. Finally, these schools must work with their monitoring authority and present a plan for improvement to their district governing board for action and approval. Staff estimates this tier would include around 114 schools, or just above 1% of all California schools.

Table 1 below provides a simplified breakdown of this information. As well, proposed regulatory language reflecting the proposed aspects of the plan along with those components that were approved at the April Commission meeting are provided in [Appendix A](#). The Commission may elect to approve the newly refined aspect of the plan and accompany proposed regulations in full or may elect to amend the refined plan or any aspects of the proposed regulatory language.

Table 1: Intervention Tiers

	Training	Reporting	Local Board Notification	Estimated % of schools¹
T1: May <10%	Available	Commission Data Dashboards	None	94.9%
T2: Should >10% <25%	Suggested	Commission Data Dashboards, Commission Notice to legally responsible individuals	Report misassignment % to Board and monitoring authority as an information item	3.6%
T3: Shall >25%	Required	Commission Data Dashboards, Commission Notice to legally responsible individuals	Report misassignment %, including Plan for Improvement to Board as action item; must include consultation with monitoring authority	1.4%

When the data is considered, it shows that 95% of schools are in Tier 1. This demonstrates that at baseline, most California’s LEAs are effectively managing educator assignments, even during staffing shortages. The final two tiers comprise 5% of schools. And Tier 3, the only tier that requires mandatory interventions, comprises around 1% of schools. Based on these outcomes, the impact of sanctions on schools identified in Tier 3 is minimal as a comparison to the state as a whole.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommend that the Commission approve the proposal to:

1. Approve 10%-up to 25% misassignments as a threshold in which the Commission notices those legally responsible, suggests training, and requires informational reporting to the school’s governing board;
2. Approve 25% or more misassignments as a threshold in which the Commission notices those legally responsible, requires mandatory training for the school site administrator and district superintendent, and requires the governing board to approve an action plan for addressing misassignments; and
3. Ensure public transparency through reporting on the Commission’s dashboards.

¹ Estimates based on 2024-25 monitoring data

Next Steps

If the Commission requests substantial changes to the proposed language, then staff will draft language to reflect the Commission's direction and provide the proposed text for review in the August Commission meeting. If the proposed language is approved by the Commission, staff will notice the Office of Administrative Law and the public beginning the 45-day public comment period. If no credible or objectionable comments are submitted during that period, staff is recommending that the Commission authorize staff to submit the Final Statement of Reasons to the Office of Administrative Law to effectuate the new regulations, including making any necessary, non-substantive changes to the regulation text that do not alter the requirements, rights, responsibilities, conditions, or prescriptions contained in the original text, without approval or consideration.

Program funding anticipated in July 2026 will provide the agency resources to move forward with acquiring software and onboarding staff to oversee the program. Program development is anticipated to begin in August 2026, and staff will use the following year to build the program and provide statewide outreach in advance of the sanctions being operational. The approved sanction plan is proposed to be imposed following the assignment monitoring cycle for the 2026-27 school year, in November 2027. At this time, the AMP will return to the Commission to showcase the training program and present the data on how many schools fell into each tier. At this time the Commission can review the program and suggest adjustments.

Appendix A

Proposed Addition to Title 5 CCR, Section 80135

Text proposed to be added is displayed in underline type. Text proposed to be deleted is displayed in ~~strikethrough~~ type.

California Code of Regulations
Title 5. Education
Division 8. Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Chapter 1. Credentials Issued Under the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970
Article 6. ~~Positions Requiring Administrative Credentials or Supervision Credentials~~ Educator
Assignments and Monitoring

§ 80135. Assignment Monitoring Interventions: System of Identification, Support, and Improvement

- (a) The commission shall enforce a system of identification, support, and improvement on schools, including charter schools, that includes required interventions for schools that have a high percentage of uncorrected misassignments, as compared to total educator assignments, in data resulting from annual assignment monitoring, as provided in Section 44258.9.
- (b) Any school that has under 10% of their educator assignments determined as uncorrected misassignments compared to total assignments during a monitoring cycle shall:
- (1) Have their uncorrected misassignment percentage reported publicly by the commission through its data dashboards.
- (c) Any school that has at least 10%, and under 25%, of their educator assignments determined as uncorrected misassignments compared to total assignments during a monitoring cycle shall:
- (1) Receive notice from the commission of their uncorrected misassignment percentage and a recommendation to complete the commission's educator assignment training program, as identified and differentiated by the commission based upon the school site type. Notice shall be sent from the commission, in writing, within 90 days of the closure of annual assignment monitoring, to the school site administrator, district superintendent, the overseeing governing board, and the monitoring authority.
- (2) Have their uncorrected misassignment percentage reported publicly by the commission through its data dashboards.

(3) Within six months of the notice, report to their governing board, as an information item, on their monitoring results and intervention status.

(A) Traditional and district authorized charter schools shall report to their overseeing district's governing board.

(B) County authorized charter schools and programs authorized by the county office of education shall report to their overseeing county's governing board.

(d) Any school that has 25% or more of their educator assignments determined as uncorrected misassignments compared to total assignments during a monitoring cycle shall:

(1) Receive notice from the commission of their uncorrected misassignment percentage. Notice shall be sent from the commission, in writing, within 90 days of the closure of annual assignment monitoring, to the school site administrator, district superintendent, the overseeing governing board, and the monitoring authority. Notice shall include the mandate that the school site administrator and district superintendent must complete the commission's educator assignment training program, as identified and differentiated by the commission based upon the school site type, prior to the start of the following assignment monitoring cycle, as specified in the notice.

(A) For any traditional school or district authorized charter school the 1) school site administrator, 2) overseeing district superintendent, and 3) any additional staff nominated by either the school site administrator or district superintendent shall be required to complete the identified training

(B) For any county authorized charter school or program authorized by the county office of education the 1) school site administrator, and 2) any additional staff nominated by the school site administrator shall be required to complete the identified training.

(2) Have their uncorrected misassignment percentage reported publicly by the commission through its data dashboards.

(3) Develop a plan of accountability and improvement for assignment practices that identifies opportunities to come into compliance with assignment requirements. The plan shall be developed in partnership with their monitoring authority.

(4) Within six months of the notice, report to their governing board, as an action item, on their monitoring results, intervention status, and plan to come into compliance.

(A) Traditional and district authorized charter schools shall report to their overseeing district's governing board.

(B) County authorized charter schools and programs authorized by the county office of education shall report to their overseeing county's governing board.

(e) The commission shall publish annual certificated educator assignment data on its website that reports schools identified for interventions, and the districts and counties which oversee them.

NOTE: Authority cited: Sections 44225, 44258.9, Education Code. Reference: Sections 33126, 35035, 44830, Education Code.