

Olds Plaza Building, 10th Floor Lansing, Michigan 48909 Phone: 517/373-6466

THE APPARENT PROBLEM:

Public Act 335 of 1993 (House Bill 5121) amended the School Code to eliminate as of the 1995-96 school year the requirement that districts only hire for an administrative post a person with a valid Michigan school administrator's certificate issued by the state board of education (or else a person working toward certification). Instead, the state board was required to promulgate rules establishing continuing education requirements as a condition of continued employment as an administrator. However, a school administrator's certificate remained available for issue, as did endorsements for specific positions, even though neither a certificate or specific endorsement was required for employment as an administrator (such as superintendent, assistant principal, principal. administrator of instructional programs, and chief business official). Also part of Public Act 335 was a provision requiring that, to be eligible for an initial administrator's certificate for administering instructional programs and for an initial endorsement as a building administrator, and to get those credentials renewed, a person would have to provide evidence of the successful completion of postgraduate coursework or training in budgeting and financial management, curriculum, and personnel evaluation, as specified by state board rule.

Public Act 289 of 1995 (Senate Bill 679) created the Revised School Code, which is due to take effect on July 1, 1996. As part of that extensive overhaul of school laws, the sections of the code dealing with the administrator's certificate were repealed, meaning that the administrator's certificate will no longer be available from the state board after the Revised Code takes effect. Reportedly, there have been some objections to the repeal, including from people connected with universities that train administrators, who have pointed out that it hurts people who are in mid-program and those administrators in the state that would like to compete for positions out-of-state, and that it would require the schools themselves to carry out the certification of administrators if it is to be done at all. Legislation has been introduced to reinstate the repealed language.

ADMINISTRATOR'S CERTIFICATE

House Bill 5642 (Substitute H-1) First Analysis (3-13-96)

Sponsor: Rep. William R. Bryant, Jr.

Committee: Education

THE CONTENT OF THE BILL:

The bill would amend the Revised School Code, which will go into effect on July 1, to require the state board of education to develop a school administrator's certificate. This certificate could be issued to school district and intermediate school superintendents, principals, assistant principals, and others whose primary responsibility is administering instructional programs and could be issued to school district and intermediate school district chief business officials. The bill specifies that a person is not required to have a school administrator's certificate or an endorsement to be employed as a school administrator by a school district, public school academy, intermediate school district, or nonpublic school.

The bill also would require the state board to develop appropriate certificate endorsements for school district and intermediate school district superintendents; chief business officials; and building administrators by elementary school, middle school, and high school level. The board would determine the educational and professional experience requirements for and issue all certificates for these administrators and determine how these administrators could obtain renewal units for periodic recertification.

In addition to other requirements, a person would have to provide evidence that he or she had successfully completed postgraduate coursework or training in curriculum and personnel evaluation, as specified by state board rule, in order to be eligible for an initial school administrator's certificate for administering instructional programs and for an initial endorsement as a building administrator, or for renewal of a certificate or endorsement after September 1, 1995, if the requirements had not been met for the initial certification or endorsement.

The state board would be required to promulgate rules to implement the bill's provisions, which would take effect July 1, 1996. (The provisions in the bill are similar to those currently in the code but which are scheduled to be repealed as of July 1.)

MCL 380.1536

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS:

The bill would continue current practice as regards certificates and endorsements for school administrators. In that sense, the bill would have no fiscal impact, according to the House Fiscal Agency. (3-12-96)

ARGUMENTS:

For:

The bill would reinstate provisions regarding the issuing of the school administrator's certificate that would otherwise be repealed as of July 1. The bill would leave things as they are currently, with no requirement that a person have an administrator's certificate to be employed as a school administrator but with the state board of education required to develop a certificate which can be issued to those who qualify for them. It makes sense for the state to issue the certificate and endorsements with uniform standards rather than force schools of education to develop their own, possibly It also permits Michigan different, standards. administrators seeking positions in other states to benefit from reciprocity agreements. The bill also would delete some provisions that reportedly have never been used regarding endorsements for people employed in various state departments in positions similar to school administrators.

POSITIONS:

Among those who have indicated their support for the bill are the Michigan Association of School Boards, the Michigan Education Association, the Michigan Association of School Administrators, the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, and the Michigan Elementary and Middle Schools Principals Association. (3-12-96)

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan House staff for use by Housemembers in their deliberations, and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.