

---

# 5A

## Information

### *Credentialing and Certificated Assignments Committee*

### **Report on the Assignment Monitoring Review of San Francisco Unified School District**

---

**Executive Summary:** Education Code Section 44258.9 requires the Commission to monitor and review the assignment practices in the seven single school district counties in the state. This item discusses the results of the 2003-2004 school year review of the assignments in the San Francisco Unified School District.

**Recommended Action:** None

**Presenter:** Terri H. Fesperman, Assistant Consultant

**Strategic Plan Goal: 1**

**Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators**

- ◆ Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators

---

# **Report on the Assignment Monitoring Review of San Francisco Unified School District**

---

## **Introduction**

The purpose of this information item is to report the results of the 2003-2004 school year monitoring of San Francisco School District, one of seven single district counties the Commission monitors for certificated employee assignments every four years.

## **Background**

Legislation signed in 1986, Senate Bill 2371 (Watson, Statutes of 1986, Chapter 1279), required the Commission on Teacher Credentialing to conduct a statewide study of the misassignment of credentialed personnel. The Commission reported its findings and recommendations in a report to the Legislature in February 1987. Among its findings, the study concluded that 8% of the State's secondary teachers were misassigned for one or more class periods during the 1985-1986 school year. Based on the findings and recommendations of the study, the Commission sponsored Senate Bill 435 (Watson, Statutes of 1987, Chapter 1376) that was signed into law in October 1987 to address a number of issues concerning certificated personnel assignments. The resulting Education Code, Section 44258.9, required each county to establish procedures for reviewing the certificated assignments in one-third of their school districts each year. The code section changed in 1996 to require monitoring in one-fourth of the districts annually.

The Commission has the responsibility to monitor and review assignments for the counties, or cities and counties, in which there is a single school district. These include the counties of Alpine, Amador, Del Norte, Mariposa, Plumas, and Sierra, and the City and County of San Francisco (referred to as "district" in this item). The seven counties are all small, rural, and remote with the exception of San Francisco which is a large urban school district. All other counties must report their assignment monitoring findings to the Commission on July 1 of each year. This data is analyzed and reported to the Commission and the Legislature at the end of each monitoring four-year cycle.

## **San Francisco Unified School District Monitoring**

The Commission monitors all assignments in a county once during the four-year cycle and San Francisco Unified School District, which is a K-12 district serving a population of over 60,000 students, was monitored in 2003-2004. There are 116 schools in the district: 78 elementary schools, 17 middle schools, and 21 high schools. The district employs approximately 4,850 teachers and an additional 450 certificated employees that serve in support positions such as administrators, librarians, and counselors.

As part of the Commission's responsibility to monitor assignments for the counties, or cities and counties, in which there is a single school district, staff reviewed the assignments in San

Francisco Unified School District in 1999-2000. As a result of the number and type of misassignments found in the district, the Commission re-monitored the district in 2000-2001, and conducted a random monitoring of the assignments in the district for the next two years. In the 2003-2004 school year, the Commission again completed a full monitoring of all assignments in the school district.

The Commission requested the following information from San Francisco Unified School District to allow the staff to complete a paper monitoring of certificated assignments at the Commission office.

- Class schedules for elementary, middle and high schools;
- Master schedules for elementary, middle and high schools;
- Master list of all certificated employees in the county, including the names and assignments for all non-teaching certificated positions;
- Board minutes for any assignments requiring School Board action;
- Approved board resolution, guidelines for establishment, and record of action taken for the Committee on Assignments [EC §44258.7(c)(d)]; and
- Policies, practices, guidelines for establishment, and a record of action taken for assigning teachers to teach departmentalized classes in grades K-12 (EC §44258.3).

Commission staff reviewed each certificated assignment in the district by matching each individual's name and credential(s) held to his or her assignment on the class schedule provided by the school site. For each discrepancy found, the information specific to the individual's assignment and certification was noted. This included the listing of individuals serving in assignments for which the Commission needed clarification of their job duties. Some examples where clarification was needed were resource teachers, project coordinators, and teachers on special assignment. At the conclusion of the paper monitoring review, a list of the questionable assignments were sent to the district's credential analyst to research and clarify the assignments in question.

Commission staff reviewed the response from the district on the questionable assignments to determine if the assignments were appropriate. Statute requires the Commission to send a letter to the county superintendent within 30 days of the conclusion of the monitoring detailing the results of the monitoring. Of the 5300 certificated employees, the Commission had difficulties receiving information from the school district regarding the credential held and assignment of 389 individuals that were either listed on a site level class schedule but not on the master list of district credential holders or vice-versa. The Commission needed clarification of the site where the individual was serving, their assignment, and credentials held before a determination could be made if these individuals were appropriately assigned.

Because of this delay, the Commission sent a preliminary letter to Superintendent Arlene Ackerman in March 2004 with a summary of the 2003-2004 monitoring listing the 225 misassignments found with instructions that the final report would be sent following the receipt of information on the 389 individuals for whom assignment information had not been sent to the Commission. The final report was sent to the school district in early April which included an additional 24 misassignments to make the total of 249 misassignments reported to the school district. Both letters included a chart showing the name and social security number of the

misassigned certificated individuals at each school site and the timeline (45 days to respond) involved for correcting the misassignments. The misassignments were found at every level; 66 in elementary schools, 88 at middle schools, 79 in high schools, and 16 in district-wide teaching and non-teaching assignments.

The 249 misassignments fell into ten areas that could be corrected in the following manner:

- 9 individuals who did not hold any certification and no application was on file including three of these individuals that did not have fingerprint clearance on file;  
*Submit application, fee, livescan or fingerprint cards, and supporting materials for credentials or remove the individuals from the classroom*
- 2 individuals who had not passed the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) during the first year of their preliminary credential but remained in the classroom;  
Out-of-state trained teachers are issued a five-year teaching credential. If they have not passed CBEST it must be passed within the first year of validity of the credential or the document becomes invalid. The document becomes valid once CBEST is passed.  
*Remove individuals from the classroom until CBEST is passed*
- 90 by the use of one of a local teaching assignment options available to employers;  
These options allow a fully-credentialed teacher, with his or her consent, to serve outside the subject area of their credential when the teacher's subject-matter competence has been approved by either completion of a specified number of units of course work or a local model of assessment verified according to policies and procedures established by the governing board.  
*Review teacher's subject matter competence, obtain teacher's consent, and receive school board approval*
- 37 teachers whose credentials had expired and no applications were on file to renew;  
*Submit application, fee and supporting materials to renew credentials*
- 14 with applications rejected for supporting materials but not returned to CCTC;  
*Return rejected application with the requested information*
- 24 individuals serving in special education assignments without the appropriate authorization;  
*Submit application, fee, and supporting materials for an emergency education specialist permit*
- 53 by enrolling the teacher in the district's Plan to Remedy the Shortage or apply for an emergency CLAD/BCLAD permit;  
*These are fully credentialed teachers who are serving English learners without the appropriate certification*
- 8 individuals for which the Commission need clarification of job duties;  
*Submit a listing of their job duties/responsibilities*
- 7 individuals serving in service assignments such as administrators, counselors, or speech therapists that did not possess the appropriate certification; and  
*Obtain appropriate certification or remove from assignment*
- 5 individuals who held internship credentials or certificates, emergency permits, or waivers serving outside their subject area.  
*Obtain appropriate certification or remove from assignment*

The county was given 45 days to respond to the Commission concerning the misassignments. The district responded to most but not all misassignments in the timeline. Because the misassignments were not corrected within the timeline, the Commission began the sanction process. The sanctions are found in Title 5 regulations, beginning in Section 80339. For the first step, the Commission sent Superintendent Ackerman a Compliance Agreement that included the remedial steps the county must take to correct the remaining 28 misassignments within 30 days. The superintendent signed the agreement and the 28 misassignments were corrected within the timeline.

Should a superintendent not sign the compliance agreement or not correct the misassignments in the timeline established, the next step in the sanction process is to contact the governing board of the district/county office to inform them of the non-compliance of the county office, the possible penalties, and the timeline to respond. The notice must be read in the first public meeting following the receipt of the letter. The regulations create a procedure that allows for a thorough review of questionable assignments by a panel of individuals, entitled the Committee on Authorized Assignments, who are knowledgeable about assignment issues. The regulations impose sanctions against administrators who knowingly misassigned individuals and against those individuals who knowingly accept a misassignment. If the employing agency does not make an effort to correct the unauthorized assignment after first being notified by the Commission and the Committee on Authorized Assignments, the Commission can refer their findings to the Committee of Credentials for further investigation and consideration of adverse action against the credentials of the responsible certificated persons who misassigned the individuals.

While the Commission has sent several compliance agreements to county offices, the next steps in the sanction process have not been necessary and the Commission has not had to form the Committee on Authorized Assignments.

As previously noted, the Commission has monitored the assignments in San Francisco Unified School District for the past five years, either as a full or a random monitoring. While progress was made in the number of misassignments, the percentage of misassignments is still above the state average of 2.5% (based on the 2000 report to the Legislature) as shown in the chart below.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of Schools</b>	<b>Number of Staff Reviewed (approx)</b>	<b>Misassignments</b>	<b>% of Misassignments</b>
1999-2000	120	5300	520	9.8%
2000-2001	120	5300	335	6.3%
2001-2002	27	1100	148	13.5%
2002-2003	15	1200	75	6.3%
2003-2004	120	5300	249	4.7%

The Commission continues to work with the Human Resources Division at the San Francisco Unified District on an on-going basis to appropriately assign their certificated staff.