

Minutes of the October 6, 2005 Commission Meeting

Minutes of October 6, 2005 Meeting of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

COMMISSION MEMBERS ATTENDING

Leslie Peterson Schwarze, School Board Member, Chair
Catherine Banker, Public Representative
Maytte Bustillos, Teacher
Paul Clopton, Public Representative
Guillermo Gomez, Teacher
Gloria Grant, Teacher
Elaine C. Johnson, Public Representative
Steve Lilly, Faculty Member
Leslie Littman, Designee, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Aida Molina, School Administrator

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT

Jon Stordahl, Teacher, Vice Chair

EX-OFFICIO REPRESENTATIVES

Marilyn McGrath, California Postsecondary Education Commission
Athena Waite, University of California
Beverly Young, California State University

EX-OFFICIO REPRESENTATIVES ABSENT

Karen Symms Gallagher, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities

STATE BOARD LIAISON

Ruth Bloom, absent

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENTING

Sam Swofford, Executive Director
Mary Armstrong, General Counsel, Director, Professional Practices Division
Bonnie Parks, Director, External Relations and Business Affairs
Larry Birch, Administrator, Professional Services Division
Terri H. Fesperman, Assistant Consultant, Certification, Assignments and Waivers Divisions
Helen Hawley, Consultant, Professional Services Division
Joe Dear, Consultant, Professional Services Division
Amy Jackson, Administrator, Professional Services Division
Dale Janssen, Director, Certification, Assignments and Waivers Divisions
Beth Graybill, Division of Professional Services presented this information action item.

RECORDING SECRETARY

William Stockwin

October 6, 2005

GENERAL SESSION

2A: Call meeting to order; call roll; pledge

The General Session was called to order by Commission Chair Leslie Peterson Schwarze. Roll was taken, confirming the presence of a quorum.

Following the Pledge of Allegiance, the Commission was addressed by Scott Himmelstein, Deputy Secretary for Education and Chief of Staff to Secretary Bersin.

Mr. Himmelstein formally introduced himself, conveyed greetings from Secretary Bersin and stated his and the Secretary's appreciation for the work being done by the Commission and its staff to design and implement the Governor's and the Secretary's vision for education in California.

Regarding the Commission's budget, Mr. Himmelstein said the 2005-2006 Commission budget contains a \$2.7 million shortfall which the legislature provided in one-time support, but said that can't be allowed to continue to happen. Toward that end, he said, the Secretary and the Department of Finance are engaged in a zero-based budgeting process in which they are examining the Commission's core functions and developing a resource plan that will support those functions on an ongoing, stable basis.

He said some of the other issues being worked on by the Secretary include "the notion" of streamlining teacher certification. He said there are a lot of things that can and should be done, and that the Secretary looks forward to engaging the Commission in that process. He said the Secretary is also interested in looking at budgetary and programmatic accreditation issues.

In closing, he said the Secretary will soon be making recommendations to the Governor regarding new appointments to the Commission.

2B: Approval of August 2005 minutes

The motion to approve the August 2005 minutes was made (Johnson), seconded (Banker) and carried without dissent.

2C: Approval of the October 2005 agenda

The motion to approve the October 2005 agenda was made (Banker), seconded (Grant) and carried without dissent.

2D: Approval of the October 2005 Consent Calendar

The motion to approve the October 2005 consent calendar was made (Johnson), seconded (Banker) and carried without dissent.

Division of Professional Practices

The Commission approved the following:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE OF CREDENTIALS

Education Code section 44244.1 allows the Commission to adopt the recommendation of the Committee of Credentials without further proceedings if the individual does not request an administrative hearing within a specified time.

1. ALOCOZY, Tara Fremont, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.

2. BAILEY, Robert K. Valley Village, CA
Mr. Bailey is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

3. BALESKIE, Teresa I. Downey, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of thirty (30) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

4. BERK, Marcella L. Rocklin, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.

5. BIGBY, Richard N. Porterville, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of forty-five (45) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

6. BLANEY, Darla J. Desert Hot Springs, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.

7. BLOSSOM, Beverly A. Stockton, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.

October 6, 2005 Commission Meeting
Approved Minutes

8. BUENOROSTRO, Angelica Thermal, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
9. CAMPBELL, Jessie E. Chula Vista, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
10. CAREY, Todd M. Sebastopol, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
11. CHATTEN, Scott A. Apple Valley, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
12. CHAVEZ, Peter A. Bakersfield, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
13. COLLIER, Gary R. Riverside, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
14. CORTINAS, Olga L. Los Angeles, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of ten (10) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
15. DANIEL, Stephen A. Merced, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
16. DAVIS, Diane D. Arcadia, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of five (5) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
17. DOAN, Lee C. Rialto, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
18. DORSEY, Lenine San Rafael, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.

October 6, 2005 Commission Meeting
Approved Minutes

19. DOUGHERTY, Carol C. Gardena, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of five (5) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44420.
20. DOWNS, Tracey M. Upland, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
21. DOYLE, Michael Visalia, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of five (5) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
22. DUNN, Cody S. Lakewood, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
23. EMERSON, Harry J. San Clemente, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of fifteen (15) days and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
24. FREEMAN, Richard Provo, UT
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
25. FREY, Richard Bishop, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of sixty (60) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
26. GARCIA, Enrique West Covina, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of twenty (20) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
27. GHANIZADEH, Minoos Corona Del Mar, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
28. GUARNIERI, Gregory J. Riverside, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.

29. HART, Eric N. McKinney, TX
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
30. HASSAN, Julie H. Grass Valley, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of ten (10) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
31. HENRY, Christine S. Agua Dulca, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
32. HOLMES, Betty L. Sacramento, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
33. HOWARD, Carole C. Inglewood, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
34. KATAYAMA, Karen N. Vacaville, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
35. KENNEDY, Penjalee C. South Pasadena, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of five (5) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
36. KILGORE, Antoinette D. Bay Point, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
37. KNIGHT, Gary B. Sacramento, CA
Mr. Knight is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
38. LESTER, Anastasia K. Bakersfield, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421.

39. MARGHERITA, Matt J. Los Gatos, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of fifteen (15) days and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
40. MAYER, Scott I. Quincy, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
41. McCLENDON, Ryan J. Orangevale, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of thirty (30) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
42. McGINNIS, Mark A. Oceanside, CA
Mr. McGinnis is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
43. McINTOSH, Cynthia D. Stockton, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of sixty (60) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44420.
44. MORGAN, Steve D., Jr. Klamath Falls, OR
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
45. NAAS, Charleen E. Chino, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
46. NEILL, Christopher J. Riverside, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
47. OBUSZEWSKI, Donald J. Claremont, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of five (5) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

October 6, 2005 Commission Meeting
Approved Minutes

48. ORTIZ-CORLETO, Leticia S. Montebello, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of thirty (30) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, effective immediately.
49. PARIS-SALB, John Sacramento, CA
Mr. Paris-Salb is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, effective immediately.
50. PARIZO, Todd O. Stockton, CA
Mr. Parizo is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, effective immediately.
51. PASILLAS, Guillermo S. Los Angeles, CA
Mr. Pasillas is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
52. RAY, Donald P. Salinas, CA
Mr. Ray is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
53. REHE, Diane M. Windsor, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
54. RINGHOFER, Katherine M. Crestline, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of five (5) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
55. SALAZAR, David P. Carmichael, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
56. SANCHEZ, Roberto L. Orangevale, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
57. SARINANA-RENTERIA, Raul Buena Park, CA
Mr. Sarinana-Renteria is the subject of public reproof and all pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.

October 6, 2005 Commission Meeting
Approved Minutes

58. SKARET, Wayne E. Kingsburg, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of forty-five (45) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
59. SMITH, Daniel W. Atascadero, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of five (5) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
60. SOTO, Jose De Jesus, Jr. North Hollywood, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of five (5) days and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
61. STOCKMAL, David B. Yuba City, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
62. SUGDEN, Janine C. Walnut Creek, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
63. SYLVESTER, Mark D. Martinez, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of sixty (60) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
64. THOMAS, Lary Inglewood, CA
Mr. Thomas is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
65. TINSLEY, Robert E. Pinole, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of sixty (60) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
66. TOYE, Zelda M. Long Beach, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
67. WANDSCHNEIDER, Sandra L. San Anselmo, CA
Ms. Wandschneider is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

68. WRIGHT, Cherita B. Los Angeles, CA
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
69. YONKERS, Rodney B. Simi Valley, CA
Mr. Yonkers is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
70. ZAVALA, Edica V. Bakersfield, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.

CONSENT DETERMINATIONS

71. BEAZER, Marjorie C. Sacramento, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, that allows Ms. Beazer to withdraw her application, is adopted.
72. RUPP, Carol E. Byron, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are suspended for a period of ninety (90) days, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
73. SPAHR, Peter C. Winters, CA
The Attorney General's Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are revoked, however, the revocation is stayed, and he is placed on probation until October 1, 2007 or until he satisfies conditions in the Proposed Consent Determination, and he must permanently surrender all agriculture-related credentials, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
74. STREAMFELLOW, Juliet S. Mokelumne Hill, CA
The Attorney General's Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are suspended for a period of thirty-five (35) days, effective December 5, 2005 through January 8, 2005, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
75. VEGA, Augustine B. Grand Terrace, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that Mr. Vega is the subject of public reproof, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
76. ZUNIGA, Anthony D. Monterey Park, CA
The Attorney General's Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that Mr. Zuniga's application for a Preliminary Clear Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is granted, however, the revocation is stayed, and he is placed on probation for a period of three (3) years, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.

RECONSIDERATION CONSENT
(No new information)

77. McCaffry, Michael J. Rohnert Park, CA
At its August 11, 2005 meeting, the Commission adopted the Committee of Credential's recommendation to revoke all certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and any pending applications.
Mr. McCaffry submitted a letter dated September 6, 2005, requesting reconsideration. No new information was provided.
78. Olmedo, Lorna Del Rosario San Jose, CA
At its May 31, 2005 through June 1, 2005 meeting, the Commission adopted the Committee of Credential's recommendation to suspend all certification documents for a period of fifteen (15) days. Ms. Olmedo submitted a letter dated July 29, 2005, requesting reconsideration. No new information was provided.

PRIVATE ADMONITIONS

Pursuant to Education Code section 44438, the Committee of Credentials recommends three (3) private admonitions for the Commission's approval.

FINDINGS

79. Winningham, Jonathan Calimesa, CA
The Decision and Order, which stipulates that Mr. Winningham's credentials are suspended for a period of sixty (60) days, is adopted.

DECISIONS AND ORDERS

80. Drucker, William E. Imperial Beach, CA
In accordance with the default provisions of Government Code section 11520, Mr. Drucker's credentials are revoked and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
81. Farmer, Kenneth E. Clovis, CA
In accordance with the default provisions of Government Code section 11520, Mr. Farmer's credentials are revoked for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

PROPOSED DECISION

82. Robinson, Mark A. San Francisco, CA
The Administrative Law Judge's Proposed Decision, which reflects the Committee of Credentials' recommendation to deny any pending applications, is adopted.

RESCISSIONS

83. Oshodi, Theresa M. Upland, CA
The Commission's action on the August 18, 2005 Consent Calendar to deny all pending applications is hereby rescinded.

84. CHILD, Jennifer M. Orange, CA
The Commission's action reported on the September/October 2004 (#2) All Points Bulletin to revoke all certification documents, is hereby rescinded.

REQUESTS FOR REVOCATION

The Commission may revoke credentials upon the written request of the credential holder pursuant to Education Code sections 44423 and 44440.

85. METROCK, Mathew Alta, CA
Upon his written request, pursuant to Education Code section 44423, his Life Single Subject Teaching Credential is revoked.

86. WILLIAMS, Henry F. Quincy, CA
Upon his written request, pursuant to Education Code section 44423, his supplemental authorization of Social Science: History on his Life Standard Secondary Teaching Credential is revoked.

**DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES
MANDATORY ACTIONS**

All certification documents held by and applications filed by the following individuals were mandatorily revoked or denied pursuant to Education Code sections 44346, 44346.1, 44424, 44425 and 44425.5, which require the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing to mandatorily revoke the credentials held by individuals convicted of specified crimes and to mandatorily deny applications submitted by individuals convicted of specified crimes.

87. ANDERSON, Harold W. Long Beach, CA
88. CLARK, Ilya Los Angeles, CA
89. DALEY, John S. Redondo Beach, CA
90. DICKSON, Brad N. Vacaville, CA
91. GOULD, Alan Tujunga, CA
92. JOHNSON, Thaddeus M. Sacramento, CA
93. KELLY, Thomas H. Placentia, CA
94. MacGOVERN, Phillip J. Paso Robles, CA
95. MULARI, Patricia M. Riverside, CA
96. PARAYNO, Maximo D. III Fresno, CA
97. PEDRI, Jeffrey V. Sonoma, CA

October 6, 2005 Commission Meeting
Approved Minutes

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| 98. PENA, Oscar A. | Parlier, CA |
| 99. PUTMAN, Jamie R. | Phelan, CA |
| 100. RAHH, Arthur | Long Beach, CA |
| 101. RODRIGUEZ, David | Fresno, CA |
| 102. RYLANDER, David E. | Chula Vista, CA |
| 103. SANTAN, Ruben M. | Santa Ana, CA |
| 104. SCOTT, Katherine K. | West Hills, CA |
| 105. STEVENSON, Sharon D. | Stockton, CA |
| 106. TACKETT, Michael T. | Simi Valley, CA |
| 107. TRUJILLO, Juan G. | Fresno, CA |

AUTOMATIC SUSPENSIONS

All certification documents held by the following individuals were automatically suspended because a complaint, information or indictment was filed in court alleging each individual committed an offense specified in Education Code section 44940. Their certification documents will remain automatically suspended until the Commission receives notice of entry of judgment pursuant to Education Code section 44940(d) and (e).

- | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| 108. BENCH-SALORIO, Sarah S. | Orange, CA |
| 109. HALL, Elijah J. | Dixon, CA |
| 110. MURPHY, Charles T., Jr. | Murrieta, CA |
| 111. O'DONNELL, Brian P. | Arcata, CA |
| 112. RODRIGUEZ, Victor | Huntington Beach, CA |
| 113. SOTO, Edmundo G. | San Deigo, CA |
| 114. WELSH, David J. | San Jose, CA |

NO CONTEST SUSPENSIONS

All credentials held by the following individuals were suspended, pursuant to Education Code section 44424 or 44425, because a plea of no contest was entered to an offense specified in the above sections of the Education Code. The credentials will remain suspended until final disposition by the Commission.

115. DIAMANTE, Jerry V. Inglewood, CA
116. GONZALES, Scott M. Sherman Oaks, CA

TERMINATION OF AUTOMATIC SUSPENSIONS

Pursuant to Education Code section 44940(d), the automatic suspension of all credentials held by the following individuals are terminated and the matters referred to the Committee of Credentials for review.

117. ARVIZU, Ricardo Cypress, CA
118. CALLAHAN, Jason P. Thousand Oaks, CA
119. SOUZA, Dylan H. Alameda, CA

TERMINATION OF NON-DISCIPLINARY SUSPENSION

120. OMER, Douglas W. Escondido, CA
The suspension of all certification documents pursuant to the terms of his Consent Determination and Order, requiring the tolling of the probation while Mr. Omer was out of the state, is terminated.

TERMINATIONS OF PROBATION

121. BANGLE, Delbert F. El Cajon, CA
Having successfully complied with the terms and conditions of probation contained in the Consent Determination and Order, which was adopted by the Commission on July 13-14, 1995, the stay order has been made permanent and his credential is restored.
122. CASTILLO, Guillermo San Diego, CA
Having successfully complied with the terms and conditions of probation contained in the Consent Determination and Order, which was adopted by the Commission on October 1, 2004, the period of probation and monitoring has ceased.
123. NORENE, Lamont J. Yuba City, CA
Having successfully complied with the terms and conditions of probation contained in the Consent Determination and Order, which was adopted by the Commission on July 11, 2002, the stay order has been made permanent and his credential is restored.
124. PORTER, Margaret E. San Luis Obispo, CA
Having successfully complied with the terms and conditions of probation contained in the Consent Determination and Order, which was adopted by the Commission on July 19, 2002, the stay order has been made permanent and her credential is restored.

Certification, Assignment & Waivers Division

DENIAL OF CREDENTIAL WAIVER REQUESTS

The Appeals and Waviers Committee having reviewed these waiver requests has recommended they be denied. The employing districts have not asked for reconsideration of the Committee's decisions.

1. Maria Ana Brown/Paradise Unified School District
2. Erin M. McHale/Mt. Diablo Unified School District
3. Chandra Yvette Edwards/Eko Multi-Purpose Center, Inc.
4. Jennifer Lynn Goins/Antioch Unified School District
5. Rita Eileen Eubanks/Pacifica School District
6. Leah Diane Wong/Coalinga/Huron Joint Unified School District
7. Sally Joy Shurter/San Jose Unified School District
8. Carla Marie Obiago/Long Beach Unified School District
9. Joel David Weckler/Riverside Unified School District
10. Amy Alisha Alger/Norwalk-La Mirada Unified School District
11. Marjorie M. Banks/Pasadena Unified School District
12. Christopher Lee Cain/Spectrum Center
13. Sophal Tes/Regency High School at Shandin Hills

2E Chair's report

The chair briefly reviewed the Commission's policy that calls for nominating new officers at the second to last meeting of the year, followed by an election at the last meeting of the year. She said that in the current circumstances, however, where the Commission has four vacancies and four other Commissioner terms expiring in November of this year, the Administration had requested a postponement of the nomination and election process until new appointments can be made and seated on the Commission. She then asked for a motion to waive Section 301 of the Commission's policy manual.

The motion to waive Section 301 of the Commission's policy manual was made (Johnson), seconded (Molina) and carried without dissent.

Chair Schwarze discussed three reports that are due to be submitted to the Legislature; two on potential cost saving strategies in the area of teacher discipline, due on November 15, and a third focused on potential cost saving measures related to certification, due on December 15. She commented that those deadlines would not allow for an opportunity for the Commission to review the reports. She asked for and received consensus on requesting an extension on the reports' submission dates so that the Commission can include a discussion of these reports on the next Commission agenda.

2F: Executive Director's report

Dr. Swofford began his report by calling on Susan Porter for an update on progress towards completion of the Cultural Competency Study required by Assembly Bill 54 (Oropeza).

Ms. Porter said AB 54 required the Commission to work with an independent evaluator to complete a cultural competency study of teachers and administrators at 10 California schools. The legislation required that selected schools reflect the demography and geography of California and the numbers of English learners and linguistic diversity of California's school population. The study would include such factors as the experience of teachers, the availability and effectiveness of cultural competency training in teaching credential programs and professional development programs, and the possible relationship between cultural competency training and improved API scores among the schools in the study. She said the evaluators were also to determine whether effective model programs could be adopted statewide for cultural competency training.

Ms. Porter noted that legislation required a report to be completed by May 1, 2005, however, the evaluator encountered delays in collecting data. The deadline was extended until September but that the final report was delivered to the Commission too late for an analysis of its findings in order to be placed on this meeting's agenda. She said copies of the report would go to the legislature and to Commissioners, would also be posted on the Commission Web site and for the Commission to expect an agenda item on the report at a future meeting.

Dr. Swofford continued his report, saying he's become very encouraged about the future of this agency following numerous meetings with Secretary Bersin and his staff members, all of whom have expressed their commitment to working with the Commission and its staff.

Dr. Swofford said an invitation had been extended to the Department of Finance and Legislative Analyst Office to assist them in better understanding how the Commission implements its mission, policies and responsibilities. He said he looks forward to meeting with the Department of Finance to work out the budget challenges. He commended staff, currently down from over 200 a few years ago to 158 now. In particular, he recognized Mary Armstrong, Mary Butera, Dale Janssen, Beth Graybill, Crista Hill, Bonnie Parks, Amy Jackson and Cheryl Hickey, thanking them for their leadership and contributions in trying times.

2G Commission Member reports

Commissioner Johnson reported the losses of Sandra Feldman and Marilyn Whirry to the teaching profession. She said the two women shared the vision of improving society through education and that both would be missed.

2H: Liaison Reports

There were no reports.

PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES COMMITTEE

3A: Interview for appointment to the Committee of Credentials

Calling the committee to order, Commissioner Johnson said the sole item today was to interview one candidate for selection of an elementary school teacher to the Committee of Credentials. She asked Mary Armstrong, Director Division of Professional Practices, to present a summary of the procedure.

Ms. Armstrong said there was only one candidate to interview due to the new school year starting and that normally the Commission would choose a candidate and an alternate. She referred committee members to interview questions in their meeting packets, and said the candidate, David Bradley had been briefed.

Commissioner Johnson asked about when there might be an opportunity to discuss changing the language of SB 148 in order to find more applicants. Ms. Armstrong said that might be possible later in the legislative season.

The candidate, David Ernest Bradley, was welcomed by Commissioner Johnson and asked for a brief opening statement.

Mr. Bradley said serving on the Committee of Credentials would allow him to advocate and support the teaching profession in an “above and beyond manner.” He said teachers along with parents are the consummate role models in society and have a paramount privilege and responsibility to model all that is excellent, moral and best before each generation of students. He said that as credible role models, teachers are called to live exemplary lives and that teachers must be held accountable for the pledge to uphold the tenets of their credential in a manner worth of the faith and trust placed upon them by society. He said teachers are vulnerable to life’s circumstances and as such must be approached using the framework of consideration based on justice, mercy and the law’s explicit provisions.

He said that as a member of the committee he will strive to consistently uphold the law designed to protect teachers and students alike; to be fair, open and honest in his assessment of each case as a unique entity; to consider all facts and circumstances of each case apart from emotion or hearsay; and will seek to understand past practice has been in similar cases. He said he would work in collaboration with committee members and pledged himself to the task of examining all evidence and consideration of each case in order to render careful and honest evaluation for the sake of all affected by the committee’s decisions. Among his strengths he listed the ability to listen carefully, learn from others, objectively analyze facts, to consider all aspects of each case respectively discerning the needs of people related to their particular circumstances and cultural perspectives.

Mr. Bradley said his experience was diverse in working as a team member in collegial environments and that he possessed a clear understanding of the importance of due process and the need for unbiased evidence when evaluating teachers and their experience. He said that as a teacher he choose to advocate for the children of California by striving to ensure that California’s teachers exemplify the highest possible professional standards at every level of education. He closed his statement by saying that his daily experience as a teacher would afford a perspective and awareness of the increased pressures on teachers striving to work effectively in the 21st Century.

Commissioners Banker, Bustillos, Grant, and Gomez proceeded to ask the interviewer question.

Commissioner Johnson then questioned the candidate regarding the hypothetical case he had been provided with prior to the interview.

Commissioner Johnson asked the Commission for further questions. Hearing none, she asked the candidate if he had questions of the panel. Chair Johnson advised him that, if selected, his appointment would commence on October 19, 2005, that the committee meets once each month for roughly 3.5 days during the third week of every month, and that he would be notified on the committee's action.

Commissioner Gomez moved the appointment of Mr. Bradley to the Committee of Credentials. Commissioner Banker seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

Commissioner Johnson closed the item by saying something needed to be done quickly to produce more candidates for committee positions, then adjourned the committee.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

In the absence of Commissioner Jon Stordahl, Commissioner Banker convened the committee and called on Bonnie Parks, Director, External Relations and Business Affairs to present item 4A.

4A: Status of Legislation of Interest to the Commission

Ms. Parks directed the Commission's attention to three legislative measures. AB 430 (Nava) is the Principal Training Program. She noted that this changes the name of the program to the Administrator Training Program and extends the sunset date for the program by six years to July 2012. Ms. Parks said the bill has been chaptered. The Commission supports this bill. She said that AB 309 (Walters) is the Emergency Permit Study. Ms. Parks explained that this would require the Commission to conduct a study comparing CSU credentialed teachers with emergency permit teachers using the STAR student achievement data by 11/1/06. The Commission took a watch position on this bill. Ms. Parks said the bill died in the Assembly Education Committee. And finally, she discussed AB 420 (Horton, Shirley) related to Languages Other than English (LOTE) Alternative Assessments. This bill would require the Commission to submit an expenditure plan for the development of a subject matter examination in the Filipino language to the Department of Finance no later than January 8, 2006. If there is funding in the 2006 budget, the Commission would also be required to contract with another entity to develop a subject matter examination in the Filipino language to be administered no later than September 1, 2008. She said this bill had been chaptered.

4B: Items of Interest to the Commission

Bonnie Parks said that SB 428 (Scott) would delete the requirement that individuals pass a basic skills examination (currently CBEST) for the purpose of earning a credential, certificate or permit for service in California public schools from the Education Code.

She noted that this bill has been made a two-year bill by the Senator, who has decided to have meetings with various interest groups to determine what they all feel is the importance of the test. She said that staff have met with his staff to provide technical assistance. She said the Commission will be kept informed of further developments.

Commissioner Johnson asked if anything has changed to make it appropriate for the Commission to take a position right now. Ms. Parks said after the turn of the year, once the bill is amended, that it might be appropriate. Hearing no other comments or questions, Commissioner Banker adjourned the committee.

CREDENTIALING AND CERTIFICATED ASSIGNMENTS COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

5A: Proposed Addition to California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Sections 80033 and 80033.1 Pertaining to Internship Credentials

Commissioner Lilly convened the committee and introduced Terri H. Fesperman, Assistant Consultant, Certification, Assignments and Waivers Division.

Ms. Fesperman began by listing the three types of credentials issued by the Commission: university, district and individualized credentials. She said the internship credentials are an alternative route to earn a credential that allows an individual to complete their professional preparation program while serving as the teacher of record.

She said the two sections of proposed regulations before the committee at this meeting were 80033 and 80033.1. The first includes the requirements and authorization for the internship credentials. She then briefly enumerated subsections (a) through (f) as described in the agenda packet. She pointed out that an “as” would be added into subsection (e) (1)’s last sentence, correcting it to read “authorizes the same service as a multiple subject credential. She said a similar correction would be made to subsection (f) (1), inserting the word “and” between “university internship and individualized internship.”

Proceeding to 80033.1, she enumerated its subsections (a) through (d) as presented in the agenda. She said staff is recommending the Commission approve the addition of these regulations to begin the rule making file for the Office of Administrative Law and schedule a public hearing. This would allow the commission to send a notice to the field for the required 45-day notice period before the public hearing.

Commissioner Lilly opened the floor to comments and questions. Ms. Robison, representing the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), said ACSA supports the regulations as stated in the agenda. The issue of the internship program has been part of a larger package that has been under discussion for a couple of years. It has been tied to the elimination of the emergency permits and waivers, but said it was also necessary to have alternatives if a fully credentialed teacher could not be found to staff existing classrooms. She said the Association feels the internship credential provides that alternative, while placing a limit on the number of years a person can be on an internship credential, providing a specific path for them to receive their credential and also indicates that they must receive support from their credential provider and the school district.

When fully credentialed teachers cannot be found, she said, it allows a district to move forward with staffing to serve students. Yet it also provides for the completion of the full credential in a timely manner and also provides support for the holder of an internship credential. She urged the Commission to approve the regulations.

Commissioner Lilly then recognized Bruce Kitchen, representing School District Personnel and Human Resource Administrators of San Bernardino and San Diego counties. Mr. Kitchen said the quality of training and teacher preparation had steadily improved over the last 10 years. He said today's new teachers are of considerably higher quality than in the past and that administrators like what they are getting. He said intern programs are a significant part of that quality growth and that the proposed regulations are supported and urged the Commission's approval.

Commissioner Lilly recognized Commissioner Bustillos, who referred to Title 5 Section 80033.1, section (c) (3) that reads, "Each District intern will complete Instruction in the culture and methods of teaching English learners during the first year of employment for interns employed in bilingual classrooms." She asked whether it was possible to strike the last four or five words so that all interns can complete that course.

Ms. Fesperman said the language was currently in statute and could not be amended.

Commissioner Lilly recognized Ex-Officio Waite. She asked who recommends a person for a credential under the individualized internship. Ms. Fesperman responded the individualized internship is made at the request of an employing school district or county office of education. She said they work cooperatively with applicants and the university to develop the plan, but the responsibility rests with the employer.

Ms. Waite pointed out that wasn't clearly specified in the regulatory language. Ms. Fesperman said it could be added.

Commissioner Lilly asked Ms. Fesperman if additional language was needed. She responded that she thought it was clear.

Ms. Waite asked who recommends for the credential at the end of the work. Ms. Fesperman said that would be the approved college or university where the program was completed.

Commissioner Banker moved to have staff initiate the rulemaking process with regard to these regulations, Commissioner Grant seconded the motion. It carried without dissent.

Commissioner Lilly adjourned the committee.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

6A: Initial Accreditation and Program Approval

Ms. Graybill, Director of the Division of Professional Services, opened the item with a power point presentation. She noted that this agenda item presents programs that are submitted for the Commission's approval and provides a brief overview of the connection between the Commission's program standards and the state's K-12 academic content standards. It also responds to the Commission's request for additional information about the alignment between higher education and public schools with respect to the Commission's approval of programs aligned with the K-12 content standards.

She said that this agenda item has two undergraduate subject matter programs to be considered for approval. The first is a math major at the University of San Diego and the second is a science major at California State University, Chico. This item also includes a proposal for an administrative services program that is the tier-two or second level credential for administrative services from the Los Angeles Unified School District.

She noted that SB 2042 required the Commission to ensure that teacher training programs are aligned with the K-12 content standards. SB 2042 included the approved programs for undergraduate majors (subject matter programs) for prospective teachers, teacher preparation programs, and induction programs.

Ms. Graybill said proposed programs before the Commission have redesigned curriculum according to new requirements, have submitted proposals according to the Commission's adopted procedures, have been reviewed against requirements aligned to the K-12 content standards, and have been required by reviewers to meet all standards. She added that Commission staff have ensured that those reviews take place according to the review procedures. She noted that the supporting documentation submitted by the programs is substantial and the syllabi for those two programs alone is more than can reasonably be included in a single agenda item.

Ms. Graybill discussed the Commission's adoption of 16 different sets of program standards between 2001 and 2005. She described the three phases of standards adoption noting that the first phase included the four core programs: English, Math, Science, and Social Science. The second phase included Art, Music, Physical Education, and Languages Other than English. She said that staff anticipates that the third phase which included standards for Home Economics, Agriculture, Business, Health and Industrial Technology will be brought to the Commission in early 2006.

She explained that most of the programs have not fully transitioned to recently adopted standards, but met standards adopted before the K-12 content standards were adopted. She noted that these older programs then are not aligned to the K-12 content standards and will continue to operate until they are approved under these new sets of standards. She said that the first candidate from these new undergraduate programs will not graduate until Spring 2007.

She reviewed the process that was involved which included the Commission adopting new requirements and standards aligned to the K-12 content standards for those undergraduate majors. Colleges and universities then develop and submit proposals that meet the new requirements and must demonstrate that coursework meets the new requirements. Reviewers of those proposals then make sure that the syllabi, textbooks, and course materials meet the new requirements. She commented that the process does not require institutions to show a direct link to K-12 content standards, but does require them to demonstrate how they meet the Commission requirements. Institutions resubmit until the reviewers determine they meet all Commission standards.

In summary, Ms. Graybill noted that programs that come before the Commission have redesigned curriculum according to new requirements and have submitted proposals according to the Commission's adopted procedures. The documents have been reviewed against requirements to align to the K-12 content standards and have been required by reviewers to meet all standards.

Commissioner Lilly commented that the rules have been defined. Institutions have played by the rules and have received fair and thorough reviews before they come before the Commission. Commissioner Lilly asked for clarification about the current procedures that do not require institutions to show a direct link to the K-12 content standards.

Ms. Graybill clarified that institutions are required to show the link to the subject matter requirements that are aligned to the K-12 content standards. Commissioner Lilly commented further saying that if they show alignment to the Commission's standards then they in fact align to the K-12 content standards. He commented that he believed that the Commission, in fact, then did require institutions to show a direct link to the K-12 content standards.

Commissioner Clopton asked whether the examples listed that include the K-12 standards reference is how they actually appear in the subject matter standards. Ms. Graybill answered in the affirmative. Commissioner Clopton noted that the map makes a direct link to specific K-12 content standards.

Commissioner Clopton inquired about the \$40,000 reference in the powerpoint presentation. Ms. Graybill clarified that this is the total amount for reviewing all 115 programs this year because there are approximately 100 programs somewhere in the review process. She noted that it represents the cost of bringing reviewers together initially for training and calibration.

Commissioner Banker asked for a legal interpretation of the term "Commission" in Education Code Section 44259. After some discussion, Mary Armstrong, General Counsel and Director of the Profession Practices Division, noted that the responsibility for actions taken, ultimately lies with the Commission.

Commissioner Lilly commented that only the Commission, those sitting around the table, can formally adopt standards and that only the Commission can, by a motion and vote, approve programs to meet those standards. He noted that the process by which the Commission gets to that vote depends heavily on staff work and the work of others who are not included in the dollar figure discussed earlier. He said that what the Commission has been struggling with recently is whether there is a sufficient level of understanding and trust of staff and volunteer work to bring the Commission the recommendations. He commented that he believed the process is rigorous and thorough and that he has reached a level of comfort in approving programs once they reach the Commission.

Commissioner Clopton noted that the limited amount of resources directed for this effort is problematic. He noted that it was his understanding that, of the programs that have come before the Commission, all have been approved. He said that this indicates that the level of judgment about these institutions rests with the staff and the reviewers. He said that it may be more beneficial for each submission to come to the Commission with staff recommendations each step

of the way for approval or rejection of that submission or resubmission. This would allow Commissioners to be more aware of the process than simply seeing the final end product.

Commissioner Grant asked for further information about the process once a document is returned to the institution for revisions. Ms. Graybill and Ms. Hawley described the process and the technical assistance that is provided to the programs. Ms. Hawley noted that most programs resubmit at least two times before they are approved.

Commissioner Schwarze asked about the selection process for the reviewers. Ms. Hawley explained that most reviewers are from the original subject matter panels and are authors of the standards. She noted that reviewers must have at least an undergraduate degree in the content area and teaching experience, both in the content area. She noted that staff reviews the nominations and selects those most qualified to meet the requirements. She discussed the calibration process and noted that, in some cases, reviewers may not be called back if there have been problems with their performance. She noted that statute prohibits the Commission from paying reviewers.

Commissioner Bustillos requested a training session for Commissioners to help them better understand the complexity. She noted that she liked the credentialing workshop conducted by Dale Janssen and thought that something similar on this topic would be helpful. She also asked about the administrative services program before the Commission and whether it was the first program of its kind.

Mr. Birch responded that the Commission has approved seven guidelines-based professional administrative services credential programs.

Commissioner Lilly asked for clarification on the cost of the reviews. Ms. Graybill clarified that the figure is for training and calibration of reviewers includes neither staff time nor volunteer time.

Mary Sandy, Assistant Director for Teacher Education, California State University, reminded the Commission that the Subject Matter Standards were developed in a collaborative manner that was advised by staff from the California Department of Education. The State-adopted Academic Content Standards for Students and Frameworks were used as primary source documents in the development of the Commission standards, which underwent substantial field review and independent analysis to ensure that they were aligned with the K-12 standards. The standards were found to be aligned, and evidence of that alignment was presented to the Commission prior to their adoption in 2001. She noted the importance of volunteer professional peer review which ensures that program documents are evaluated by multiple individuals who review the evidence and documentation independently in order to determine that the specific program they are reviewing is aligned to the standards.

Dr. Nina Winn, Orange County Office of Education, noted that she has been a reviewer and she described the process she experienced for calibration and review. She noted that over 100 individuals were brought together for training and calibration and that on some reviews she spent over four months reviewing the documents with her partners, some of whom were located in

other parts of the state. In addition, she said that there was a great deal of communication between her and her partners electronically and by phone. She said she had great confidence in the staff in the way they addressed concerns reviewers had.

Commissioner Molina asked for a motion. Commissioner Clopton commented that he did not have a level of comfort to approve the programs. He moved that the Commission reject the two subject matter programs for lack of sufficient evidence for the Commission to vote on.

Commissioner Banker spoke in support of the motion noting that she felt she has an obligation to follow the Education Code and that she has a responsibility to ensure that alignment has occurred. She seconded the motion.

Commissioner Lilly objected to stating that the programs were rejected because of insufficient evidence, given the amount of time and work put into the review process, is not a reasonable or professional decision based on the information available. He suggested that perhaps a postponement would offer time for those needing more specific information.

Commissioner Bustillos concurred. She asked what the implications would be for a rejection. Ms. Graybill responded that rejection would at some point result in a continuation of an institution's old program which is not aligned to the revised K-12 content standards. She noted that at some point, according to the procedures that were adopted by the Commission, the program would cease to exist and the program sponsor would not be able to admit students to an approved program. This would mean that all of its candidates then at that point would need subject matter competency by passing a subject matter exam.

Commissioner Bustillos urged the Commission to think about postponing rather than rejecting the programs.

Ex-Officio Young suggested that it would be unfair to not give notice to people who in good faith have spent a lot of time and effort preparing documents, and then reject them for no good reason. She commented that it would be better to educate Commissioners about the process and familiarize them with it, than to penalize the hard-working, well-intentioned people who have participated in the process.

Commissioner Lilly warned that if the Commission continues along these lines, universities across this state are likely to choose not to offer the programs since they are not required to align their curriculum to the K-12 content standards. The result would be that all students would have to pass a test and that the alignment to state student K-12 academic content standards will invariably suffer over time. He noted that there has been monumental progress in bringing the colleges of arts and sciences to understand the importance of aligning the content to the K-12 content standards. He commented that the Commission could chase these programs away from participating entirely.

Commissioner Johnson further cautioned that such action could lead to less-well-prepared teachers, less-aware of the K-12 content standards and called rejection of the two programs unprofessional and unconscionable.

Commissioner Schwarze spoke of seeing checks in boxes but no evidence as to the process that occurred. She described a situation in which a mathematics program was sent back for revisions not because the K-12 academic content standards were lacking, but for other reasons. She commented that just because the process took place, that does not give her enough confidence to be able to certify and approve these programs. She asked whether the panels included individuals from the state standards commission.

Ms. Sandy responded in the affirmative and noted the contributions of Dr. Stan Metzberg, Marion Joseph and Marian Bergeson to this process. Commissioner Schwarze commented that at least two of these individuals do not believe that this occurred. She expressed concern over being asked to rubber stamp something for which some members felt evidence was lacking.

Ex-Officio Waite commented that there are three themes in the conversation: the two programs that submitted their SMP documents, the process by which they were approved for review by the Commission, and the standards (K12 and SMPP). She then asked the members of the Commission who do not feel confident in the process how they would propose fixing the problem to avoid these lengthy discussions every time a University submits a program.

Commissioner Clopton suggested that proposals could come to the Commission during each step in the review process instead of being sent back with recommendations from the staff. He also suggested that the reviewers come and present an individual case to the Commission to get input and allow the Commission to ask questions of the reviewers. Commissioner Clopton noted that they asked to have a study session on this topic, but that has been mixed with the next batch of proposals coming through. He noted it is a process issue and that, while the Commission may not have evidence to reject, he also didn't feel that he had the evidence he needed to affirm these particular programs.

Commissioner Johnson asked for clarification of Chair Schwarze's statement regarding the mathematics program she referenced noting that if the program was sent back because it didn't meet the standards, then this should be proof the process is working.

Commissioner Schwarze indicated that it has to do with what she feels requires importance and how it was viewed in totality as to whether or not a program is rejected. She said the reviewers wanted more emphasis on an area that the department did not believe should be emphasized. She noted that it was probably more of a problem with the teaching standards.

Commissioner Banker commended the staff for doing a wonderful job but suggested there was a need to assure that the process provided some avenue that will help the Commission understand and support that the core content standards are being addressed in the program standards and know, rather than just trust, that this is actually being accomplished. She commented that she takes her responsibility to uphold the Education Code very seriously particularly as it states that the Commission must "ensure" the alignment.

Commissioner Lilly addressed Commissioner Clopton's proposal and commented that he believed this was too much detail and above and beyond the role of the Commission. He

suggested that he would be supportive of asking staff and the reviewers who did the review of the programs to come back and discuss the process they went through and the rationale for their decision as a study session. He cautioned that it would be for this time only and that he does not support such a process for each program being reviewed.

Commissioner Clopton expressed a willingness to accept this suggestion as a friendly amendment.

Commissioner Littman reminded Commissioners there had never really been a formal presentation on the programs.

Commissioner Johnson asked for further clarification from Commissioner Banker on the term “core standards” and questioned whether there was some agenda to shift the role of the student content standards into the area of higher education.

Commissioner Banker responded that it has been widely agreed that there needs to be a correlation between the core content standards and teacher preparation standards. She added that, although SB 2042 mandates an alignment, it is very difficult to pull out those components to illustrate that those content standards are folded into the program standards when the Commission is evaluating programs.

Commissioner Johnson commented that, as a policy board, it is the Commission’s charge to approve programs and if they do not like a policy already adopted, then they need to change it. She said that the Commission should not micromanage, but should establish policy and direct staff to implement that policy.

Dr. Swofford pointed out that there had been discussion of having an Executive Committee meeting in November/December that could include a discussion of a new direction regarding what the Commission requires as evidence about subject matter approval. That would go to the entire Commission for discussion as well and would be prospective in nature, not retroactive.

Ex-officio representative Young agreed with Commissioners Lilly and Littman, and urged Commissioner Clopton to withdraw the motion to reject. She also noted that asking for documentation regarding a review while it is in progress has the potential for significantly lengthening the review process since the Commission only meets every month or so. Ex-officio Young disagreed with the idea that the Commission is being asked to simply rubber stamp programs and acknowledged the hard work done to bring forward only programs that will meet the standards. She voiced support for a study session, similar to what was done by Mr. Janssen and staff about the certification process, and suggested it may help build confidence in the process, without penalizing staff and holding up programs needlessly. She also suggested focusing on the standards themselves so that Commissioners can be confident that they are aligned with the K-12 content standards.

Commissioner Clopton withdrew the motion to reject with the comment that he was unlikely to support a motion to approve the programs without the evidence he needed to feel comfortable.

Commissioner Banker withdrew the second on that motion. She agreed with Ex-Officio Young that they needed to discuss the standards themselves.

Commissioner Lilly made a motion that the Commission postpone the decision on the two subject matter programs until the November /December meeting, at which time there would be a presentation by the staff member responsible for shepherding each program review and the external reviewers who reviewed the programs. This process is not to be precedent setting on how the Commission will operate in the future, but more as a combination study session and establishing a basis for action. The second part of his motion called for scheduling a second study session on the standards themselves. Commissioner Bustillos seconded the motion.

Ex-officio Young discussed the need to inform institutions about the current process the Commission is going through in fairness to the institutions in the process of being reviewed. Staff responded that notice would be provided.

Commissioner Molina asked for public comment.

Commissioner Littman asked for clarification about the Los Angeles Unified School District administrative program was part of the motion.

Commissioner Molina responded that she would consider that matter under a separate motion.

Ken Burt, California Teachers Association, commented that the discussion showed the Commission needed more time to resolve the issues discussed.

Commissioner Molina called the question and the motion passed without further dissent.

Dr. Swofford asked for official clarification of the motion. Ms. Graybill summarized the motion: to postpone the decision on the two subject matter programs in question until the November-December meeting. At that time there would be a presentation by the staff person who shepherded the review along with the reviewers who were involved in the review. She said the second part of the motion was to schedule a study session on the standards. She asked whether the Commission was interested in getting training similar to how the reviewers were trained and calibrated.

There was general agreement expressed to do so.

Ex-Officio Young clarified that the study session about the process and the standards should happen prior to these two programs coming back for action.

Commissioner Lilly concurred and added that the study session on the standards and on the reviewer training should be without regard to any specific programs, but that a previously approved program could be used as an example for the session, excluding the two currently under discussion.

It was agreed that the two programs that would be used as examples would be the two previously approved at the last meeting, not the two that would be up for approval again next meeting.

Ex-officio Young suggested Commissioners Clopton and Banker could help design the content of the session to meet their needs.

Commissioner Molina then moved to the next item. She noted that Commission has the option to approve or deny approval of the guidelines-based on Alternative Professional Clear Administrative Services Credential program as follows: Los Angeles Unified District.

Commissioner Gomez moved approval of the program. Commissioner Banker seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

6B: Options for the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA) and California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) Contracts

Amy Jackson, Administrator, Professional Services Division and Beth Graybill, Director, Division of Professional Services presented this item.

Commissioner Molina explained the purpose of this item is to consider options for contracts for continued administration and development of the Reading Instruction Competence Assessment (RICA) and the California Basic educational Skills Test (CBEST). Under current contracts, the last administrations of these examinations will be held in June and July of 2006.

Ms. Graybill began by summarizing the item, noting that contracts for the administration of the RICA and CBEST expire in 2006. She noted that for the RICA, the Commission could direct staff to let a Request for Proposal (RFP) and seek a new contract, or direct staff to seek an extension of the current contract, and that extension would go through October of 2007. She said the options with CBEST were the same.

Ms. Graybill offered background about the RICA. The first administration was in 1998. The parameters of the current contract end with the June 2006 administration but the contract runs through October of 2006 because the Commission allows the contractor some time to wrap things up and provide it with information and data from the last administration. The current contract also requires NES to conduct a validity study that would normally be done this coming spring. The cost of that validity study was built into the current fees that candidates have been paying when they take the RICA exam. The validity study is a necessary precedent to any revisions to RICA. A new contract would require the contractor to take the results of that validity study and develop revisions that might need to take place in RICA and then administer that for the rest of the contract.

Ms. Graybill then asked Ms. Jackson to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of releasing an RFP versus extending the contract. Ms. Jackson stated that a release of an RFP on RICA would result in a revised or new exam by the fall of 2007, tentatively. It would require a fairly tight time table in that the Commission would have about a year to take the findings from the validity study, create new items if necessary, reconstruct the design of the test and how it is built and then conduct the first administration. The result from the first administration would be the basis for

setting a passing standard. She noted that the process would likely take 12-18 months, but that if the findings led the Commission to request a redevelopment of the entire exam program it would likely take longer. She stated that if the Commission were to release an RFP this fall, it might not allow for sufficient opportunities for adequate involvement by Commission members.

Ms. Jackson noted that if the Commission directed staff to ask the Department of Finance to allow the Commission to amend the contract for another year, it would delay the development of a revised RICA by one more year to 2008. This would allow more time to conduct the validity study called for under the current contract and provides more opportunity to fine tune an RFP that would be sent out to find a contractor to develop the items for that new RICA exam program.

Ms. Graybill stated that the CBEST was first administered in 1983 and that the current contract also ends with the June 2006 administration. Ms. Graybill noted the pending legislation which could potentially change who is required to CBEST in the future.

Ms. Jackson noted that the options for CBEST are similar to the RICA with the possibility of legislation that would end the administration of CBEST putting the Commission in the position of having a contract and a contractor and no legal direction to administer the test. She stated that extending the current contract for one year gives the Commission the opportunity to wait until this policy decision works its way through the legislature before being forced to make a decision.

Ms. Graybill said that staff recommended seeking an amendment to extend the current contract with RICA because it would allow sufficient time for a validity study which will provide information for changes in the RFP. She also recommended seeking an amendment to extend the CBEST contract for another year, allowing pending legislation to work its way through the legislature, which could drive how the RFP was developed.

Chair Schwarze asked if every CSET exam subject area has a writing component to it. Ms. Jackson noted that CSET exams have two types of items: multiple choice and constructed response items. However, she noted that the constructed response items are not scored for grammar.

Chair Schwarze wondered if it would be possible to one day have those constructed response questions be scored for grammar, and thus take the place of the CBEST test. Ms. Jackson answered that this might be possible.

Chair Schwarze commended Ms. Graybill for working with the California Department of Education (CDE) on the framework for the language arts. She noted her approval of the staff recommendation in order to continue dialog between the Commission and CDE. Ms. Graybill stated that working with CDE would be important in addition to the validity study.

The motion was made to direct staff to seek contract extensions for both the RICA and the CBEST (Banker), seconded (Gomez).

Ex-Officio Young wondered if it would be possible to look at providing more CBEST administrations throughout the year to ensure it is offered enough times. Ms. Jackson noted that this would be possible.

Commissioner Molina called question; it carried without dissent.

6C: Options for Proposed Changes to the Accreditation System

Dr. Birch introduced the item. He explained that in January 2004, the Commission directed the Committee on Accreditation (COA) to meet with stakeholders to recommend the process to review the Commission's accreditation framework. In May 2004 the Commission adopted a review process that included an accreditation study work group to work with the COA in evaluating the current system and identifying options for a revised system. This item represents a report on the efforts of accreditation study workgroup and the COA that is a result of 17 months of intensive work. He explained that the agenda item includes each of the major topics discussed and a preferred option on that topic after study and consideration by the workgroup and the COA. He directed Commissioners to pages PSC-6C-4 through page PSC-6C-48 in the agenda for preferred options, details, and specifics of the report.

Dr. Birch recognized Dr. Ed Kujawa, Dean of School of Business and Education at Dominican University and a member of the COA. Dr. Kujawa also co-facilitated the accreditation study work group. Dr. Birch then recognized the accreditation study work group members who were present in the audience including: Sue Westbrook (California Federation of Teachers), Ellen Curtis-Pierce (Chapman University and representative of the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities), Mary Sandy (California State University), Terry Cannings (Cal Lutheran and representative of the Association in Independent California Colleges and Universities), Sharon Robison (Association of California School Administrators), and Joyce Abrams (California Teachers Association). He also recognized the work of Consultants Cheryl Hickey and Teri Clark. He noted that Ex-Officio member of the Commission, Dr. Beverly Young, had also actively participated prior to being appointed to serve on the Commission.

Dr. Kujawa described the process of the work group and the Committee on Accreditation employed to review the accreditation system. He noted that they reviewed models that were used in other professions and that they looked beyond the credentialing process. He said that they stayed within a standards-based model and models where standards in fact were of a high enough caliber that there is accountability to the public. They considered the recommendations from the evaluation report from the American Institutes for Research (AIR). In addition, they examined the COA process and some of the issues COA members believed needed to be addressed. He commented that the final proposal is a combination of what was contained in the AIR report, the practical experiences of COA members and the field, and also what was happening with respect to other professions regarding accreditation.

He noted that one important area of focus was related to the "snapshot" approach taken by the Commission's current system. He informed the Commission that the COA and work group members wanted to look at developing an ongoing system that requires submission of data over time and was a process of continuous improvement rather than a system where a decision is made and then reexamined five to seven years later.

He explained that the COA and the work group propose a seven-year model that also requires interim reports be written by program sponsors to the COA on a regular basis. One primary purpose of these reports would be to ensure that institutions are collecting and using data to inform their programmatic decision making. Unlike the previous snapshot system, this would be a process where every two years something would be generated and submitted by the program sponsor to look at what is occurring at that institution or district.

Dr. Kujawa noted that the COA and the work group members were very interested in improving the follow-up in a revised accreditation system. He noted that under the current system, once a final decision is made about a program sponsor to accredit, that there is no way to know for certain that an issue was resolved once and for all or that it did not reoccur. For example, a major stipulation might have been addressed within the one year time frame, however, the COA has no ability to look beyond that one year to ensure the problem is not resurfacing and will not be an issue again in the next visit.

Dr. Kujawa noted that the COA and the work group members were interested in changing the idea that decisions made at previous reviews would not be available to current reviewers. He noted that the proposed revised process allows for a historical view of an institution in terms of what the issues were at the institution in a previous review, what is it doing to improve the program, and where is it at the time of the current review.

He emphasized that one of the themes of the proposed revised system is continuous improvement while another is looking at historical evidence and then being able to follow up with institutions. He noted that ultimately, the group is proposing an ongoing model with high standards. He commented that the final part of the report identifies some of the areas that need further work, but that the work group and the COA did not believe that these items fell within the charge given to them in May of 2004. For example, the work group and the COA believe it is time to reevaluate the common standards since the last time the Commission did this was in 1995.

He noted the difficult discussions the work group members and COA had with respect to data collection. He said the proposed revised model requires more data to be produced and examined by the institution and incorporated in the reports submitted to the COA across the cycle. He commented that the members discussed what kinds of data would be collected and that the members wanted something that would be common for all program sponsors to be able to work with.

He highlighted the changed nature of the site visit under the proposed revised system. A site visit under this system would be focused on the common standards, with the program being reviewed prior to the site visit by teams that would look at the data reports and responses to the program standards.

Commissioner Bustillos asked for clarification with respect to data collection. Dr. Kujawa noted that under the current system, universities are given discretion as far as what kinds of data they are collecting. He noted that the work group and the COA attempted to design a system where universities would use a common template to submit data. He noted that program sponsors

would submit a common set of information and data that would be common across programs, so there would not be variations on a theme. In teacher credentialing, for example, he said the group discussed the RICA and CBEST data. They determined that this data is used for admission to a program and the completion of a credential, but not necessarily used for program improvement. Rather, what is better for accreditation purposes is more descriptive data of how candidates are assessed. He noted that the group believed that teacher performance assessment data and teacher performance expectations would be much more useful since the institution can actually code scores. Institutions would examine their scores and make decisions about the areas where their candidates are the weakest on the teacher performance expectations. The university would choose to address these areas of weakness for that particular two-year cycle as its focus for improvement. Follow-up data would be submitted again two years later and the level of improvement could be determined, based on teacher performance expectations.

Commissioner Bustillos asked whether the template has been developed. Dr. Kujawa responded that an 11-page report template has been drafted. He said that not only would reviewers have access to this report, but the institution would have to explain what it is doing with the information it collects to improve its programs. He said the members put a lot of importance on making sure that the leaders of the institutions are acting upon the information collected otherwise the data collection has no meaning.

Dr. Birch clarified that this data report could be a feature of the proposed revised system. Commissioner Bustillos noted the importance of working together with the universities to make sure that everyone is on the same page.

Commissioner Lilly asked about whether the Commission previously approved the framework and the handbook. Dr. Birch responded that the framework contains the policies that govern the accreditation system and is within the purview of the Commission to act upon. The handbook was developed by the COA and describes the process and procedures for implementing the Commission's policies. The handbook was reviewed by the Commission prior to its adoption by the COA.

Commissioner Lilly inquired about the time frame to put this revised system in place. Dr. Birch responded that the Commission needs to first adopt a framework. Upon adoption, there is much more work to be completed in order to implement the system.

Commissioner Lilly clarified that a new framework does need to be drafted and then acted upon by the Commission. Dr. Birch responded that Commissioner Lilly was correct. He added that the work group and the COA have actually been drafting some proposed language for a framework that could come forward if the Commission chooses to go in the particular direction recommended. He noted that although the members have been working on draft language for a framework, they felt it was inappropriate to bring it forward as of yet because the Commission has not acted upon the ideas proposed.

Commissioner Lilly asked for further clarification about how quickly a new system could begin being implemented once the Commission was to approve the recommendations. He asked whether there was a regulatory process involved as well in adopting a new system.

Commissioner Banker asked how the additional work proposed by the work group fits into the timeline. Dr. Birch noted that he believed she was referring to the items under Option 18, which is a category of items that the work group and the COA believe need to happen to implement a new system and some suggested ideas on how they might happen. He noted that most of these items are related to the standards themselves and are within the purview of the Commission. He said the Commission could direct the work group and the COA to proceed with work in those areas but that the work would really need to be done for the Commission's consideration and action.

Commissioner Lilly asked whether the process for adopting the framework included public hearings and if it needs to go through the regulatory process. Dr. Kujawa confirmed that the group had been considering language changes for the framework consistent with the proposed revised framework and that a draft document could be brought to the Commission quickly once the Commission requested it. He added that with respect to Topic 18, the Commission could implement the revised model using the current common standards and that this work could be done after the adoption of a revised framework. Dr. Birch added that the framework was originally adopted at a regular Commission meeting and not through the regulatory process.

Ex-Officio Young noted that throughout the process, staff worked with the members to determine which of the policy changes would require policy action, changes in the framework, changes in the manual, or education code changes. She said that the framework language was drafted along the way so that participants could see how their suggestions would be incorporated into the framework. She discussed the importance of collaboration and consultation with the field. She said before taking action on something as important as changes in accreditation the Commission would want to make sure all the stakeholders have been involved and have had an opportunity to review the recommendations. She discussed the process of field review to date, noting the workgroup was selected to represent the stakeholders. She noted that an important part of the process included an agreement that at every meeting every member was charged to go back to their constituency, share what was done, and ask for feedback. Each meeting started with a review of the feedback the members had received. She said that although this process had taken place, it may be wise for the whole body of recommendations to be reviewed by the field to make sure all stakeholders have input. She commented that it need not be an extensive process but it is important to do.

Commissioner Lilly asked whether this could occur in the context of Commission meetings. Ex-officio Young responded that there is the possibility of more review within the two months before our next meeting. She suggested that the option for the further work described could be to direct this workgroup to continue its deliberations and come back with recommendations about Topic 18 and the common standards or the Commission could select a smaller group and have them do it.

Chair Schwarze noted that the current framework was adopted in 1995. She noted that this is one of the last pieces to the system that has not been realigned since standards came about. She commented that she is not worried about how long it is going to take because the system has been out of sync for awhile and she would rather get it right. She commented that waiting until

now to see where the dust settled is probably a good thing. She referenced Mr. Himmelstein's earlier presentation that this is one of the areas where there is some direct interest by the Secretary. She said that the field review would be welcomed in that office.

Dr. Swofford noted that this could go out for field review and then the results could be presented at the April Commission meeting.

Commissioner Lilly agreed with Chair Schwarze. However, he noted that the Commission has not had any on-site visits to institutions preparing teachers for two or three years and that the quality control mechanism is not currently functioning. He noted that the Commission would still have to look at revisions of standards and the Commission has already acknowledged that when an accreditation framework is adopted it will be two years before the first institution can be visited under it. He voiced support for doing the standards revision work now while the system is starting to "percolate and function."

Commissioner Molina summarized the discussion noting that the Commission is asking staff to conduct a field review for the purpose of soliciting feedback about the topics presented in the agenda item. This should be done in a manner that will minimize costs, such as an electronic survey. She asked staff to report back at the Commission's April meeting.

Commissioner Banker noted the recommendation in the Bureau of State Audits report to promptly resume continuing accreditation reviews. She noted her concern with postponing this until April.

Dr. Swofford commented that the Secretary of Education should play a prominent role in this discussion and that there was a need to ensure that he concurs with the direction the Commission is going. He discussed the current fiscal problems of the agency and the need to create a budget change proposal (BCP) in order to fund accreditation. He said that a field review would allow the field an opportunity to respond. The Secretary's office and the Commission can review the findings of that survey and discuss it in a coherent fashion.

Commissioner Lilly commented that he believes the budget change proposal should not be to support accreditation, which has been an ongoing activity of this Commission that has been suspended, not something done away with. He suggested that a BCP should be drafted to support the activities that have been supported with the resources for accreditation while it was in suspension. He noted that the activity was not suspended permanently, but temporarily while the review was being conducted.

Dr. Kujawa commented that his institution was to be reviewed in December 2003, near the time of the suspension. The last visit to the institution by CTC was 1997. If it were to be extended out three years or so that would mean there would have been 10-11 years between actually having a review on campus. He urged the Commission to do what it can to restart the system.

Ex-Officio Young responded that the importance of getting this right is critical. She voiced support for the field review, for including the Secretary's office, and for bringing the item back

in April. She suggested that in the meantime, the Commission be provided with updates. She also suggested that the Commission give direction to move ahead with Topic 18.

Commissioner Littman voiced support to implement the system as soon as possible.

Commissioner Lilly noted that there would be two years until a full set of visits occur and that this additional time provides an opportunity to figure out the funding mechanism.

Dr. Swofford commented that the Secretary's office has requested that this Commission conduct a field review and have that information returned to the Secretary's office as well as to the Commission in order to have budgetary responsibility to be able to carry out any accreditation visits. He noted that the April time line is in accordance with what the Secretary of Education expects us to do.

Commissioner Lilly asked whether this information has been shared. Dr. Swofford commented that it was shared both with the chair of this Commission and himself.

Chair Schwarze suggested that the Commission put the field review on the web and said that she will discuss this matter with the Secretary, the director, and Mr. Himmelstein at which time she will talk about the practical aspects of what is happening and also the reallocation of accreditation funding. She said that she would report back on this discussion at the November/December meeting.

Commissioner Banker voiced support for on-going updates during the field review process.

Ms. Graybill clarified that the Commission requests staff do a field review, that the field review can be in the form of an online survey, that between now and the November/December meeting the chair and Dr. Swofford will meet with the Secretary for additional clarification to be included in an update at the next meeting, and that between now and April staff will provide some updates on the status of the field review. In addition, there could be additional work continuing on some of the issues imbedded in Topic 18. She asked for clarification on the size of the workgroup.

Dr. Kujawa suggested that smaller groups consisting of representatives of COA and some members of the accreditation study work group could continue to work on some of these areas.

Commissioner Banker suggested that there be a Commissioner liaison assisting in those discussions to help provide the Commission with a better understanding of the rationale for the changes suggested.

Ms. Graybill asked whether the Chair would choose the Commissioner to be the liaison. It was agreed that the Chair would choose the liaison.

Commissioner Molina then closed the item and adjourned the committee.

RECONVENE GENERAL SESSION

Chair Schwarze reconvened the general session.

2I: Progress Report on the Implementation of the Findings from the 2004 Bureau of State Audits Report

Mary Armstrong, Division of Professional Practices; Mary Butera, Office of Human Resources; Beth Graybill, Division of Professional Services; Crista Hill, Fiscal and Business Services Division; and Dale Janssen, Certification, Assignments and Waivers presented this item.

Chair Schwarze opened the item with some preliminary background, saying this report was done initially in November 2004 and is now at the one-year anniversary date.

Dr. Swofford noted that the members of the Commission can direct questions about the responses to any member of the staff.

Chair Schwarze introduced audit principal John Baier, and senior auditor evaluator Ben Belnap from the Bureau of State Audits.

Commissioner Banker asked if the Commission could go through the report sequentially, saying this was the first time there has been a public discussion of this issue.

Commissioner Clopton asked for more information about the reports required for the teacher development programs. He asked whether there are particular criteria for the format of these reports and what kinds of statistics generally are included. Ms. Graybill responded noting that for the two kinds of teacher development programs: intern programs and paraprofessional programs, the Commission has annually reported on the status of those programs. She noted that a specific standardized report format is not used because the Commission is responding to different statutes and the reports are guided by these statutes. She noted for example, in the intern program, the Commission has been interested in how many interns going through programs actually remain in teaching, while for the paraprofessional program, the statute intended the program to be used as a pipeline to diversify the teaching force and provide opportunities for people to enter training programs that otherwise might not have had an opportunity.

Commissioner Banker asked for more information from the auditors for the rationale behind the three recommendations on page GS 2I-1. Mr. Baier responded that they examined the paraprofessional program, the pre-intern program, and intern program to see how the Commission evaluates its performance under those programs and how well those programs operate. He noted some statistical inconsistencies with the reports on the first two programs. He explained that their recommendation is to keep those statistics and make sure that they are checked against each other so that internal inconsistencies didn't continue to occur.

Mr. Belnap provided an example where in a report on the paraprofessional program where numbers did not match. He said they suggested a process be implemented here to identify and correct these kinds of mistakes.

Commissioner Molina asked for further clarification. Ms. Graybill noted that there are two kinds of reports at issue. One is a summary report and then there are individual reports from every program that gets state funding. She explained that in the reports from the paraprofessional programs, Commission staff is requiring more data about the academic progress of the participants in their local program.

Ms. Jackson discussed the need to ensure that candidates are making progress as a condition of continued funding. She noted that through discussions with auditors, staff determined that the Commission should be keeping individual record level data on candidates. She noted that with the new CGP, which the Commission approved in August for the new paraprofessional programs, much more comprehensive counts of candidates as well as progress in relation to courses completed would be required. She noted that it reflects a move from a global accounting of candidates and programs into much more detailed candidate level data coming to the Commission.

Commissioner Lilly asked whether the concern is that there might be paraprofessionals who continue to get funding over time and don't make progress toward their degree or credential. Ms. Jackson said that was correct and that the staff is working closely with program directors to obtain better data.

Commissioner Banker asked about whether the Commission was preparing to submit a BCP in Fall 2006 to fund independent evaluation of its paraprofessional program, as suggested in the report. Ms. Graybill responded that it would have been more correct to say Commission staff will seek permission from the Commission to submit a BCP which would seek funding for the study.

Commissioner Clopton asked for clarification about the consent form process. Ms. Jackson and Ms. Graybill explained that this is an enrollment form that is required of all programs. Participants acknowledge that they will follow the rules defined by the Education Code. It is from this document the Commission can obtain information about the candidates participating.

Commissioner Gomez asked for clarification of criteria for "increased oversight" in the context of "consequences for underperformance" and "progressive remediation." Ms. Jackson explained that these terms are written from the perspective of funding mechanisms. She noted for example, in the paraprofessional program, if a program is asking for funding but cannot demonstrate that their candidate had completed the requirements in the current year, the Commission can refuse funding for that candidate.

Commissioner Molina asked whether the collection of data on candidates includes transcripts. Ms. Jackson responded that the Commission does not have the staff to collect and analyze transcripts for all those who come through the paraprofessional program but that the Commission would do that if there were a candidate that appeared not to be making progress. She discussed the difficulty some program participants have in passing the required exam noting some have taken the test up to 25 times. She commented a better solution might be to advise the program director to set some limitations, counsel these candidates out of the program, and discontinue funding them. The difficult part of this is that a requirement of the paraprofessional program is

that for every year of funding participants must give a year back as a credentialed teacher or return all the funds.

Ms. Armstrong noted that some cases are complex such as when there has been illness or death in the family. However, she noted a strict interpretation of the law would say that the minute they stop progressing they owe money.

Commissioner Lilly noted the shortness in time and noted that next time the Commission gets audited that there be a discussion when the report is released that describes how the recommendations will be addressed and identifying the items that need policy considerations and decisions by the Commission itself.

Chair Schwarze asked for an explanation of how an audit actually comes about.

Mr. Baier responded that this audit was requested by Assembly Member Pavley. He described the audit process, including notification of the organization that an audit has been requested, working with the organization's staff and issuing a draft report. Then the organization is asked for a response (at 60 days, six month and one-year intervals). The response is then put into an annual report issued annually in February to legislative budget subcommittees.

Commissioner Banker noted that she believes it is important that the Commission focus on the report so the legislature sees that it is serious about understanding the process and procedures and ensuring the money is being spent accurately and efficiently.

Commissioner Johnson suggested that the discussion focus on comments by the Bureau of State Audits representatives.

Commissioner Clopton asked about the level of detail expected in responses. Mr. Baier noted that the level of detail varies from large packets to a document of about the size of this draft response. He commented that he believed that this document has a fair amount of information in it so that they at least get a sense of how far the recommendation is going. He added that sometimes they get too much information.

Commissioner Johnson asked what the process is after the one-year annual report is submitted. Mr. Baier responded that once they receive the one-year response, if they have questions they would call the staff for clarification and then incorporate it into their February report. After the one-year period they typically do not go back to agencies for additional audit work unless there is a particular risky area that they want to look at, if they get a specific question regarding some issue, or if a new audit request comes out. He noted they have the authority to designate any entity as high risk and do an audit if they choose to.

Ex-Officio Young asked about the response to the audit recommendation related to the Commission cooperating with colleges and universities to get the Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA). She asked how the estimate was arrived at.

Ms. Jackson responded that this is based upon California Teaching Performance Assessment system that the Commission developed under the Education Code as directed and with Title II funds. The \$400 is an estimate to provide an instrument, score it, get it back to the candidate and defend it.

Ex-Officio Young asked for clarification that this estimate is based on the assumption that the Commission would do the TPA, not the university implementing the California TPA instrument that is already being used. Ms. Jackson responded that this estimate is what it would cost to score the state model and return it to candidates. So there would be an external contractor involved who would charge fees. She clarified that it is a very loose estimate.

Ex-Officio Young noted that the figure does not reflect universities using the California TPA instrument. She noted that the TPA and PACT are both embedded assessment models that the majority of universities plan to use. Ms. Jackson noted there were a couple of possible models. This estimate is not based on the model where there would be scoring sites on each campus. This is a general number that is statewide, not campus-by-campus. She noted that 44 or so campuses using some part or the entire TPA are reporting costs around that amount.

Dr. Swofford noted that with respect to the TPA, the Commission staff is concerned about a uniform system and interested in a rubric that goes to an external contractor. He noted that there would not be staff available to evaluate each center.

Commissioner Johnson objected to the word uniformity and noted the 2042 discussions centered around the term consistency. Dr. Swofford reiterated that he is concerned about ensuring uniformity in the scoring of the particular items and ensuring that the contractor applied the same standard for all institutions.

Commissioner Littman spoke about her concern about passing these costs on to the candidates.

Dr. Swofford responded that the manner and who would pay has not been decided to date. Chair Schwarze asked Mr. Baier to share his concerns about the draft document.

Mr. Baier responded that he asks the Commission to include a date for as far as when the Commission thinks it would submit a BCP for evaluation of the paraprofessional program. He said the concern is that there is a legal requirement for an evaluation of the program and wants to know when that would take place. There are also two elements of that requirement that Commission staff told us were problematic. The other route that the Commission could take would be to work to have those other elements worked out of the law so problematic expense requirements would not be in there.

He noted that on the TPA issue, their recommendation was that the Commission should collaborate with colleges and universities to determine the cost per candidate to implement the assessment. The law predicates the use of the teacher performance assessment on availability of funding. They noted the concern of the colleges and universities regarding the additional cost. He suggests working with colleges and universities to determine the funding needs they have and submit a BCP to the legislature to obtain needed funding.

He noted that the recommendation related to teacher retention data to measure the performance of the teaching credential process and of teacher preparation programs is a legislative recommendation and that they do not expect the Commission to respond here unless the Commission was planning to petition the legislature to pass legislation on this issue.

He noted there were no issues on page three and that on page four, the response related to gathering customer service data is appropriate. He commented that it appears as though great strides have been made.

He said that on page five, the paragraph discussing a time management study for the types of applications, is good. He noted that with the next item, related to automated reports for the TCSIP, these are helpful. He said that even though the response indicates that they are still under development, it is a good step to go in that direction. The last item on that page related to the requirement for colleges and universities to submit credential applications electronically, they believe the additional step of doing the automated review of those credentials is good thing to be doing noting it takes staff time away from having to do the manual review. He said that it is their opinion that this is a fairly routine review. He noted that there is concern that the transcript review can take longer, but that is part of what colleges and universities already do when they submit the applications. He commented that they think that is appropriate.

He said that the Commission response to consider expanding TCSIP to allow school districts to submit applications electronically is another area they think is a good opportunity to reduce work load. In the data they looked at, school districts submitted approximately 22,000 applications or about 19 percent of the application processing workload that year. Submitting electronically instead of in paper form would be a great benefit. He noted that he thought the Commission can go a step farther and talk to an information technology consultant about how much it would cost to make this change, and also identify the logistical obstacles to making the change. He said this is not a mandatory recommendation, but one that needs consideration and careful thought.

Regarding the on-line renewal process, he noted that there is a certain segment or segments of the credential population that is not taking advantage of this process and the Commission should focus its efforts there.

Mr. Baier noted that with respect to the Commission's standard setting efforts, the auditors felt a plan would be helpful to lay out what needs to be done still and the timelines. He suggested a long-range plan that would list when other standards need to be updated again. Regarding the advisory panels that assist in the development of these standards, the auditors think that the response is appropriate and looks like a process is being put in place.

Mr. Baier noted that the responses in the first two boxes on page 8 look appropriate, and while the policy for the record retention is still under development, having that policy in development is a good thing.

He noted that with respect to the accreditation process and continuing accreditation reviews, he said the auditors were concerned that the suspension of the continuing accreditation review left

out an element of the review process and the assurance that the Commission has that colleges and universities are doing the things that it wants them to do. He said they are concerned that there needs to be a timely reinstatement of this process. He noted that they understand there are a number of other factors going on with the new standards being put in place and with Commission staff reviewing accreditation policy, but the reinstatement of the continuing accreditation reviews needs to happen sooner rather than later. On the update of the strategic plan, he noted that the Commission's response is appropriate. Now that the Commission is getting up to a full compliment of members, they think it is good to revisit this on a regular basis.

Commissioner Lilly commented that there appears to be some legislative work needed on the paraprofessional program issue discussed earlier. Whether it's alternative forms of forgiveness, or other solutions, he noted that this is a real tragedy for those who do not make progress in these programs. Commissioner Lilly noted a distinction in the response language should be made between actions the Commission has taken and the Commission staff.

Chair Schwarze and Mr. Baier agreed that clearer use of those terms was needed. Hearing no further questions or comments, Chair Schwarze closed the item.

2J: Report of Appeals and Waivers Committee

Commissioner Gomez read the report as follows: The committee recommends approval of the following items: the August 11, 2005 minutes; the consent calendar; the conditions calendar; the denial calendar and grant Donald Shuschmidt a five-year preliminary multi-subject teaching credential. The motion carried without dissent.

2K: Report of Closed Session Items

Chair Schwarze reported that the Commission granted Mr. Noden's petition for reinstatement, adopted the proposed decision on the matter of Denise Hecker, and discussed pending litigation.

Chair Schwarze recognized Commissioner Gomez for a comment. Commissioner Gomez thanked other Commission members for providing comments regarding the budget.

2L: New Business

The Quarterly Agenda for November/December 2005, January/February 2006, and April 2006 was presented. Commissioner Lilly noted the need to put monthly updates on that accreditation review on the Quarterly Agenda

Audience Presentations

Dr. Nina Winn, Orange County Office of Education, commented on the ongoing challenge of some paraprofessionals having difficulty meeting program requirements and hence, providing the service requirements.

2M: Adjournment

Chair Schwarze adjourned the meeting with a reminder that the next meeting would be on Nov. 30/ Dec. 1.