2A

Information/Action

Educator Preparation Committee

Proposed Recommendations and Actions to Implement AB 1119: Dual Credentialing

Executive Summary: This agenda item presents five recommendations and proposed actions to establish more efficient pathways to dual credentialing across general education and special education. Building on the statewide inquiry presented in August 2026, the recommendations address full instructional authorizations, inclusive educator preparation, guidance for dual credential pathways, streamlined program approval and accreditation, and expansion of integrated preparation programs. The Commission will be asked to discuss, provide feedback on, and consider adoption of the recommendations to guide subsequent regulatory, legislative, and Commission actions.

Recommended Action: Staff recommends that the Commission discuss the five recommendations and associated proposed actions, provide feedback, and, if appropriate, adopt them to guide the next phase of implementation.

Presenters: 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

Proposed Recommendations and Actions to Implement AB 1119: Dual Credentialing

Introduction

This agenda item presents five recommendations and associated proposed actions to advance implementation of Assembly Bill 1119 (Patel, Chap. 390, Stats. 2025), which requires the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) to establish efficient routes to dual credentialing across general education and special education. The recommendations build on the statewide inquiry and findings presented to the Commission in August 2026 and address full instructional authorizations, inclusive educator preparation, guidance for dual credential pathways, program approval and accreditation, and expansion of integrated preparation programs. Staff request Commission discussion and feedback on the recommendations and, if appropriate, their adoption to guide subsequent regulatory, legislative, and Commission processes.

Background

Assembly Bill (AB) 1119 (Patel, Chap. 390, Stats. 2025), codified in Education Code section 44238.5, directs the Commission, with input from the education field, to develop and establish efficient routes to dual credentialing across general education and special education. The legislation identifies three groups: (1) teacher candidates seeking both a general education and an Education Specialist credential; (2) existing Multiple Subject (MS), Single Subject (SS), or PK-3 Early Childhood Education Specialist Instruction (PK-3) credential holders seeking an Education Specialist credential; and (3) existing Education Specialist (ES) credential holders seeking a general education credential. In developing these routes, the Commission must examine existing pathways, overlapping preparation requirements, potential supplementary authorizations, barriers and opportunities for educators and preparation programs, approaches used in other states, and necessary statutory changes.

The legislation builds on the Commission's longstanding efforts to strengthen educator preparation for students with and without disabilities. Revisions to general education and special education preparation standards have established greater commonality across credential areas, including the Universal Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) that provide a shared foundation for MS, SS, and applicable ES preparation programs. These reforms have created opportunities for greater alignment while maintaining the specialized knowledge and skills associated with each credential.

California's credentialing system nevertheless continues to include distinct pathways, requirements, and authorizations across general education and special education. Candidates seeking two credentials may encounter overlapping coursework, separate clinical practice and assessment requirements, and differences in program sequencing. Current credential holders pursuing an additional credential may experience similar challenges, particularly when prior preparation or professional experience is not readily recognized within an additional pathway. Variation in program structures and requirements also raises questions about equitable access

to preparation pathways, consistent recognition of prior preparation and experience, and the availability of clear guidance to help candidates navigate their options.

Expanding access to dual credentialing offers an opportunity to strengthen California's educator workforce and advance more inclusive learning environments. For candidates and existing educators, more efficient pathways can reduce barriers to professional advancement and expand opportunities to serve students with diverse learning needs. For employers, a broader pool of dually prepared educators can support greater flexibility in staffing, collaboration, and instructional delivery. Most importantly, students may benefit from more cohesive educational experiences, with teachers better prepared to address the full range of learning needs across general education and special education settings.

To implement AB 1119, the Commission established a Focused Policy Review (FPR) team to examine existing requirements and identify opportunities for more efficient dual credential pathways. The FPR team included Mary Vixie Sandy, Marquita Grenot-Scheyer, Michelle Fennell, and William Hatrick from the Commission on Teacher Credentialing; Kristin Wright, Sacramento County Office of Education; Nat Hansuvadha, California State University, Long Beach; and Megan Gross, Supporting Innovative Practices Project. The team reviewed credential structures, preparation standards, and statutory and regulatory provisions and examined issues related to overlapping preparation, clinical practice, supplementary authorizations, and program implementation. The team also helped guide statewide engagement with educators, preparation program sponsors, and other education partners.

The statewide inquiry included separate surveys of educators and preparation program sponsors, which received 426 and 77 responses, respectively, as well as listening sessions and interviews with credentialed teachers, preparation program representatives, local educational agencies (LEAs), and individuals with experience operating dual credential programs. The inquiry examined interest in dual credentialing, awareness of existing pathways, barriers to obtaining additional credentials, opportunities to recognize shared preparation, and considerations affecting program design and implementation. Survey results and listening-session findings are presented in Appendices A, B, and C of the August 2026 agenda item.

Drawing on this evidence, staff synthesized the inquiry results into eight findings and ten related issues for further examination, which staff and FPR team members jointly presented to the Commission at its August 2026 meeting. The findings identified substantial interest in dual credentialing, barriers to accessing existing pathways, and opportunities to reduce duplicative requirements while maintaining preparation quality. They also highlighted considerations involving clinical practice, program capacity, educator assignments, and the differing needs of teacher candidates and existing credential holders. Together, the findings and related issues established the basis for the FPR team's subsequent policy review and development of the recommendations presented in this item.

Tables 1 and 2 summarize the eight findings and ten related issues presented to the Commission in August 2026. The complete discussion and supporting evidence are available in August 2026 Commission Item 3A.

Table 1. Findings from the August 2026 Inquiry

Finding	Description
1	Survey and listening-session input indicate substantial interest in dual credential pathways and uneven awareness of available options.
2	Respondents and participants identified multiple barriers that may compound the workload concern of earning an additional credential.
3	Field input supports reducing duplicative requirements while maintaining credential-specific preparation.
4	Clinical practice requirements present a central design tension between feasibility and preparation quality.
5	Field input identified program and LEA implementation capacity as a condition for expanding dual credential pathways.
6	Existing dual credential models provide design examples, but current approaches vary in structure, sequencing, and implementation conditions.
7	Current credentialed teacher input identified post-credential assignment, workload, and educator-protection concerns when seeking a subsequent credential as an ES or MS/SS teacher.
8	The inquiry record supports consideration of differentiated routes for distinct candidate and credential-holder groups.

Table 2. Related Issues for Further Inquiry

Issue	Description
1	Supplementary Authorizations
2	Undergraduate and Intern Pathways
3	Program Approval, Standards, and Accreditation Structures
4	Recognition of Prior Preparation, Experience, and Demonstrated Competency
5	Role of County Offices, SELPAs, and Regional Intermediaries
6	Definition of Inclusive Placement
7	PK–3 and Early Childhood Pathways
8	Candidate Motivation, Recruitment, and Labor-Market Signaling
9	Approaches in Other States
10	Potential Statutory Changes

Following the August meeting, the FPR team considered Commission feedback and examined potential policy responses to the findings. Deliberations during September, October, and November addressed supplementary authorizations, inclusive preparation, recognition of prior competencies, possibilities for integrated pathways, program approval processes, and the resources necessary to expand dual credential opportunities. Building on these deliberations,

staff examined existing credential requirements and Commission authority to determine which approaches could proceed through regulation, which would require statutory changes, and which could be advanced through other Commission actions.

This analysis identified different policy responses for the three groups specified in AB 1119. For candidates seeking concurrent general education and ES credentials, existing preparation and approval structures permit integrated pathways, and additional regulations were not identified as necessary. For existing general education credential holders seeking an ES instructional authorization equivalent, staff identified an opportunity to establish a full Mild to Moderate Support Needs (MMSN) instructional authorization through regulation under the Commission's existing statutory authority in Education Code section 44256. For ES credential holders seeking complementary general education instructional authorization, staff identified the need for statutory amendments before corresponding authorization requirements could be established through regulation.

The FPR team also examined opportunities to strengthen preparation for inclusive instruction, clarify requirements for dual credential pathways, streamline institutional approval processes, and support the expansion of integrated programs. These areas address barriers identified through the inquiry that may not be resolved solely through changes to credential authorization requirements. The resulting five recommendations provide a coordinated policy framework encompassing regulatory actions, matters requiring future Commission approval, and proposals for statutory changes and additional resources.

Proposed Recommendations and Actions

The following recommendations reflect the FPR team's examination of the statutory requirements, statewide inquiry findings, and potential policy responses. Each recommendation identifies the proposed actions and explains their relationship with the evidence and issues identified through the inquiry. The actions would proceed through regulatory development, Commission approval processes, or recommendations for legislative consideration, as appropriate.

Recommendation 1. Establish Full Instructional Authorizations

Expand opportunities for existing credential holders to obtain additional instructional authority while recognizing prior preparation and professional experience and maintaining equivalent rigor.

Proposed Actions

1. Develop regulations establishing full MMSN instructional authorizations for eligible general education credential holders, including preparation requirements recognizing prior preparation and demonstrated competence. *(Vehicle: Regulations)*
2. Recommend statutory changes authorizing the Commission to establish complementary full general education instructional authorizations for ES credential holders. *(Vehicle: Legislation)*
3. Establish regulatory requirements for pathways through which MMSN and Extensive Support Needs (ESN) credential holders may obtain the other specialty authorization,

including recognition of prior preparation and demonstrated competencies, and provide a corresponding pathway to ESN authorization for holders of the proposed full MMSN instructional authorization. *(Vehicle: Regulations)*

4. Maintain educator consent protections for assignments made pursuant to the new full instructional authorizations, while preserving educators' right to request removal and subsequent reinstatement of their authorizations. *(Vehicle: Statute/Regulations)*

Rationale

The statewide inquiry identified substantial barriers associated with earning an additional credential and strong support for reducing duplication while maintaining preparation quality. Among educator survey respondents, 81.5 percent identified tuition as a barrier, 61.5 percent identified additional clinical practice, and 50.2 percent identified additional coursework. Additionally, 82.4 percent agreed or strongly agreed that reducing duplication should be a priority. Program sponsor responses reinforced this finding, with 65.4 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that meaningful overlap in preparation could be counted across credentials and 89.3 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that requirements could be streamlined while maintaining rigor. Together, Findings 2, 3, and 8 support pathways that recognize prior preparation while ensuring educators demonstrate the competencies necessary for additional instructional responsibilities.

Subsequent staff analysis identified full instructional authorizations as a means of establishing more efficient pathways for existing credential holders. Under existing authority in Education Code section 44256, the Commission may establish a full MMSN instructional authorization through regulation, allowing eligible MS, SS, and PK-3 credential holders to obtain instructional and assignment authority equivalent to an MMSN credential without requiring issuance of a separate ES credential. Establishing a complementary full general education instructional authorization for ES credential holders would require statutory changes to section 44256 before corresponding regulations could be developed. Both approaches would recognize prior preparation while establishing requirements appropriate to the additional instructional authority sought.

Commission-approved programs currently provide pathways for MMSN credential holders to obtain the ESN authorization and vice versa, typically through additional specialty-specific coursework and abbreviated clinical practice. These approaches demonstrate opportunities to recognize prior preparation, although requirements and methods for demonstrating additional competencies vary among programs. Establishing regulatory requirements would provide consistent statewide expectations while preserving flexibility in how programs prepare candidates and verify their competence. The regulations would also establish a pathway for holders of the proposed full MMSN instructional authorization to subsequently obtain the ESN authorization without completing a separate ES credential program.

The inquiry also identified concerns extending beyond the requirements for earning an additional credential. Finding 7 documented concerns among practicing educators regarding teaching assignments, workload, and the implications of holding additional instructional authorizations. The proposed recommendations respond to these concerns by maintaining

educator consent protections for assignments made pursuant to the new authorizations and preserving educators' right to request removal and subsequent reinstatement of those authorizations.

Recommendation 2. Strengthen Inclusive Educator Preparation
Strengthen the preparation of general education and ES teachers to provide effective instruction to students with and without disabilities in inclusive educational settings.

Proposed Actions

1. Evaluate the sufficiency and implementation of existing Universal TPEs in preparing teachers for inclusive instruction, including disability-related knowledge, evidence-based instructional practices, and collaborative teaching. *(Vehicle: Commission Action)*
2. Identify gaps in preparation standards, clinical practice, or implementation that may limit candidates' readiness to teach in inclusive settings. *(Vehicle: Commission Action)*
3. Recommend targeted revisions to standards, clinical practice expectations, or guidance, as warranted by the findings and input from education partners. *(Vehicle: Commission Action)*

Rationale
AB 1119 directs the Commission to examine which preparation requirements may satisfy expectations across general education and ES credentials. The Commission's prior reforms established a shared foundation through the Universal TPEs while retaining credential-specific preparation requirements. The development of more efficient dual credential pathways provides an opportunity to examine whether existing standards and their implementation adequately prepare educators to provide effective instruction to students with and without disabilities.

The statewide inquiry demonstrated strong support for reducing duplication while maintaining preparation quality. Among educator survey respondents, 82.4 percent agreed or strongly agreed that reducing duplication between credential programs should be a priority, while 80.3 percent agreed or strongly agreed that changes should be implemented carefully to maintain preparation quality. Program sponsor responses reflected similar priorities, with 89.3 percent agreeing or strongly agreeing that changes should be implemented carefully to maintain quality.

These findings do not suggest that existing preparation standards are insufficient. Rather, they demonstrate the importance of distinguishing between overlapping preparation that may be recognized across credentials and competencies that remain necessary for effective instruction. Finding 3 supports a focused examination of shared and credential-specific expectations rather than a general reduction in preparation requirements.

Clinical practice was also a significant consideration in the inquiry. Additional clinical practice was identified as a barrier by 61.5 percent of educator survey respondents, while listening-session participants emphasized the importance of meaningful experiences in both general education and special education settings. Participants described variation in opportunities for

collaborative teaching, inclusive placements, and supervised experiences involving students with different learning and support needs.

Staff would conduct additional analysis of existing preparation standards and their implementation, informed by continued consultation with education partners. This work would distinguish potential gaps in standards from differences in program implementation or the need for clearer guidance. Staff would return to the Commission with recommended revisions or other actions, as warranted, to strengthen inclusive educator preparation while preserving established expectations for program quality.

Recommendation 3. Strengthen Guidance for Dual Credential Preparation
Improve access to clear, comprehensive guidance that supports efficient preparation for concurrent and additional teaching credentials.

Proposed Actions

1. Develop a comprehensive Dual Credentialing Guide addressing, at minimum:
    a. Concurrent preparation and pathways for existing credential holders.
    b. Credential and authorization requirements, including the scope of instructional authority and pathways for adding authorizations.
    c. Shared coursework, TPEs, assessments, and clinical experiences.
    d. Recognition of prior preparation, experience, equivalencies, and early-completion options.
    e. Integrated clinical practice, including inclusive placements and co-teaching.
    f. Program sequencing, completion requirements, and options for candidates who do not complete both credentials.
    g. Examples across traditional, intern, undergraduate, and residency models.
    h. Relevant Commission actions and policy changes resulting from implementation of the recommendations, including revised preparation standards, authorization requirements, and program guidance.

(Vehicle: Commission Action)

Rationale
AB 1119 requires the Commission to examine existing pathways and identify opportunities for candidates and credential holders to obtain dual credentials more efficiently. California's preparation system already permits institutions approved to offer general education and ES programs to develop concurrent pathways, including integrated approaches to coursework and clinical practice. However, the availability of these pathways and the requirements for earning an additional credential may not be readily apparent to candidates, educators, or preparation programs.

The statewide inquiry identified substantial interest in dual credentialing, with notable differences among credential-holder groups. Overall, 60.8 percent of educator survey respondents indicated that they would have considered earning both a general education and an ES credential simultaneously if their preliminary program had offered that opportunity. Interest was particularly pronounced among ES credential holders seeking general education

preparation, compared with general education credential holders considering ES preparation. Awareness of available options was also uneven: only 15.5 percent reported that their preliminary program offered a dual pathway, while 34.5 percent were unsure whether such an option had been available.

Program sponsor responses reinforced concerns about pathway clarity and navigability. Only 29.3 percent agreed or strongly agreed that current pathways were clear to candidates, while 44 percent disagreed or strongly disagreed that candidates could navigate existing pathways without significant difficulty. Finding 1 identified this combination of interest and uncertainty as an important consideration for improving access to dual credentialing.

The inquiry also documented variation among existing dual credential programs. Listening-session participants described integrated coursework, shared foundational preparation, coordinated clinical experiences, residency models, and other approaches developed through institutional and LEA partnerships. Finding 6 recognized these programs as valuable examples while identifying differences in their structure, sequencing, and implementation conditions.

These findings support the development of comprehensive guidance addressing both concurrent preparation and pathways for existing credential holders, while providing a means to document and communicate the outcomes of related Commission actions. The guide would consolidate applicable credential and authorization requirements, clarify the instructional authority conferred, and identify opportunities to recognize shared coursework and demonstrated competencies. It would also address approaches to clinical practice and assessment, with examples from existing programs illustrating how institutions may develop efficient pathways while meeting applicable preparation standards.

Guidance would also address the differing circumstances of candidates entering preparation and existing educators pursuing an additional credential. Finding 8 identified the need for differentiated routes reflecting prior preparation, employment status, and the credential sought. The guide would clarify program sequencing and completion requirements, including options for candidates who complete one credential but do not finish an integrated dual credential pathway. The guide would provide candidates and programs with a clearer understanding of available pathways, applicable requirements, and opportunities to complete preparation efficiently.

Recommendation 4. Streamline Program Approval and Accreditation
Reduce unnecessary duplication in program approval and accreditation processes while maintaining standards for high-quality general education and ES preparation.

Proposed Actions

1. Streamline Initial Institutional Approval (IIA) documentation for new institutions proposing both general education and ES preparation programs, recognizing shared institutional structures and systems and reducing duplicative evidence requirements. *(Vehicle: Commission Action)*
2. Establish a streamlined Initial Program Review (IPR) process for existing institutions adding a complementary general education or ES preparation program, recognizing

previously approved preparation components and reducing duplicative documentation and review requirements. *(Vehicle: Commission Action)*

Rationale
AB 1119 directs the Commission to identify barriers and opportunities affecting preparation programs' ability to prepare dually credentialed teachers. The Commission's accreditation system provides oversight of educator preparation through institutional approval, program review, and ongoing accountability. As institutions develop complementary general education and ES programs, the IIA and IPR processes provide opportunities to recognize shared institutional systems and preparation components while maintaining requirements specific to each credential.

The statewide inquiry identified program implementation capacity as an important consideration for expanding dual credential pathways. Preparation program representatives described the institutional coordination necessary to align coursework, organize clinical practice, support faculty collaboration, and establish partnerships with LEAs. Finding 5 recognized that the availability and sustainability of dual credential programs depend in part on institutions having the capacity to develop and operate them.

Finding 3 identified opportunities to recognize overlapping preparation while maintaining credential-specific expectations. Although the inquiry primarily addressed duplication experienced by candidates, the distinction between shared and credential-specific requirements is also relevant to the evidence institutions submit during program approval. Finding 6 further documented variation among existing dual credential models, supporting approval processes that accommodate different institutional approaches while applying consistent standards.

The proposed actions would streamline IIA documentation for institutions proposing both general education and ES preparation programs and IPR procedures for existing institutions adding complementary programs. These changes would recognize shared institutional systems and previously approved preparation components, reducing the need to submit or review duplicative evidence. Institutions would continue to demonstrate compliance with applicable standards, preserving the Commission's oversight of program quality while reducing unnecessary administrative requirements.

Recommendation 5. Expand High-Quality Dual Credential Programs
Expand access to high-quality integrated preparation and strengthen the conditions that support educator recruitment, professional development, and retention.

Proposed Actions
1. Recommend to the author of AB 1119 legislation providing General Fund support to institutions of higher education for the development and expansion of integrated dual credential preparation programs, including undergraduate pathways, teacher residencies, and registered apprenticeships, with funding for faculty collaboration, integrated clinical placements, and mentor preparation. *(Vehicle: Legislation)*

2. Recommend to the author of AB 1119 legislative opportunities to strengthen educator recruitment and retention through financial assistance, mentoring, and professional learning. *(Vehicle: Legislation)*

Rationale

AB 1119 directs the Commission to identify barriers and opportunities affecting educators seeking dual credentials and the preparation programs responsible for developing those pathways. The statewide inquiry identified financial barriers and institutional capacity as significant considerations affecting access to dual credentialing. Although changes to credential requirements may create more efficient routes, expanding integrated preparation also depends on institutions having the resources and partnerships necessary to develop and sustain programs.

Financial barriers were especially prominent in the educator survey. Tuition costs were identified by 81.5 percent of respondents, additional clinical practice by 61.5 percent, and additional coursework by 50.2 percent. Finding 2 recognized the cumulative burden of these requirements, particularly for educators completing additional preparation after entering the workforce. Finding 1 also identified substantial interest in concurrent preparation, with 60.8 percent of respondents indicating they would have considered a dual pathway if one had been available.

Listening-session participants described existing programs that coordinate general education and ES preparation through shared coursework, integrated clinical experiences, and LEA partnerships. They also identified resources necessary for faculty collaboration, curriculum development, mentor preparation, and appropriate clinical placements. Findings 5 and 6 recognized institutional capacity as a condition for expansion and documented existing models with differing implementation requirements.

These findings support recommending legislative consideration of General Fund investments in integrated dual credential programs, including undergraduate pathways, teacher residencies, and registered apprenticeships. Such investments could support program development, faculty collaboration, clinical placements, and mentor preparation. Additional legislative recommendations would address candidate financial barriers and support recruitment and retention through financial assistance, mentoring, and professional learning.

Table 3 summarizes the alignment of the five recommendations with the findings and related issues identified through the statewide inquiry.

Table 3. Alignment of Recommendations with Inquiry Findings and Related Issues

Recommendation	Findings	Related Issues
1. Full Instructional Authorizations	2, 3, 7, 8	1. Supplementary Authorizations; 4. Prior Preparation; 10. Statutory Changes
2. Inclusive Educator Preparation	3, 4	6. Inclusive Placement

3. Dual Credentialing Guide	1, 3, 6, 8	2. Undergraduate and Intern Pathways; 4. Prior Preparation; 5. Regional Intermediaries; 7. PK–3 and ECE
4. Program Approval and Accreditation	3, 5, 6	3. Program Approval and Accreditation
5. Expansion of Dual Credential Programs	1, 2, 5, 6	2. Undergraduate and Intern Pathways; 5. Regional Intermediaries; 8. Recruitment and Labor Market; 10. Statutory Changes

Note: Related Issue 9, Approaches in Other States, was addressed through the statewide inquiry presented in August 2026.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission discuss the five recommendations and associated proposed actions, provide feedback, and, if appropriate, adopt them to guide the next phase of implementation.

Next Steps

Following the December meeting, staff will use Commission feedback and continued consultation with education partners to develop proposed regulations for consideration in February 2027. Staff will also advance work on preparation standards, guidance, and accreditation improvements through applicable Commission processes and communicate proposed statutory changes and investment recommendations to the author of AB 1119.

Appendix A

Proposed Full Instructional Authorization Framework

The following framework summarizes the proposed full instructional authorizations and preliminary preparation considerations associated with Recommendation 1. It distinguishes authorizations that may be established through regulation under existing Commission authority from those requiring statutory changes. Specific eligibility criteria, preparation requirements, and methods for demonstrating competency would be developed through subsequent regulatory and legislative processes.

Proposed Full Instructional Authorizations

Element	Full MMSN Instructional Authorization	Full General Education Instructional Authorization
Eligible Credential Holders	Preliminary or Clear MS, SS, and PK–3 credential holders.	Preliminary or Clear MMSN and ESN credential holders.
Implementation Vehicle	Regulations under existing statutory authority.	Statutory changes establishing Commission authority, followed by regulations.
Instructional Authority	Full instructional, assessment, and assignment authority equivalent to an MMSN credential, including specialized instruction, educational assessment, and IEP case management.	Full instructional, assessment, and assignment authority equivalent to the corresponding MS, SS, or PK–3 credential.
Credential Issuance	Authorization added to the underlying general education credential; no separate ES credential required.	Authorization added to the underlying ES credential; no separate general education credential required.
Additional Authorization Pathways	Eligibility to obtain ESN or other applicable authorizations upon completion of additional requirements.	Eligibility to obtain other general education authorizations upon completion of applicable additional requirements.

Recognition of Prior Preparation, Experience, and Demonstrated Competency

The proposed pathways would recognize relevant preparation, professional experience, and demonstrated competency in determining the requirements for full instructional authority. Applicable coursework, TPEs, assessments, and clinical experiences completed through an underlying credential would count toward the additional authorization. Relevant professional experience could also satisfy requirements where corresponding competencies can be verified through Commission-approved methods.

Applicants would demonstrate remaining credential-specific competencies through additional coursework, clinical practice, approved assessments, performance evidence, or other appropriate methods. Clinical practice requirements would recognize previously completed

experiences and permit appropriate equivalents where necessary competencies can be demonstrated. Subject matter and literacy requirements would be evaluated according to the authorization sought, recognizing previously established competencies while addressing remaining expectations.

The proposed frameworks would establish consistent competency expectations and verification methods while allowing differentiated pathways based on prior preparation and experience. Additional preparation or competency demonstrations would be required only where applicable requirements have not been satisfied.

Additional ES Authorization Pathways

Existing MMSN and ESN credential holders may pursue the other specialty authorization. The proposed regulations would establish consistent requirements for these pathways, recognizing previously completed ES preparation and demonstrated competencies while identifying any additional preparation or verification necessary.

The regulations would also extend eligibility for ESN authorization to holders of the proposed full MMSN instructional authorization, recognizing preparation and competencies already demonstrated.

Educator Consent and Authorization Protections

The proposed framework would maintain educator consent protections for assignments made pursuant to the new full instructional authorizations. Educators would retain the right to request removal and subsequent reinstatement of these authorizations, consistent with applicable requirements.

The framework and preparation considerations presented in this appendix are preliminary and do not establish final eligibility, competency verification, or completion requirements. Those requirements would be developed through the applicable statutory and regulatory processes and presented to the Commission for consideration.