REVISED

4A

Information/Action

Education Preparation Committee

Update on the Plan to Revise and Restructure the Administrative Services Credential

Executive Summary: This agenda item provides an update on the Commission's work to revise and restructure the Administrative Services Credential. The item presents the statutory and policy context, prior Commission work, proposed focus areas for inquiry, proposed workgroup charge, project plan, planned Commission engagement points, and initial questions for Commission consideration.

Recommended Action: Staff recommend that the Commission review and, if appropriate, approve the proposed charge for the Administrative Services Credential Workgroup. Staff further requests Commission feedback on the proposed focus areas, project plan, and initial questions for inquiry that will guide the first phase of work.

Presenter: Erin Sullivan, Director, Division of Standards, Accreditation, and Workforce Investment

Strategic Plan Goal

Educator Preparation and Advancement

- **Goal 1.** Educator preparation programs hold candidates to high standards and adequately prepare them to support all students by using culturally and linguistically responsive and sustaining practices in equitable, inclusive, and safe environments.
  A. Set and uphold rigorous standards for educator preparation programs

REVISED

Update on the Plan to Revise and Restructure the Administrative Services Credential

Introduction
This item continues the Commission's work on Administrative Services Credential (ASC) preparation and pathway design. Building on the Commission's prior discussion in October 2025, this item presents the policy context for the next phase of work, the evolution of the ASC, the current credential structure, focus areas for inquiry, the proposed workgroup charge, the project plan, and the planned points for Commission engagement throughout the development process.

The purpose of this item is to establish the process for moving from prior policy direction into structured inquiry, field engagement, workgroup deliberation, and future recommendations. The project plan includes opportunities for Commission input before the work moves from inquiry to possible changes, and again before formal recommendations or proposals are developed. Substantive proposals related to standards, authorizations, assessments, regulations, or credential structure would return to the Commission for consideration at later stages of the project.

Background
The current review is shaped by four related policy developments: Assembly Bill (AB) 1454 (Rivas, 2025), AB 959 (Hadwick, 2025), the Governor's veto message for AB 2725 (Blanca Rubio, 2024), and AB 1119 (Patel, 2025). Each addresses a different part of the administrator preparation system. AB 1454 directs the Commission to add specific literacy-related requirements to the ASC standards. AB 959 requires a related review of preservice preparation, professional development, and supervision for ASC internship pathways. The AB 2725 veto message asks the Commission to develop differentiated ASC pathways, including one for teachers and one for other credential or license holders without a teacher preparation background. AB 1119 is being implemented through a separate Commission process focused on dual credentialing across general education and special education. For this project, the connection is practical: inclusive campuses depend on administrators who can organize staffing, schedules, services, collaboration, and school climate.

Taken together, these developments require the Commission to examine the ASC as a connected system. The current ASC standards already address many related areas at a broad leadership level, including support for teaching and learning, equity and access, school climate, human resources, fieldwork, assessment of candidate competence, and support for educator practice. The current review is therefore not a question of whether these topics exist anywhere in the ASC system. It is a question of whether existing expectations should be updated, clarified, differentiated, or aligned in light of new statutory requirements, the Governor's veto message, and related Commission work. As a result, the review must address pathway structure,

authorizations, bridge options, intern preparation, assessment, induction, accreditation, regulations, and implementation, as well as standards language.

AB 1454: Literacy in Administrative Preparation

AB 1454 requires the Commission, no later than September 1, 2028, to ensure that Preliminary ASC program standards include preparation on how administrators can support teachers in delivering effective literacy instruction. The law requires this preparation to be aligned with the English Language Arts/English Language Development Framework and to address the varied language development needs of English learners. It also identifies evidence-based foundational reading skills, oral and written language development, comprehension, supports for students with reading difficulties, supports for students with disabilities, and the state's dyslexia guidelines. The statute specifically references explicit and systematic instruction in print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, and fluency.

For ASC preparation, the practical question is how existing expectations related to teaching and learning, professional learning, data use, and educator support should be updated or clarified so administrators can support teachers and classified staff in serving students effectively in the domains of language and literacy. Current ASC expectations already address professional learning, data use, effective teaching and learning, English learners, students with disabilities, and support for educator practice. AB 1454 adds a more specific literacy-related charge that will need to be considered and integrated in an updated ASC. This includes sufficient understanding of foundational reading skills, language development, comprehension, and assessment to guide professional learning, observe instruction, use data, align resources, and help ensure that students with different learning and language needs receive appropriate support.

AB 1454 also includes legislative intent related to programs in which English learners are instructed in their primary languages. That intent connects directly to how administrators support programs serving multilingual learners, including bilingual and primary-language instructional settings. For California administrators, support for literacy instruction needs to account for English language development, multilingual learners, bilingual programs, and the ways that home languages and multilingualism can be leveraged as assets for literacy, language development, and access to the full curriculum.

The statutory language also identifies supports for pupils with exceptional needs and the state's dyslexia guidelines. Those references are part of the same systems question: how administrators support teachers, classified staff, programs, and school systems so that literacy instruction responds to varied learning needs. The review should therefore consider how literacy-related expectations connect to multilingual learners, students with disabilities, dyslexia, tiered supports, and access to the full curriculum, while keeping the focus on the administrator's role in supporting teachers, classified staff, programs, and school systems.

REVISED

AB 959: Administrative Services Internship Programs
AB 959 amended Education Code section 44270 related to ASC internship programs. The bill clarified that a one-year internship program in supervised administrative training must be provided by a school district, county office of education, or regionally accredited institution of higher education and approved by the Commission. It also requires the Commission, when it next considers ASC pathways, to examine preservice, professional development, and supervision requirements for those internship programs.

AB 959 does not itself initiate a redesign of the ASC. Rather, it ensures that the intern pathway is reviewed as part of the broader pathway work. Current ASC standards already include field experiences, guidance and feedback, program partnerships, candidate support, and assessment of candidate competence. The AB 959 review should determine whether those existing expectations are sufficient for interns who may assume administrative responsibilities while completing preparation, or whether they should be updated or differentiated.

The review should identify what preparation occurs before an intern begins service, what ongoing role-specific learning and support occurs during the internship, and how supervision responsibilities are shared by preparation programs and employing agencies. If the Commission develops differentiated ASC pathways or authorizations, intern requirements may also need to account for differences in prior preparation, role expectations, and administrative role or placement. These questions are part of how any pathway would operate in practice.

AB 2725 Veto Message and AB 1009 Context: Pathway Structure and Authorization
AB 2725 would have provided a pathway for licensed occupational therapists and physical therapists with school-based experience to obtain an Administrative Services Credential. The Governor vetoed the bill in September 2024. In the veto message, the Governor stated that, as a more appropriate statewide approach, the Commission could create at least two ASC pathways: one for teachers and one for other credential or license holders without a teacher preparation background. The Governor requested that the Commission develop such pathways.

Subsequent legislation addressed one part of the issue raised by AB 2725. AB 1009 (Blanca Rubio), enacted in 2025, amended Education Code section 44270 to allow a valid California occupational therapy or physical therapy license to satisfy the prerequisite credential or license requirement for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, subject to other statutory requirements. AB 1009 also provides that a preliminary credential issued based in part on one of those licenses does not authorize supervision or evaluation of teachers, except under specified circumstances.

Together, the veto message and AB 1009 move the work beyond a conventional standards update. The veto message raises the broader question of differentiated ASC pathways for teachers and for other credential or license holders without a teacher preparation background. AB 1009 creates a specific statutory instance of differentiated eligibility and authorization by recognizing occupational therapy and physical therapy licensure for preliminary ASC eligibility while limiting automatic authority to supervise or evaluate teachers. The Commission's broader

review therefore needs to consider not only who may enter an ASC pathway, but also what each pathway authorizes the holder to do.

The current ASC already serves candidates from multiple professional backgrounds, including holders of teaching credentials and holders of specialized services credentials. AB 1009 adds a more explicit example of a credential or license background that may support entry into administrative preparation without carrying the same resultant authorization. That distinction is central to the current review because differentiated pathways may require differentiated preparation, authorization statements, bridge options, and employer guidance.

The design questions are practical and also consequential. The Commission will need to consider what preparation should be common across pathways, what preparation may need to be pathway-specific, and when additional preparation, experience, assessment, or other requirements should be required for particular responsibilities, including teacher supervision or evaluation. A differentiated structure will also need a bridge option so that a candidate or credential holder can complete additional requirements needed to move into a different authorization or administrative role. Any pathway and bridge structure will need to be clear to programs, candidates, employers, and the public.

AB 1119: Inclusive Campuses and Administrative Leadership

AB 1119 requires the 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. That work is proceeding through a separate Commission process focused on dual credentialing, pathway efficiency, preparation overlap, barriers and opportunities for candidates and programs, approaches in other states, and possible statutory or regulatory changes.

AB 1119 does not directly require changes to the ASC. Nevertheless, the goals of AB 1119 are relevant to this review because inclusive campuses depend not only on teacher preparation, but also on the organizational conditions that administrators help create. Current ASC standards do address equity, diversity, access, school climate, student supports, family and community engagement, organizational systems, and conditions for teaching and learning. The ASC review provides an opportunity to coordinate with the AB 1119 work and ensure that any revisions to administrative preparation are aligned with the state's broader goals for access, belonging, collaboration, and inclusive educational environments.

Administrators make decisions about staffing, scheduling, service delivery, collaboration between general education and special education staff, classified staff roles, family engagement, resource allocation, school climate, and educator support. Those decisions shape whether inclusive practice is supported by the organization of the school or local educational agency. The review should therefore examine whether current expectations related to equity, access, student supports, staffing, collaboration, classified staff roles, and school climate remain aligned with the goals reflected in AB 1119 and related Commission work.

REVISED

Relationship Among the Legislative and Policy Developments

These policy developments are connected because each affects how the ASC system is organized or experienced in practice. AB 1454 points to specific literacy-related expectations within administrator preparation. AB 959 points to how interns are prepared and supervised. AB 1119 points to the administrator's role in supporting inclusive campuses. The AB 2725 veto message directs the Commission to develop differentiated pathways, while AB 1009 provides a specific statutory example of differentiated eligibility and authorization.

The proposed process treats these issues as connected parts of a broader credential review. A literacy update may have implications for standards, assessments, and induction. A differentiated pathway structure may have implications for authorization, bridge options, intern requirements, and employer guidance. Inclusive campus leadership may affect common preparation expectations for all candidates. Reviewing these issues together will help ensure that recommendations for one part of the ASC system are coherent with the others.

These policy developments also sit within a longer history of Commission work on administrative credentialing. The current review builds on prior decisions about the ASC's broad authorization, two-tier structure, standards architecture, fieldwork, assessment, and induction. That history provides important context for understanding why the current review is not limited to adding new language to existing standards.

Evolution of the Current ASC Structure

California has long organized administrative credentialing around a single broad Administrative Services Credential, while gradually adding more structured preparation, assessment, and induction requirements. As described in the History of California Teacher Credentialing, that single-credential approach followed an earlier period in which California distinguished more clearly between supervision and administration. The Fisher-era structure, named for Senator Hugo Fisher and the 1961 Fisher Act, included separate Standard Supervision and Standard Administration Credentials. The supervision credential was tied to more limited supervisory responsibilities, while the administration credential carried broader authority for administrative service.

That structure changed with the Ryan reforms, named for Assembly Member Leo J. Ryan and the Teacher Preparation and Licensing Law of 1970. The Ryan reforms condensed several administrative and supervision credentials into a single Administrative Services Credential with a broad authorization. That consolidation created the foundation for California's current single-credential approach to administrative service.

Later reforms added a developmental structure to that broad authorization. The early Ryan-era structure allowed candidates to satisfy professional preparation requirements through an approved written examination, but that examination option was later eliminated in 1979. In the early 1980s, policy attention turned to preservice preparation, field experience, evaluation, and continuing professional development for school administrators. Legislation enacted in 1981 established preparation programs for two sequential administrative credentials, creating the

two-tier structure that was fully implemented in 1985. This shifted the ASC from a credential earned at one point in time toward a structure that distinguishes between preliminary and advanced administrative preparation.

In 2011, the Administrative Services Credential Advisory Panel revisited the structure of the credential and recommended that California maintain a single generalized Administrative Services Credential for all administrative roles. The panel also recommended maintaining the two-level credential structure, continuing multiple pathways to the preliminary credential, retaining the examination route then available in statute, continuing the internship pathway, strengthening fieldwork, and establishing induction as the sole pathway to the clear credential. These recommendations preserved the flexibility of a single broad authorization while strengthening preparation, fieldwork, assessment, and induction for new administrators.

The next phase built the standards and assessment system around that structure. The 2012 Administrative Services Credential Work Plan identified program standards as the vehicle for translating the Advisory Panel's recommendations into preparation requirements, including program design, candidate support, employer partnerships, field experience, program content, and candidate competencies. That item also anticipated development of California Administrator Performance Expectations and a possible performance assessment.

Between 2013 and 2017, the Commission refined the standards architecture that supports the current ASC system. The Commission adopted revised Administrative Services Credential Program Standards and accompanying California Administrator Content Expectations (CACEs) and California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) in 2013, Clear Administrative Services Credential induction standards in 2014, and revised California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) in 2015. The 2017 CACE/CAPE realignment then brought the preliminary content and performance expectations into closer alignment with each other and with the CPSEL, without adding new substantive expectations. Together, this work clarified the relationship among program standards, professional standards, content expectations, performance expectations, assessment, and induction.

Current ASC Structure and System Components

The current system is broad in authorization and layered in preparation. Candidates first earn a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and then complete administrator induction to earn the Clear Administrative Services Credential. The preliminary credential provides initial preparation for administrative service. The clear credential is earned through a job-embedded induction program that supports administrators during their early years of administrative employment.

The current ASC system includes several components that may be affected by pathway, authorization, or standards changes:

- Preconditions establish requirements that must be met before a candidate may be admitted to, recommended by, or complete a credential program, as applicable. For the

ASC, preconditions address statutory and regulatory requirements such as prerequisite credentials, basic skills, prior experience, program completion, and employment.

- Program Standards govern the design and delivery of Commission-approved preparation programs. They address how programs are organized, how candidates are supported, how coursework and fieldwork are structured, and how programs ensure candidates are prepared for recommendation.
- California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL) serve as broad professional standards for California education leaders. They describe areas of leadership practice that apply across an administrator's career, including preparation, induction, professional learning, and employment.
- California Administrator Content Expectations (CACEs) describe what preliminary ASC candidates need to know and understand. They represent the knowledge base for preliminary administrative preparation.
- California Administrator Performance Expectations (CAPEs) describe what preliminary ASC candidates must be able to do. They describe beginning administrator practice and are measured through the California Administrator Performance Assessment.
- California Administrator Performance Assessment (CalAPA) is the performance assessment completed by candidates in Commission-approved preliminary ASC programs. CalAPA measures candidates' ability to apply leadership knowledge and skills in practice.
- California Preliminary Administrative Credential Examination (CPACE) is the examination route authorized in statute as an option for meeting preliminary ASC requirements in lieu of completing a Commission-approved preliminary administrative services preparation program.

To earn the preliminary credential, candidates must meet statutory prerequisite, professional preparation, and employment-related requirements. Current preliminary routes include completion of a Commission-approved entry-level preparation program, completion of an approved one-year internship in supervised training in administrative services, or use of the examination option authorized in statute.

Commission-approved preliminary programs are designed and reviewed under the Administrative Services Credential Program Standards. Within that program structure, the CACEs describe the knowledge base for preliminary administrative preparation, the CAPEs describe beginning administrator practice, and CalAPA provides a statewide performance assessment for candidates completing Commission-approved preliminary programs. CPACE remains the statutory examination route in lieu of completing a Commission-approved preliminary program.

The current structure already serves candidates from several professional backgrounds, including holders of teaching credentials, designated subjects credentials, pupil personnel

services credentials, health services credentials, clinical or rehabilitative services credentials, speech-language pathology services credentials, teacher librarian services credentials, and, as provided by AB 1009, occupational therapy and physical therapy licenses, subject to statutory requirements. As a result, the ASC system already includes candidates who enter with different preparation, experience, and professional expertise.

The ASC authorization is broad and duty-based. It is not organized around a comprehensive list of job titles. Instead, it turns on the services an individual provides and the positions identified in statute. This structure has allowed one credential to support varied site, district, county office, programmatic, and specialized administrative roles.

Those roles can differ substantially in practice. Some ASC holders serve as principals or assistant principals with direct responsibility for teacher supervision and evaluation, classified staff support, school climate, student outcomes, family engagement, operations, staff development, and support for teaching and learning. Others serve in district-level, county office, programmatic, specialized, operational, or student-support roles. Some roles involve direct supervision or coaching of teachers and classified staff. Others involve administration of programs, services, compliance systems, student supports, fiscal operations, or specialized services.

Administrators also play a role in staffing and workforce decisions. Current ASC expectations already address human resources, legal and ethical staffing procedures, scheduling, organizational systems, and service delivery. The review should examine whether those expectations should more explicitly address how school and district leaders support effective workforce management, including appropriate assignment of certificated staff, credential authorization, service delivery, educator support and retention, public reporting, and improvement planning.

These features of the current system point to the core design work for this review. The Commission is not beginning with a single standards question. It is examining how existing expectations and system components may need to be updated, clarified, differentiated, or aligned if the ASC moves toward differentiated pathways.

Policy Considerations and Focus Areas for Initial Inquiry

The policy developments, prior Commission work, and current ASC structure suggest four possible focus areas, described below, for initial inquiry. Because the work is at the launch stage, staff are not presenting proposed answers. The questions below are intended to guide workgroup inquiry and invite early Commission input before recommendations are developed. The questions are not intended to limit Commission input or the range of issues the workgroup may identify.

Each focus area identifies the primary policy drivers and context that give rise to the questions. Some questions cut across more than one policy development, so the tags are intended as orientation rather than as a complete legal crosswalk.

REVISED

Focus Area 1: Credential Structure and Authorization
Primary policy drivers and context: AB 2725 veto message; AB 1009; prior ASC authorization history.

One proposed focus area is credential structure and authorization. The ASC has long operated as a single broad credential serving multiple administrative roles and candidates from multiple professional backgrounds. The Governor's AB 2725 veto message directs the Commission to develop differentiated ASC pathways. AB 1009 provides one statutory example of differentiated eligibility and authorization. Together, these developments raise questions about what each pathway should authorize, whether some responsibilities should require additional preparation or experience, and how candidates or credential holders should move between authorizations.

Initial questions include:

- What distinctions, if any, should be made between a pathway for teachers and a pathway for other credential or license holders without a teacher preparation background?
- What should each pathway authorize the holder to do?
- Should a pathway that does not include prior teacher preparation authorize the holder to supervise or evaluate teachers, or should those responsibilities require additional preparation, experience, or demonstration of competence?
- How should differentiated pathways account for site-level, district-level, county office, programmatic, specialized, operational, and student-support roles?
- If differentiated pathways or authorizations are developed, how should a candidate or credential holder move from one pathway or authorization to another?
- What bridge preparation, field experience, assessment, or employer verification might be appropriate?

Focus Area 2: Preparation Expectations and Candidate Readiness
Primary policy drivers: AB 2725 veto message; AB 1454; AB 1119; appropriate assignment of certificated staff.

A second proposed focus area is preparation expectations and candidate readiness. Candidates entering from teaching backgrounds and candidates entering from other credential or license backgrounds may bring different preparation, experience, and professional expertise. The review should examine what preparation should remain common to all ASC candidates, what preparation may need to be pathway-specific, and what additional preparation or experience may be needed for particular authorizations or administrative roles.

This focus area builds on existing ASC expectations related to teaching and learning, equity, access, school climate, human resources, student supports, and support for teachers, classified staff, and programs. The review should consider whether those expectations should be updated, clarified, or differentiated in relation to literacy, inclusive campus leadership,

workforce management, appropriate assignment of certificated staff, and the preparation needs of candidates entering through different pathways.

Initial questions include:

- What should all ASC candidates know and be able to do, regardless of prior professional background?
- What knowledge and skills may need to be added or strengthened for candidates from non-teaching credential or license backgrounds?
- How should existing ASC preparation expectations address literacy, including support for effective literacy instruction, English language development, multilingual learners, students with disabilities, dyslexia, and tiered systems of support?
- How should existing ASC preparation expectations address inclusive campus leadership, including staffing, scheduling, services, collaboration, school climate, student belonging, family engagement, classified staff roles, and educator working conditions?
- How should existing ASC preparation expectations address administrator responsibilities related to workforce management, appropriate assignment of certificated staff, credential authorization, service delivery, educator support and retention, public reporting, and improvement planning?
- How should pathway-specific preparation be reflected in program standards, CACEs, CAPEs, assessments, and induction?

Focus Area 3: Clinical Practice, Supervision, and Demonstration of Competence
Primary policy drivers: AB 959; AB 2725 veto message; prior fieldwork and assessment work.

A third proposed focus area is clinical practice, supervision, and demonstration of competence. Current ASC standards already require field experiences, guidance and feedback, program partnerships, candidate support, and assessment of candidate competence. The current review should consider whether those expectations should be adjusted for intern pathways, differentiated pathways, and any revised authorizations.

AB 959 directs the Commission to examine preservice, professional development, and supervision requirements for ASC internship programs when the Commission next considers ASC pathways. That review should be considered alongside broader questions about fieldwork, clinical practice, assessment, employer partnerships, CalAPA, CPACE, and the relationship between preparation programs and employing agencies.

Initial questions include:

- How should existing fieldwork and clinical practice expectations be reviewed in light of differentiated pathways or revised authorizations?
- What preservice preparation should be required before an ASC intern assumes administrative responsibilities?

- What ongoing job-embedded learning, mentoring, and role-specific support should be provided during the internship?
- What supervision, mentoring, and support structures are necessary for interns and other administrative candidates?
- What responsibilities should the preparation program hold, and what responsibilities should the employing agency hold?
- How should candidates demonstrate readiness for the responsibilities authorized by a pathway?
- How should CalAPA and CPACE be reviewed or revised to align with any updated expectations or differentiated pathways?

Focus Area 4: System Alignment, Implementation, and Transition
Primary policy drivers: AB 1454; AB 959; AB 2725 veto message; AB 1119; prior standards, assessment, and induction architecture.

A fourth proposed focus area is system alignment, implementation, and transition. Any proposed change to pathway structure or preparation expectations may have implications across the broader ASC system. This includes preconditions, program standards, CACEs, CAPEs, CPSEL, CalAPA, CPACE, induction, accreditation, regulations, employer guidance, and transition timelines.

The purpose of this focus area is to ensure that recommendations for one part of the system do not create conflicts elsewhere. If the Commission moves toward differentiated pathways or authorizations, the system will need to remain clear for programs, candidates, employers, assessors, accreditation reviewers, and the public.

Initial questions include:

- Should the current structure of professional standards, program standards, content expectations, performance expectations, assessments, induction expectations, and accreditation requirements be maintained, consolidated, streamlined, or more clearly crosswalked?
- How should any recommended pathway changes inform updates to program standards, CACEs, and CAPEs?
- How should administrator induction align with any revised preliminary preparation structure?
- How should bridge options be reflected in preconditions, program standards, assessments, induction, regulations, or employer guidance?
- What transition period should programs have to revise coursework, fieldwork, assessments, and program documentation?

- What further guidance will employers need regarding authorization, appropriate assignment of certificated staff, supervision, and appropriate use of differentiated pathways?
- How should the Commission communicate any revised structure so that programs, candidates, employers, and the public understand what each pathway authorizes?

The focus areas and questions above provide the initial frame for workgroup inquiry and early Commission feedback. The remaining sections describe how staff propose to organize the work, including the workgroup charge, recruitment and selection process, project sequence, Commission engagement points, and appendices that provide additional detail.

Proposed Approach, Work Plan, and Engagement

Staff propose to conduct this work through a structured process that combines workgroup deliberation, field engagement, staff analysis, review of current research and examples from other states, and Commission input at key points. The approach is intended to support careful review of the ASC system before any formal recommendations are brought forward.

The proposed work plan is organized around three related elements. First, the workgroup charge identifies the areas in which recommendations are needed. Second, the workgroup roster brings together members with preparation, practice, policy, and implementation experience. Third, the project sequence provides a process for moving from shared understanding and inquiry, to possible changes and recommendation themes, to any proposals requiring future Commission consideration.

This structure is intended to avoid a closed workgroup process followed by a final proposal. Staff would return to the Commission at key points so that Commission feedback can inform the development of the work before it moves from inquiry to possible changes and again before formal recommendations are developed. Substantive proposals related to standards, expectations, assessments, authorizations, regulations, or credential requirements would return to the Commission for consideration through future agenda items.

Proposed Workgroup Charge

The proposed charge of the ASC Workgroup is to review statutory requirements, the Governor's veto message, prior Commission direction, current credential requirements, current standards and expectations, current research, state and national examples, and field input in order to develop recommendations for Commission consideration.

The workgroup is charged with developing recommendations in the following areas:

- Credential Structure and Authorization: Potential differentiated ASC pathway structures, authorization statements, bridge options, and the relationship between pathway design and administrative responsibilities.
- Preparation Expectations and Candidate Readiness: What preparation should remain common across ASC pathways, what preparation may need to be pathway-specific, and

how existing preparation should be updated, clarified, or differentiated in relation to literacy, inclusive campus leadership, support for teachers and classified staff, workforce management, appropriate assignment of certificated staff, and role-specific expectations.

- Clinical Practice, Supervision, and Demonstration of Competence: Fieldwork, clinical practice, internship requirements, preservice preparation, supervision, ongoing job-embedded learning and support, assessment, and the respective responsibilities of preparation programs and employing agencies.
- System Alignment, Implementation, and Transition: How proposed changes may affect preconditions, program standards, CACEs, CAPEs, CPSEL, CalAPA, CPACE, induction, accreditation, regulations, employer guidance, communication, and transition timelines.

The workgroup's role is advisory. Any proposed changes to standards, expectations, assessments, authorizations, regulations, or credential requirements would return to the Commission for consideration through future agenda items.

Workgroup Recruitment, Selection, and Logistics
Recruitment for the ASC Workgroup began in March 2026. Commission staff announced the opportunity through the Weekly Educator Quality Update newsletter on March 13, 2026, and accepted applications through April 6, 2026.

Applicants were asked to complete a survey that included acknowledgment of participation expectations, current and prior employment information, self-ratings of expertise and experience, and a brief statement describing their interest in participating and the perspective or expertise they would bring to the workgroup.

Applications were reviewed through a blind scoring process. Each application was assigned an identification number and evaluated using a numeric scoring system based on applicants' experience, expertise, knowledge areas, and credentials. After initial scoring, the finalist pool was reviewed to support representation across geography, institution type, professional role, expertise, and experience.

The workgroup includes members identified by key constituent groups as well as additional members selected through the application and scoring process. The group includes representation from institutions of higher education, county offices of education, school districts, administrator preparation programs, induction programs, faculty, practitioners, and education partners. The full roster appointed by the Executive Director is included in Appendix A.

Project Sequence and Commission Engagement
The proposed process will begin with launch and inquiry activities in 2026. During this stage, staff will organize baseline materials, convene the workgroup, review statutory and policy

direction, examine current research and state examples, analyze the current ASC structure and standards architecture, and use Commission feedback to refine the initial questions for inquiry.

The workgroup's first meetings will establish a shared foundation before the workgroup begins developing possible changes. Those meetings will focus on statutory direction, current research and state examples, the current ASC structure, prior Commission work, current standards and expectations, and the four focus areas.

Following the initial inquiry phase, staff anticipate returning to the Commission with inquiry findings before the workgroup moves into possible changes. This will allow the Commission to respond to what has been learned from the workgroup, field input, research, state examples, and staff analysis before the project moves into the next stage.

The next phase will focus on possible changes and recommendation themes. Field engagement will be used to test emerging ideas and identify implementation concerns. Staff anticipate returning to the Commission again before formal recommendations are developed so that Commission feedback can inform the direction of the work.

Later phases will focus on refining recommendation themes, incorporating workgroup and field feedback, and identifying any standards, authorization statements, assessment revisions, regulations, or implementation materials that may need to be developed by staff for future Commission consideration. Any substantive proposals would return to the Commission for consideration through future information/action or action items, as appropriate.

The full list of meeting dates and proposed topics is included in Appendix B.

Staff Recommendation
Staff recommend that the Commission review and, if appropriate, approve the proposed charge for the Administrative Services Credential Workgroup. Staff further requests Commission feedback on the proposed focus areas, project plan, and initial questions for inquiry that will guide the first phase of work.

REVISED

Appendix A

Administrative Services Workgroup Members

Name	Affiliation	Nominated by	Current Position
Carmen Beck	California State University, San Bernardino		Assistant Professor and Assistant Director of the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership / Retired Chief Academic Officer
Mary Briggs	California School Boards Association	California School Boards Association	Senior Director of Research and Education Policy Development
Rebecca Cheung	Regents of the University of California, Berkeley, School of Education	University of California	Assistant Dean for Leadership Programs, and PI and Director of 21CSLA
Delia Estrada	Los Angeles Unified School District		Administrative Coordinator Lead, LAPASC Program
Dr. Kelly Fountain	Lancaster School District	EdTrust-West	Director of Early Learning / Adjunct Faculty
Tristen Gartrell	Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District		Induction Coordinator
Victoria Graf	Loyola Marymount University		Director of Special Education and Professor
Jo Ann Isken	University of California, Los Angeles School of Education		Lecturer / Field Supervisor, UCLA PLI Program; Accreditation Coordinator, UCLA School of Education
Jason Mercier	Madera County Superintendent of Schools		Director, Credential and Certification Programs
Ryan Miller	Shasta County Office of Education		Director of School and District Support

REVISED

Natasha Neumann	California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo		Associate Professor and Co-Coordinator, MS Educational Leadership and Administration Program
Jennifer Ollila	Fountain Valley School District		Principal
Dina Pacis	National University		Professor and Department Chair, Organizational Leadership and Educational Administration
Angela Pascual	Stockton Unified School District, Teachers College of San Joaquin	California Teachers Association	Intervention Teacher / Adjunct Instructor
Amanda Shoffner	San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools	California County Superintendents	Manager, Credential Services Department
Tamerin A. Tooker, Ed.D.	Association of California School Administrators	Association of California School Administrators	Director of Credentials & Coaching Services
Nichole Walsh	Fresno State University	California State University	Associate Professor / PASC Program Coordinator
Angela Williams	Sonoma County Office of Education - North Coast School of Education		Director of the North Coast School of Education
Dr. L. Steven Winlock	Sacramento County Office of Education		Executive Director, School of Education, Sacramento County Office of Education
Estela Zarate	Loyola Marymount University	Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities	Dean

REVISED

Appendix B

Proposed Workgroup Meeting Schedule and Topics

Timeframe	Meeting / Activity	Proposed Focus
Spring–Summer 2026	Project launch and preparation	Staff review statutory direction, prior Commission work, current ASC requirements, current standards and expectations, research, and examples from other states.
June 2026	Commission meeting	Commission considers the proposed workgroup charge and provides feedback on the focus areas, project plan, and initial inquiry questions.
August 2026	Workgroup Meeting 1: Baseline Framing	Establish shared understanding of statutory and policy direction, the current ASC structure, prior Commission work, current standards and expectations, and the four focus areas for inquiry.
September 2026	Workgroup Meeting 2: Inquiry Framing	Refine inquiry questions, identify key field issues, and determine what additional information is needed before possible changes are developed.
Fall 2026	Field Inquiry 1	Gather field input on pathway needs, authorization, preparation expectations, intern requirements, literacy leadership, inclusive campus leadership, workforce management, and implementation issues.
December 2026	Workgroup Meeting 3: Inquiry Findings	Review field input, research, state examples, and staff analysis. Identify major themes, areas of agreement, unresolved questions, and issues requiring Commission direction.
Winter 2026–27	Commission meeting	Staff present inquiry findings and request Commission feedback before the work moves from inquiry to possible changes.
Spring 2027	Workgroup Meetings 4–5: Possible Changes and Recommendation Themes	Develop possible approaches related to pathway structure, authorization, bridge options, preparation expectations, clinical practice, intern support, assessment, induction, and system alignment.
Spring–Summer 2027	Field Inquiry 2	Test emerging ideas with the field and identify implementation considerations for programs, candidates, employers, assessors, accreditation reviewers, and the public.

REVISED

Summer/Fall 2027	Commission meeting	Staff present emerging recommendation themes and request Commission feedback before formal recommendations or proposals are developed.
Fall 2027–Spring 2028	Workgroup Meetings 6–7: Refinement	Refine recommendation themes and identify any needed changes to standards, expectations, assessments, authorizations, regulations, induction, accreditation, employer guidance, and transition timelines.
2028	Future Commission action items, as needed	Any substantive proposals related to standards, expectations, assessments, authorization statements, regulations, credential requirements, or implementation timelines return to the Commission for consideration.