

---

# 3A

## Information

### *Credentialing and Certificated Assignments Committee*

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

---

**Executive Summary:** Education Code §44258.9 requires the Commission to monitor the seven single district counties in California. This agenda item provides the results of the assignment monitoring review for San Francisco Unified School District during the 2007-2008 academic year.

**Recommended Action:** For information only

**Presenter:** Roxann L. Purdue, Assistant Consultant, Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

**Strategic Plan Goal 2:**

**Support policy development related to educator preparation, conduct and professional growth**

- Provide and report information to the legislature, stakeholders and other state agencies

November 2008

---

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

---

## **Introduction**

The purpose of this information item is to report the results of the assignment monitoring for the certificated employees in San Francisco Unified School District during the 2007-2008 academic year. This item includes cumulative data for all schools in the San Francisco Unified School District (district) on unauthorized assignments identified as a result of assignment monitoring activities. As required by statute, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission) conducts a complete monitoring for each of the seven single district counties every four years. In addition, assignment monitoring is conducted annually among these districts that also include California's lowest performing schools based on the 2006 Base Academic Performance Index (API) including additional data collection related to English learners.

An explanation of common terms used in this report is provided below for clarification.

### *Misassignment*

The placement of a certificated employee in a teaching or services position for which the employee does not hold a legally recognized certificate, credential, permit, or waiver with an appropriate authorization for the assignment or is not authorized for the assignment under another section of the law.

### *Academic Performance Index (API)*

A measurement maintained by the California Department of Education of the academic performance and growth of schools. It is a numeric index or scale that ranges from a low of 200 to a high of 1000. A school's score on the API is an indicator of a school's performance level. For purposes of monitoring the decile 1, 2 and 3 schools including the English learner data collection, 2003 is the base year used for assignment monitoring activities.

### *Deciles*

California schools are ranked in deciles 1 (lowest) through 10 (highest) based on the API. If a decile 1, 2, or 3 school is under review through a state or federal intervention program, the school is exempt from annual monitoring. Title 5 California Code of Regulations §17101 defines which schools are considered 'under review' for purposes of the implementation of the Williams settlement.

## **Background**

California Education Code (EC) §44258.9 requires the Commission to monitor and review the 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, 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. The Commission maintains a calendar for monitoring all seven single district counties within the four year monitoring cycle. The 2007-2008 academic year was designated for

monitoring San Francisco Unified School District as the number of certificated staff far exceeds the other single district counties. The other fifty-one 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 four-year monitoring cycle. The most recent report was completed for the 2003-2007 monitoring cycle and presented at the August 2008 Commission meeting. In the future, this data will be reported to the Commission and Legislature every two years and will incorporate the data collected by the Commission from the seven single district counties.

All certificated assignments in San Francisco Unified School District were monitored by the Commission during the 2007-2008 academic year as part of the one-fourth monitoring cycle. In addition, the Commission monitors the assignments for all schools ranked in deciles 1, 2 and 3 (2006 Base API) in San Francisco Unified School District each year.

The last full monitoring of the district occurred in the 2003-2004 academic year with additional yearly monitoring conducted each following year in the schools ranked in deciles 1, 2 and 3. For the full monitoring conducted in 2007-2008, the Commission requested the following information from the district to allow Commission staff to complete a paper monitoring of certificated assignments prior to our site visit at the district office and selected school sites in early April of 2008:

- Class schedules for elementary, middle, high and alternative schools;
- Master schedules for elementary, middle, high and alternative schools;
- Master list of all certificated staff in county, including the names and assignments for all non-teaching certificated positions; and
- Board minutes for any assignments requiring School Board action.

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 of assignments where additional clarification was needed include teachers on special assignment and college to career classes. At the conclusion of the paper monitoring review, a list of approximately 764 questionable assignments were sent to the district's credential analyst to research and provide clarification for the assignments in question.

### **Teacher Misassignment Data**

San Francisco Unified School District is a K-12 district serving a population of over 55,000 students. The Commission monitored 107 school sites which included 71 elementary schools, 14 middle schools, 14 high schools and 8 alternative schools as well as all certificated staff assigned through the district's central office. In total, the assignments of approximately 3,800 staff were reviewed including both teachers and other certificated employees who serve in support positions such as administrators, librarians, and counselors. After a review of all questionable assignments with district staff, a total of 221 or 5.8% of their certificated staff were identified as misassigned.

Commission staff conducted a site visit at the district office in the first week of April in 2008. Pre-selected school sites were also visited at this time which included interviews with school site administrators and teachers at each site. District office staff met with Commission staff to discuss the questionable misassignments and work on resolutions. A final exit meeting was conducted with the district superintendent, Carlos Garcia, and district staff members to review a summary of the questionable assignment data and discuss broad areas of concern.

The district office staff reviewed the questionable assignments and provided a response to Commission staff. Statute requires the Commission to send a letter to the county superintendent within 30 days of the conclusion of the assignment monitoring detailing the results of the monitoring. As a result, the Commission sent a letter to Superintendent Garcia on May 2, 2008 along with a final chart of the 221 certificated staff identified with misassignments for correction. Approximately 20 staff members at the secondary level were placed in more than one unauthorized assignment. In addition, Commission staff identified the following four primary areas of global concern as a result of the review:

- Lack of communication between the district office and the school sites;
- Limited tracking by district office of expired documents, applications returned by the Commission, and one year documents with additional requirements for renewal as they relate to current assignments;
- Misassignment of teachers of English learners and students with special needs; and
- Inaccurate reflection of current job codes, classes taught, and services provided on District's master printout of assignments and credentials.

The letter to Superintendent Garcia included a chart showing the name and social security number of the certificated individuals at each school site, the identified unauthorized assignment(s), and Commission staff suggestions for possible correction. The misassignments were found at every level with the highest concentration by far at the high school level; 42 staff in elementary schools, 37 staff in middle schools, 115 staff in high schools, and 27 staff in alternative schools including district-wide teaching and non-teaching assignments.

The 221 staff initially identified as misassigned fell into a variety of categories; however, the majority of staff was identified with an English learner misassignment accounting for approximately 47% or 104 teachers that did not hold an appropriate English learner authorization for the services being provided. The majority of English learner misassignments were resolved with the issuance or renewal of an Emergency CLAD/BCLAD Permit or Waiver.

A total of 70 certificated staff was teaching in a subject area not authorized by their credential. Commission staff recommended that 58 of these assignments could be resolved by the use of one of the local teaching assignment options available to employers in statute or regulations or with a Limited Assignment Permit. 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.

An additional 25 teachers were identified as serving in an unauthorized special education assignment. A variety of suggestions were made for these individuals that included the use of Short-Term Staff Permits, internships and removal from the assignment. In addition, 12 certificated staff members were categorized by the district as teachers on special assignment or resource teachers. Commission staff required clarification on these as to the actual assignment.

The district was provided 30 days to respond to the Commission concerning the misassignments. The district responded to most but not all misassignments within that 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 Garcia a Compliance Agreement that included the remedial steps the district must take to correct the remaining 35 misassignments within 30 days. The superintendent signed the agreement and the 35 misassignments were corrected.

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, 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 misassign 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.

### **Summary**

As previously noted, the Commission has monitored the assignments in San Francisco Unified School District as a full or partial monitoring every year for the last 9 years. While progress has been made in district record keeping, the percentage of initial misassignments is still relatively high at 5.8%, an increase from the 4.7% identified in the last full monitoring conducted in 2003-2004 in this district. In contrast, while the overall state percentage for misassignments during the last report cycle was 6.3%, only 11 of the 58 counties identified a percentage of misassignments higher than the San Francisco Unified School District. (2007 Report to the Legislature). The Commission continues to work with the Human Resources Division at the San Francisco Unified District on an on-going basis to insure appropriate assignment of their certificated staff.

### **Next Steps**

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.

In November, the Commission will begin the 2008-2009 academic year monitoring in San Francisco Unified for approximately 30 schools that are ranked in deciles 1, 2 and 3 (2006 Base API) as required by statute. In addition, the Commission has selected one middle school and one high school for re-monitoring based on the high number of subject area misassignments at these two sites during the 2007-2008 academic year. This monitoring will include a site visit to the district office.

The Commission continues to work closely with the district on their action plan for teachers of English learners in order to ensure that the teachers complete their training for the full authorization.