

## **Minutes of the November 30 – December 1, 2005 Meeting**

---

---

### **California Commission on Teacher Credentialing 1900 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento**

#### **COMMISSION MEMBERS ATTENDING**

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

#### **COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT**

Aida Molina, Administrator

#### **EX-OFFICIO REPRESENTATIVES**

Marilyn McGrath, California Postsecondary Education Commission  
Athena Waite, University of California  
Beverly Young, California State University  
Karen Symms Gallagher, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities

#### **STATE BOARD LIAISON**

Ruth Bloom

#### **COMMISSION STAFF PRESENTING**

Beth Graybill, Director of Professional Services Division  
Sam Swofford, Executive Director  
Mary Armstrong, General Counsel, Director, Profession Practices Division  
Lee Pope, Staff Counsel, Professional Practices Division  
Janet Vining, Staff Counsel, Professional Practices Division  
Kimberly Hunter, Staff Counsel, Professional Practices Division  
Bonnie Parks, Director, Office of Governmental Relations  
Crista Hill, Director, Fiscal and Business Services Division  
Amy Jackson, Administrator, Professional Services Division  
Dale Janssen, Director, Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division  
Terri Fesperman, Assistant Consultant, Certification, Assignments, and Waivers Division  
Lawrence Birch, Administrator, Professional Services Division  
Helen Hawley, Consultant, Professional Services Division

**RECORDING SECRETARY**

William Stockwin

**Wednesday, November 30, 2005**

**CONVENE GENERAL SESSION**

Chair, Leslie Peterson Schwarze, called the General session to order.

**2A: Undergraduate Subject Matter Program Review (Study Session)**

Chair Schwarze opened the study session on the process used to review undergraduate subject matter programs and turned the meeting over to staff for an overview of the training individuals receive before reviewing programs. She said Commissioners would also hear from reviewers about the review process, using as examples two programs that were approved by the Commission at its August 2005 meeting, and then the Commission would have an opportunity for discussion.

Helen Hawley, Consultant, Professional Services Division, provided some background for the discussion with a short Power Point presentation. The presentation covered training outcomes, charge to reviewers, context for review, decision-making process, subject matter requirements (SMRs), relationship of SMRs to program standards, understanding a standard, examples of evidence, calibration criteria and guidelines, and calibration activity.

Commissioner Lilly asked how many times a program goes back to the university for revision before acceptance. Ms. Hawley responded that programs are usually resubmitted at least once in 99 percent of the cases and, on average, 2.5 times.

Ms. Hawley introduced two reviewers. Dennis Parker reviewed the University of California Irvine Mathematics Program and Helen Anderson-Cruz reviewed the California State University, Northridge English Program. Ms. Hawley noted that they would summarize first their initial findings and then the responses they got back addressing their concerns.

Mr. Parker began by presenting his background. He said he is an associate professor with the Mathematics Department at the University of Pacific in Stockton where he has coordinated the single-subject program. He began his career as a classroom mathematics teacher in public schools, has “extensive involvement” with K-12 professional development, and is a parent with two children in California public schools. He was also a member of the panel that helped develop the mathematics program standards for the Commission. Mr. Parker referred to the agenda insert which was a letter from Jack Price, who reviewed the UC Irvine Mathematics program with him.

Mr. Parker said the first thing he and Mr. Price did was to make sure the submitted program met the Subject Matter Requirements (SMRs). Referring Appendix C (Alignment Matrix for SMPP Courses and the Math Subject Matter Preparation Program), he discussed the matrix that includes the mathematics subject matter requirements, and where each of the subject matter requirements are shown to be met in the various courses. He said catalog course descriptions, course syllabi, and textbooks to be used were also reviewed.

He said it was determined that UC Irvine met all the requirements. There were areas where reviewers found lack of sufficient evidence, however, such as the use of technology relevant to K-12 and revisions were requested. He said reviewers also found that program review guidelines had not been submitted and those were requested as well. He said two revisions were eventually needed to answer all the reviewers' concerns.

Mr. Parker said that the nature of the revisions requested were related to revising course syllabi, receiving statements from instructors or the department chair to further document course requirements and teaching strategies, and submission of the program review guidelines mentioned previously.

Chair Schwarze asked for some examples of teaching strategies the reviewers needed to see. Mr. Parker provided examples such as graduate problem solving sessions involving an entire group or one-on-one tutoring or students take turns making presentations in a seminar format in the higher level courses. In either case, he said those strategies may not be apparent in catalog course descriptions or the syllabus.

Commissioner Lilly asked for some examples of programs missing content standards, and for more information about what was done in those cases. Mr. Parker said there are some cases like that and that they involve adding, subtracting, or changing courses. Ms. Hawley said that requires institutional approval and it can take up to two years for a resubmission to come back. In some cases an institution cannot show where something is covered or an institution might decide that it does not want to cover particular content in the program. In those circumstances the institution does not resubmit the program and it falls out of the review process.

Dr. Parker mentioned another case where the content is covered in a professional education course, breaking a rule against having a course that counts for subject matter and professional education, which can mean revising an existing course or developing a new one

Commissioner Clopton asked for further explanation of what the various columns of checkmarks in Appendix C actually designate. As an example, he picked "exponential and logarithmic functions" under Functions in the Alignment Matrix for SMPP Courses and the Math Subject Matter Requirements.

Mr. Parker said that fell under the calculus series they take and reviewers look to make sure they have the calculus course in the program and that they are using a standard textbook covering the subject.

Commissioner Clopton asked if reviewers had seen a list of textbooks used in the courses and Mr. Parker said yes, and that he was familiar with nearly all textbooks used. He said that as a reviewer, however, he could not guarantee that every instructor would cover every chapter of a given text because there is a limit to the evidence that can be reviewed.

Ms. Hawley said evidence of what is being taught could also be looked for in the assessments, which need to be aligned with the subject matter requirements. She said there should be a body

of assessments covering all the subject matter requirements and that the assumption would be that if something is being assessed then it was being taught.

Mr. Parker said many programs also submit copies of final examinations for particular courses, which UC Irvine had done.

Commissioner Lilly said he had always been confident that the programs align well with the standards, but had less confidence that five years later they align to the standards. He said teacher education, administrator preparation programs, and other credential programs are reviewed every five to seven years to ensure they are still aligned, but that does not happen with subject matter programs and he wanted to know if that would be a part of the redesign of the accreditation process.

Ms. Hawley said that issue had been part of the discussion.

Commissioner Banker asked if reviewers actually go from using the course descriptions to the syllabus to the assessment components looking for evidence, not without being told by the university where to look. Mr. Parker said the university would hopefully indicate in its narrative where to look in the appendix for supporting evidence, and that some universities were better than others at doing this.

Ms. Hawley said that did not eliminate all of the searching around reviewers have to do and that there was still a need for more fine-tuning of the process to make it easier on both reviewers and universities submitting programs.

Commissioner Lilly said there is a stake for the university to provide sufficient proof in order to reduce the number of revisions that have to be made.

Chair Schwarze asked if anything would prevent one university from using another's successful submission as a model. Mr. Parker said that he had been asked for copies of successful programs and that it was probably happening already.

Commissioner Clopton asked for some elaboration on cases that had been specifically rejected for content. Mr. Parker said a common case was when programs were designed to give students a choice of courses but only one meets the standard.

Ms. Hawley introduced Dr. Anderson-Cruz to summarize the CSU Northridge English Program. Dr. Anderson-Cruz started by saying this particular program submission document arrived weighing 75 pounds. She said the review team had questions centering on diversity and equity issues evident in literature courses. Questions such as whether non-western literature was present and balanced in the literature classes; about early field experience and whether the institution had put sufficient funding and resources behind the early field experience; about program review and evaluation and how data informed curriculum and what assessments besides student assessments were used; and whether an advanced composition course had sufficient academic rigor. She said the submission met the subject matter requirement standards.

She said the response from CSU Northridge contained a revised course syllabus and posting of a website that student teachers and faculty could access to track what was happening in the program. She said reviewers also received sample exams, course syllabi, sample student work of advanced composition, documentation that a full-time field experience coordinator had been hired to oversee early field experience and a narrative addressing concerns of the self-study program review. She said her impression as a reviewer was that the institution addressed the standards and submitted documents supporting the program.

Commissioner Clopton asked for more information regarding the website that Dr. Anderson-Cruz had mentioned. Dr. Anderson-Cruz said a concern had been how they tracked early field experience and how they disseminated information to prospective students as the staffing outlined in the program did not appear adequate to provide enough time for that to occur with such a large program. She said the institution's response was to hire a full-time coordinator charged to post a website that faculty and students could log on to for needed documents and information regarding course activities. Ms. Hawley added that the website also includes how a candidate might find K-12 standards and how to find out what that means to their program.

Commissioner Lilly asked both reviewers why institutions just didn't offer a major and let faculty members teach what they wanted to and send students to take the CSET in that subject area. He wanted to know what was the value-added of having an approved program.

Mr. Parker said marketing was one practical reason. He said savvy students would ask for a program for a teaching credential. Many do not want to take an exam.

Commissioner Lilly asked him if a university did not have an approved program what the probability that five years from now the mathematics major for teachers would align with academic content standards. Mr. Parker responded that he thought a lot of it is automatically aligned. He said there might be a few cases where students are not getting something contained in the content standard, but he thought there would still be a big overlap.

Dr. Anderson-Cruz said her instinct was to say yes.

Commissioner Lilly said he thinks it is inevitable that arts and sciences faculty will spend more time attending to K-12 academic content standards in the approved program format than in a test format and that over time there would be drift without the incentive of having a CTC approved program.

Commissioner Banker said that, if the fundamental goal is to produce K-12 students who have been taught well, there is a basic incentive for universities to produce teachers who can achieve that goal.

Commissioner Lilly said that was a prevailing value held by many. Another, he said, in the university is academic freedom for faculty and, without the subject matter programs, where induced competition between those values exists, academic freedom wins.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

Commissioner Banker responded that teachers who can not satisfy the standards of the Williams Case would not get hired and that should be additional incentive for universities to produce teachers who can.

Commissioner Lilly responded that was more of a concern for the teacher education faculty than the arts and sciences faculty, but that with program approval it brings them all in with a stake.

Dr. Gallagher said University of Southern California does not have a math, history or social science major for education. She said students getting a degree in mathematics must meet the requirements for that degree and may not be able to meet K-12 standards if they decide to become teachers later. She said not many private universities have specific content areas designated for people who want to go into education.

Commissioner Lilly agreed, but said they have Commission-approved subject matter programs in those majors.

Mr. Parker said subject matter programs in mathematics are generally housed within a mathematics major, so if a student with a mathematics major is working on a credential program they are told what their electives are. He said a problem with the new foundational math program is finding a major to house it, so many getting credentialed under the foundational math program are doing it through CSET.

Commissioner Clopton asked what the limit a person can teach to is with foundational math. Mr. Parker said up to and including Algebra 2.

Commissioner Clopton that the higher areas of mathematics that are not required in foundational mathematics, should actually be part of the knowledge that would normally be expected for a teacher, even an Algebra 1 teacher and that he did not understand the distinctions.

Ms. Hawley said only had one program had been submitted thus far and it was still under discussion.

Commissioner Clopton discussed a situation in which teachers did poorly on a mathematics test. He said it raised many concerns about the content preparation of those teachers, and he asked Mr. Parker to speculate on how it could be that those teachers were so unprepared.

Mr. Parker said that there are so many different ways that could qualify them to be in the classroom, including emergency credentials, different board authorizations, and some may have been credentialed before there were single-subject math programs that it would be hard to say, although Commissioner Clopton's story did not surprise him.

Commissioner Banker asked if completing a course program was more difficult than passing the CSET and Mr. Parker said it was.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

Commissioner Clopton asked whether the field experience in an education directed mathematics bachelor's degree would substitute for some other mathematics course they might take with a regular mathematics major.

Mr. Parker said no. He said compared to a regular mathematics major, an education-directed program major takes the same number of courses but that the math electives are pre-determined.

Commissioner Banker asked whether it was correct that if students come out of the mathematics teacher education program more prepared, then there should be no problem with taking the CSET and Mr. Parker agreed.

Commissioner Banker then asked if there were available pass-rate data on the exam, comparing mathematics education program majors to mathematics majors. Ms. Hawley said people taking the subject matter program would not take the test, therefore a comparison was not possible. She said test anxiety was the main reason for people not wanting to take the test.

Commissioner Lilly said the advantage of the subject matter programs is that the fear of the test has served the purpose of getting people into real subject matter content preparation programs that are tied to academic content standards.

**Dr. Claire Palmerino, Director of Academic Advising, CSU Fullerton**, responded to Commissioner Lilly's question about value added. She said that when there is an approved subject matter program at an institution, it directs students to appropriate classes that align their undergraduate studies to the content standards. A student pursuing a B.A. who decides late to be a teacher may have coursework only 70% aligned and then has to take the test. She said the carrot for taking subject matter programs is not having to take the test, even though students would be taking tests regularly as part of the program. As for Commissioner Lilly's question on whether the courses would stay aligned without an approved program, she said they probably would not due to the divergence between subject matter faculty and education faculty in most institutions.

Ex-Officio McGrath asked if there was any research demonstrating the retention rates of teachers taking subject matter courses as opposed to CSET and Ms. Hawley said no, most retention data came from induction programs or intern programs.

Chair Schwarze asked, regarding the CSU Northridge English program, how reviewers can assure that those standards are covered in the two optional classes under linguistics and language study.

Dr. Anderson-Cruz said the course description, catalog description, the syllabi and sample student work were relied on for evidence.

Ms. Hawley added that there are two courses in language studies that students are required to take.

Chair Schwarze said her problem was understanding how, if a student has the choice between two different courses, the Commission could be sure the content is covered in both courses.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

Ms. Hawley said the exact same information would not have to be covered in both courses as long as whatever is not covered in the required course would be covered in both optional courses. Chair Schwarze said she still could not see how that happens and needed more proof. Commissioner Lilly suggested perhaps a discussion on how to handle that kind of situation and figure out a way not to get hung up on it.

Chair Schwarze thanked the presenters and staff at that point and opened the floor to a broader discussion.

Commissioner Banker suggested starting with the core content standards and working backwards.

Ms. Graybill said staff had provided the form used for textbook adoption by the Department of Education that might possibly be adapted to the review process under discussion to show how K-12 content standards and subject matter requirements align, along with three examples of what the final form might look like.

Ms. Hawley said the subject matter requirements had been mapped to each of the K-12 student content standards on the draft forms for English, Math and Science. She said the form could be used by institutions for submission, and then as a check off for the reviewers during program review.

Commissioner Clopton said he was concerned with a double mapping process because things get lost in the translation. He illustrated that concern by referring to the math draft form while describing an error he had found.

Ms. Graybill suggested that if the Commission liked the concept of the forms, then further work addressing specific concerns and errors could be carried out. Chair Schwarze asked Commissioner Clopton if he could assist with checking a final form's accuracy in matching K-12 standards with subject matter requirements once one was developed and he agreed.

Commissioner Banker expressed preference for the English subject matter draft form because it offered the potential to show more information. She said it could even be expanded to make finding evidence as simple as possible. Chair Schwarze agreed saying it would bolster Commissioners' confidence in the process.

Commissioner Lilly asked how many subject matter programs were in the review process that had not come to the Commission yet. Ms. Hawley estimated the number at 120-125.

Commissioner Lilly then asked if the Commission adopted one of the review forms, would it ask all those institutions to resubmit their programs. Commissioner Banker responded that the form would be the piece of evidence the Commissioners needed to fulfill their charge under the Education Code to ensure that K-12 standards align with subject matter requirements otherwise, as discussed at a previous meeting, Commissioners opened themselves up to potential lawsuits.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

Commissioner Lilly said it sounded like institutions would have to resubmit their work and he could not support that as it was unreasonable.

Commissioner Banker said the Commission was bound by the Education Code, and that she could not vote to approve a program otherwise.

Commissioner Lilly responded that it was not an "Education Code question but rather a trust question."

Commissioner Gomez said there was no ideal time to impose a new format and that it would always be a lot of extra work, but if institutions were going to be asked to make changes then the Commission should set a target date and a time element for implementation.

Vice Chair Stordahl asked Dr. Gallagher for her opinion on whether asking institutions to go back and comply with a new format was an onerous request.

Ex-Officio Gallagher said that setting a future date for implementation might be better than asking institutions that have already begun the process to go back and resubmit a program because they may just decide not to have an approved program. She said she did not see what their incentive would be to do it.

Ex-Officio Waite said that if it was just a matter of putting the information into a new format, the retroactive part might be difficult but she did not think it would be that onerous although departments probably would not be very happy about it. She added that, for those with doubts about the process, the draft forms did an excellent job of showing where the K-12 standards are.

Commissioner Lilly said the difficulty in complying with a new format would depend on how much the Commission would ask for. He said a list of course numbers would be easy, but a complete cross-referencing of related instructional materials to syllabi and textbooks, for instance, would essentially amount to producing another proposal. He suggested getting the new format finalized and then applying it to all new proposals and subsequent program reviews from a future date forward. He also suggested asking a couple of programs to volunteer to comply with the new format to see just how much time it would take to complete.

Commissioner Clopton said if the evidence is there already, then perhaps the reviewers could fill out the new form.

Commissioner Lilly asked if the reviewers would have to go back and re-do work they have already done.

Commissioner Clopton asked how many of the 125 current program submissions had been through the initial review process. Ms. Hawley said probably 100 were in process and suggested that if reviewers used the new form as a report to the institutions, then discrepancies could be flagged and the institutions could fill in the rest of the form as part of their response.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

Commissioner Bustillos thought that would be a good way to begin the process of using a new format, but that it should eventually become a standard part of the submission process. She suggested adding an “as evidenced by” column to make the review process easier.

Commissioner Banker said then the form would become a living document to track program changes over time as well. She also pointed out that K-12 does not always get two years notice of impending changes.

Commissioner Grant said the new format would be a selling tool as well as evidence and that Commission approval of programs had to be based on evidence and not just trust.

Commissioner Clopton said he saw the new format as a map to work already done on submissions and not as asking for institutions to do all their work again and felt most universities would comply with it.

Commissioner Lilly said there seemed to be general agreement except on transitional issues. He suggested finalizing a new format as quickly as possible and implementing it on new program submissions. Further, he suggested having Commission staff develop something similar but less onerous to be used on the existing programs under review. He said that way, the Commission gets what it wants and the new format could be phased in.

During a short break, Chair Schwarze presented a plaque to outgoing Commissioner Clopton for service to the Commission.

Returning to the topic, she said she was seeing agreement on using the new format, and asked for ideas on the best way to proceed to approval.

Commissioner Bustillos reiterated the previous suggestion to let reviewers begin implementing the format and setting a date for when institutions would begin using it with their program submissions.

Commissioner Lilly said he thought the Commission was at least a couple of months from having a final form.

Ex-Officio Gallagher said the Commission also needed assurance that the field agrees that the K-12 and program standards are in right alignment and that needed to begin right away.

Commissioner Lilly suggested looking at short-term approvals of programs that have already submitted and then have them revise the programs in two years using the new format.

Dr. Swofford asked if it would be helpful to convene a higher education group within the next month or two to discuss these proposals and then bring something back to the Commission.

Commissioner Lilly offered the following proposal: stop accepting new subject matter program applications right away; for existing proposals under review, the Commission would consider

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

two-year approvals; and then work to get the new format process in place as quickly as possible and apply it to all new proposals and, eventually, to programs granted a two-year approval.

Commissioner Banker said she would vote for that, but would be interested in hearing input from higher education. Ex-Officio Gallagher responded that higher education would like to have some input, especially from representatives of the 13 subject matter areas.

Following some discussion on how to prioritize implementation of a new format, Chair Schwarze suggested starting with the K-12 core areas of mathematics and language arts first, science and history second.

Ex-Officio Waite said the Commission knew subject matter programs address K-12 standards and asked what the real reason for doing something new would be. Chair Schwarze responded that even though she understood claims that subject matter programs addressed K-12 standards, no one had ever shown her evidence on exactly how and where that happened. She said she wanted more specific evidence she could check and verify for herself.

Commissioner Lilly asked if it would be possible to get something as an action item on this topic for the following day's meeting.

Chair Schwarze said the discussion would be part of the Executive Committee.

Ms. Graybill reiterated Commissioner Lilly's earlier three-part proposal on how to move the issue forward.

The study session adjourned.

**Thursday, December 1, 2005**

**2B: Call meeting to order; call roll, pledge**

Commission Chair Leslie Peterson Schwarze called the General Session to order. Roll was taken, Commissioners Molina and Clopton were absent; a quorum was declared.

Chair Schwarze introduced Deputy Secretary of Education and Chief of Staff to the Secretary, Scott Himelstein.

Mr. Himelstein presented plaques to Commissioners Bustillos, Johnson, and Lilly who were leaving office. He acknowledged their work on the Commission and thanked them for their service.

Commissioners Lilly, Johnson, and Bustillos thanked members of the Commission, Executive Director Swofford, Deputy Secretary Himelstein, and staff for the recognition. They spoke fondly of their participation on the Commission, noted some of the accomplishments of the Commission during their tenure, and acknowledged the continued importance of the work of the Commission.

Chair Schwarze asked Mr. Himmelstein to address the Commission.

Mr. Himmelstein thanked the Commission for all its work and noted that the Secretary of Education is reviewing the work of the Commission and will be presenting recommendations to the Governor. He indicated that Secretary Bersin is looking at the Commission's budget, subject matter program review, and reciprocity. He noted that Secretary Bersin would like the opportunity to meet with the Commission at its next meeting to discuss program review and other teacher quality related issues. He said that the Secretary would like the opportunity to obtain Commissioner and stakeholder input regarding these issues.

Chair Schwarze asked if that meant that the Commission should delay approval of current undergraduate subject matter programs up for approval. Mr. Himmelstein indicated that Chair Schwarze was correct.

Commissioner Johnson stated that she was concerned about further delaying approval of subject matter programs.

Mr. Himmelstein asked that the Commission wait on making a decision in light of the Secretary's upcoming recommendations.

Ex-Officio Young voiced her concern regarding delaying approval of programs that are currently in the review process. She indicated that she would be in favor of delaying any action to change the process of approval, but was hesitant to further delay approval of programs already involved in the review process.

Mr. Himmelstein clarified that the Secretary would like there not to be any change in the review process at this time. He indicated that Secretary's office is looking at going in a different direction with regards to subject matter review.

Ex-Officio Young asked for clarification that the Secretary's Office would like the Commission to delay making any decisions regarding a change in process for subject matter review and not delay the approval of the programs currently up for approval.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the Commission should not change programs and requirements for programs for those programs already involved in the approval process.

Mr. Himmelstein said that he could not dictate what action the Commission takes, but is relaying the wishes of the Secretary of Education. He noted that the Secretary's chief concern is that the process for approval not be changed at this time.

Commissioner Lilly presented the idea that the Commission was considering possibly approving programs on a two-year basis, and wondered if that affected the Secretary's view regarding subject matter program approval.

Mr. Himmelstein reiterated that the Secretary is not in favor of implementing any changes in the process of approval.

Ex-Officio Young asked for clarification about whether the Commission should approve current programs up for approval because that would not be a change in process.

Vice Chair Stordahl made a motion to table Executive Committee item 3D until the January/February Commission meeting per the request of the Secretary of Education's office. Commissioner Banker seconded.

Chair Schwarze asked that any motion be delayed until the item comes up as planned in the agenda for the Executive Committee meeting.

The Commission thanked Mr. Himmelstein for coming and speaking with them.

Mr. Himmelstein again thanked the Commissioners leaving office for their service and stated that he looked forward to coming back to the Commission in January along with the Secretary of Education.

**2C: Approval of October 2005 minutes**

Commissioner Lilly moved approval of the minutes of the October 2005 meeting, Commissioner Gomez seconded the motion. The Commission approved the motion with Vice Chair Stordahl abstaining.

**2D: Approval of the November/December 2005 agenda**

Commissioner Lilly moved approval of the November/December 2005 agenda. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Banker and carried without dissent.

**2E: Approval of the November/December 2005 Consent Calendar**

Commissioner Johnson moved approval of the consent calendar. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Banker and carried without dissent.

The Commission approved the following:

**Division of Professional Practices**

**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. ALVAREZ, Julio C. Los Angeles, CA  
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of thirty (30) days and any pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
2. ATCHISON, Scott L. Fresno, CA  
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

3. BERNAL, James D. Calexico, 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.
4. BIRON, Christopher Pasadena, 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. BOUDREAU, Jeanne L. Aptos, CA  
Ms. Boudreau is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
6. BRUNELLE, Corey J. Yuba City, CA  
Mr. Brunelle is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
7. BURT, Veronica M. San Jose, CA  
Ms. Burt is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
8. CALLOWAY, Felton M. Rancho Cordova, 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.
9. CAMPBELL, Francine Rancho Cucamonga, 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, effective December 20, 2005.
10. CARRILLO, Elaine M. Los Angeles, CA  
Ms. Carrillo is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
11. CAVUTI, William H. Carson, 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.
12. COOK, Jeffrey M. North Hollywood, 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.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

13. DAVENPORT, Carlton M. Los Angeles, 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.
14. DORVILLE, Susan C. Modesto, CA  
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
15. GAINES, William L. Modesto, 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.
16. GARCIA, Raul A. Covina, CA  
Mr. Garcia is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
17. GARZA, Abel Santa Maria, CA  
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
18. GRAY, Janice R. Gardena, 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.
19. GUILLEN, Kathleen V. Martinez, 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.
20. HARRIS, Clifton L. Victorville, CA  
Mr. Harris is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
21. HEDRICK, David E. Upland, 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. HERMANS, Carl J. Van Nuys, CA  
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
23. HULL, Mark R. Clovis, 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.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

24. HUSAIN, Nasir S. Garden Grove, 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.
25. KRUSE, Nancy K. Chowchilla, 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.
26. McCABE, Carry L. Glendora, CA  
Mr. McCabe is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, effective immediately.
27. NELSON, Robert A. Bayside, CA  
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are suspended for a period of one hundred twenty (120) days for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
28. PEARSE, Joe F. Alameda, 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 44420.
29. PEREZ, Rick A. Fresno, 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.
30. PIATEK, Sharon G. Kenmore, NY  
All pending applications are denied for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
31. SALAZAR, Alberto R. Fresno, CA  
In accordance with the default provision of Government Code section 11520, Mr. Salazar's application is denied.
32. SCARBOROUGH, Winifred W. San Diego, CA  
Ms. Scarborough is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
33. SMITH, Michael D. San Francisco, 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.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

34. SORIA, Richard M. Madera, 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. SOTO, Alma C. Avenal, CA  
Ms. Soto is the subject of public reproof for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
36. VAN SICKLEN, Mary J. 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.

**CONSENT DETERMINATIONS**

37. ALLEN, Coy Lakewood, CA  
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that Mr. Allen agrees to self-revoke his credential, pursuant to Education Code section 44440, is adopted.
38. BERRA, Michelle L. Santa Maria, CA  
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that Ms. Berra agrees to self-revoke her credential, pursuant to Education Code section 44440, is adopted.
39. BHARE, Ronald Redondo Beach, CA  
The Attorney General's Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are revoked; however, the revocation is stayed, he will serve a thirty (30) day suspension, and is placed on probation for a period of three (3) years, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
40. CHATARD, Tahra D. Los Angeles, CA  
The Attorney General's Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that Ms. Chatard is the subject of public reproof, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
41. DRUMMOND, Duncan G. Orland, CA  
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are suspended for a period of five (5) days, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
42. ECKLUND, Steven L. Ahwahnee, CA  
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that Mr. Ecklund agrees to self-revoke his credential, pursuant to Education Code section 44440, is adopted.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

43. GRAY, Patricia J. Redondo Beach, CA  
The Attorney General's Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are suspended for a period of five (5) days, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
44. OSHODI, Theresa M. Upland, CA  
The Proposed Consent Determination, that allows Ms. Oshodi to withdraw her application is adopted.
45. OVIEDO, Monica M. Whittier, CA  
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are suspended for a period of seven (7) days, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
46. SAVAR, Jonathan Los Angeles, CA  
The Attorney General's Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are suspended for a period of thirty-six (36) days; however, fifteen (15) days are stayed, he will serve a twenty-one (21) day suspension, and he is placed on probation for a period of one (1) year, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
47. SHARGHI, Ali San Diego, CA  
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are suspended for a period of fifteen (15) days, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
48. TOVAR, Carol L. Mariposas, CA  
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that Ms. Tovar is the subject of public reproof, her application is granted and revoked; however, the revocation is stayed, and she is placed on probation for a period of three (3) years, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
49. VASTBINDER, Ivanna M. Patterson, CA  
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that Ms. Vastbinder's Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is revoked; however, the revocation is stayed, her Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is suspended for a period of fifteen (15) days, and she is placed on probation for a period of three (3) years, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
50. WATKIN, George E. III Magalia, CA  
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are suspended for a period of thirty (30) days, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.

**RECONSIDERATION CONSENT**

**(No new information)**

51. ALOCOZY, Tara Castro Valley, CA  
At its October 6, 2005 meeting, the Commission adopted the Committee of Credentials recommendation to revoke all certification documents and deny any pending applications. Ms. Alocozy submitted a letter dated October 21, 2005, requesting reconsideration. No new information was provided.

**PRIVATE ADMONITIONS**

Pursuant to Education Code section 44438, the Committee of Credentials recommends two (2) private admonitions for the Commission's approval.

**REQUESTS FOR REVOCATION**

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

52. CALLAHAN, Jason P. New Preston, CT  
Upon his written request and while allegations of misconduct were pending, all certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are revoked pursuant to Education Code section 44423. This does not constitute consent for purposes of Education Code section 44440(b).
53. ESTERKYN, Lyle Sacramento, CA  
Upon his written request, pursuant to Education Code section 44423, his supplementary authorizations of Biology and Chemistry are revoked on his Single Subject Teaching Credential.

**WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATIONS**

54. GRANT, Nicholas A. Altadena, CA  
Pursuant to his request and while allegations of misconduct were pending, his application is withdrawn.

**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.

55. ALDERETE, Rosa C. Duarte, CA  
56. ALEXANDER-LOW, Janet K. Stockton, CA  
57. AMMONS, Floyd E. Irvine, CA  
58. BOICELLI, Rebecca A. Menlo Park, CA  
59. BOWE, Bruce U. Barstow, CA  
60. CASEY, Christopher C. San Jose, CA  
61. ESPANOL, Rachel M. San Diego, CA  
62. GALLARDO, Rogelio R. Corona, CA

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

63. HILL, Andrew L.	Moreno Valley, CA
64. HUSSAIN, Samir N.	San Diego, CA
65. JUNGKEIT, Amy M.	Anaheim, CA
66. KNUTSON, Kara L.	Lake Forest, CA
67. LOPEZ, Alfred L.	San Diego, CA
68. MARQUEZ, Michael A.	La Puente, CA
69. McCAULEY, Cedrick H.	Sacramento, CA
70. McGANN, Cathleen E.	Los Alamitos, CA
71. McNEIL, Michael K.	Apple Valley, CA
72. MURPHY, Charles T., Jr.	Murrieta, CA
73. OSBORNE, Cynthia R.	San Luis Obispo, CA
74. RANGEL La Donna M.	Fremont, CA
75. REBHAN, Michael J.	Elk Grove, CA
76. ROSKE, Earl T.	San Jose, CA
77. THOMPSON, Glenn T.	Rialto, CA
78. WRIGHT, Gloria L.	Paradise, 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).

79. BECERRA, James J.	Stockton, CA
80. BERRYMAN, Robert F.	Crescent City, CA
81. GIORDANO, Bill P.	Menlo Park, CA
82. KARAPETYAN, Arutyun h.	Los Angeles, CA
83. LINK, Derek E.	Yuba City, CA
84. McEVOY, Jason D.	Orangevale, CA
85. McNAMARA, Thomas D.	Fullerton, CA
86. ROSSETTE, Leo W.	Mount Shasta, CA
87. STEIN, David A.	Los Angeles, 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.

88. HAZELTON, Charles B., Jr.	Highland, CA
89. LOPEZ, Robert N.	Palmdale, CA
90. WINGERT, Nathan T.	Visalia, CA

**TERMINATION OF AUTOMATIC SUSPENSIONS**

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

91. HAMMER, Carl S. Santa Monica, CA  
92. HUGHES, Ronald G. Oakland, CA  
93. MARTINEZ, Fernando x. Stockton, CA

#### **TERMINATIONS OF PROBATION**

94. ANASTAS, Michael T. Sacramento, 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 September 5, 2002, the stay order has been made permanent and his credentials are restored.
95. GOODSON, Stephen E. Palm Springs, 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 February 5, 2004, the stay order is vacated and his credential is restored.
96. MINGO, Ronald T. Oakland, 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 3, 2002, the stay order has been made permanent and his credential is restored.
97. ORR, Gregory Santa Cruz, 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 10, 2002, the stay order has been made permanent and his credential is restored.
98. SPAHR, Peter Winters, 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 13, 2005, the stay order has been made permanent and his credential is restored

#### **Certification, Assignment & Waivers Division**

##### **DENIAL OF CREDENTIAL WAIVER REQUESTS**

The Appeals and Waivers 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. Iris Ese/Westside Union Elementary School District
2. Victoria A. Artiano/Irvine Unified School District
3. Donald Moreland/San Marino Unified School District
4. Rebecca Alvarez/San Jose Unified
5. Christina Frances Morabe/
6. Kimberly Hewitt/Long Beach Unified School District

**2F: Chair's report**

The Chair did not present a report.

**2G: Executive Director's report**

The Executive Director did not present a report.

**2H: Commission Member reports**

Commissioners Johnson, Bustillos and Lilly each said a few words on their tenure on the Commission.

**2I: Liaison Reports**

State Board of Education Representative Ruth Bloom thanked departing Commissioners Johnson, Bustillos and Lilly for their service to state education.

**LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Jon Stordahl, Chair of the Committee, called the Legislative Committee of the Whole to order.

**4A: Legislative Concepts for Commission Consideration**

Bonnie Parks, Director, Office of Governmental Relations presented legislative concepts for the 2006 legislative year for Commission consideration.

**Legislative Proposal #1: Authorization for Retired Teachers to Serve on the Committee of Credentials.**

Ms. Parks said the proposed legislative concept authorizes retired teachers to serve on the Committee of Credentials within their first five years of retirement. She said current law requires Committee members to be full-time certificated classroom teachers, but increased demands on teachers are acting as deterrents to the recruitment of working educators to the COC. Classroom teachers who cannot leave their students for the required monthly, three-day meetings are most impacted. She said Commissioner Johnson recommended changing the law to increase the pool of potential committee members.

Ex-Officio Waite suggested adding a special education teacher to the COC.

Commissioner Johnson said that would increase the committee roster to eight members, which would necessitate either to adding or subtracting one public member to avoid tie votes.

Ex-Officio Waite expressed concern that special education teachers should also be able to qualify for these positions. Vice Chair Stordahl asked Ms. Parks if Ms. Waite's suggestion was going beyond the point presented in the proposal. Ms. Parks said the Commission could propose legislation as it chooses.

Commissioner Lilly asked if anything currently precluded special education teachers from applying to positions on the committee. Ex-Officio Waite responded yes and disagreed with excluding an entire population of credentialed teachers from committee positions.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

Commissioner Johnson said a check of the language of the pertinent code section would likely find “elementary teacher or secondary teacher” but not “credentialed.”

Commissioner Lilly said the proposed legislation should talk about teachers retired not more than five years to be “appointed to the committee” rather than “to serve on the committee.” He said the Commission would not want people removed from the committee in the middle of a term because they had reached five years of retirement.

Ms. Armstrong, referring to Commissioner Johnson’s earlier point, said the specific language reads “a member shall be a full-time certified classroom teacher in the public elementary schools with not less than five years classroom experience.” She said that would allow a person holding a special education credential to serve on the Committee.

Ex-Officio Waite said that should be better publicized in order to get more volunteers.

Commissioner Littman said if the legislation went through then it could produce a committee with no active teachers on it. Ms. Parks said that was possible.

Commissioner Littman said that was a concern because the committee might lose sight of day-to-day issues without any members actively engaged in teaching. Commissioner Littman said she thought the committee should be comprised of active teachers and would oppose this proposal.

Commissioner Johnson suggested a compromise of letting teachers who are not working full time apply for the committee, rather than opening the Commission to outside criticism not having any active classroom teachers on the Committee of Credentials.

Ex-Officio Young said she could not see any working teacher leaving their class for the 4-5 days a month the committee normally meets. She suggested splitting the committee in two and dividing the workload.

Commissioner Lilly said he preferred Dr. Young’s option because having teachers spend 20 percent of their time away from class probably was not good for education.

Commissioner Johnson suggested a change to the language of Ed. Code Section 44240, deleting the words “full-time” in both sections (a) and (b) as a start to increase the number of applicants. After some discussion, Commissioner Johnson suggested the Commission not move forward with this legislative proposal at this time.

**Kathy Harris, California Teachers Association**, said her organization was prepared to be part of the work of solving this challenge. She said CTA was not prepared to support this legislation in its current form and appreciated it being pulled.

Commissioner Littman said she was uncomfortable with just tweaking the proposal and would rather discuss options to make it a better proposal. Dr. Swofford said staff could come back with additional recommendations at a future meeting.

**Legislative Proposal #2: Technical Amendments Related to the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program.** Ms. Parks said the proposed legislation is to clarify specified aspects of the law governing the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program via amendments addressing the following points:

1. The need for candidate selection criteria to be provided by the school district or county office of education to better ensure candidate success in earning a teaching credential.
2. The need for clarification regarding fluctuating teacher supply needs and credential program preferences currently outlined in the law.
3. The need for clarification regarding repayment of financial assistance including an appeal process based on illness or family care needs and a section to address recent developments such as the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) requirement that all multiple- subject credential candidates pass a subject matter exam.
4. The need for clarification regarding responsibility for repayments to the State General Fund.
5. The need for funding for an external evaluation of the program to be contracted by the Commission as specified under current law as noted in the 2004 Bureau of State Audits report.

Ex-Officio Young asked how clarification about repayment aligns with the new requirement of No Child Left Behind.

Commissioner Littman said the issue was that they do not have to repay as long as they are in the program and making progress. Failing the test triggered repayment.

Chair Schwarze said she could not see where the “test piece” was in the proposal’s language and Commissioner Lilly pointed her to the appropriate passage under section D (4).

Commissioner Lilly moved to approve the second proposal forward. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion and it carried without dissent.

## **FISCAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Committee Chair Bustillos, called the Fiscal Policy and Planning Committee of the Whole to order.

### **5A: Proposed Legislative Reports Due to the Joint Legislative Budget Committees and the Department of Finance**

Mary Armstrong, Director, Division of Professional Practices; Crista Hill, Director, Fiscal and Business Services Section; Dale Janssen, Director, Certification, Assignments and Waivers Division, presented this item.

Ms. Hill introduced the item, saying language in the 2005-06 Budget Act requires the Commission to submit two proposals: 1) the feasibility of using internal legal counsel rather than the Attorney General at administrative hearings and; 2) the feasibility of establishing fees for disciplinary reviews and associated disciplinary actions. The Commission is also charged with preparing a report on its efforts to streamline and automate the review of credentials submitted by institutions of higher education as well as child care permits submitted by community

colleges. She said if approved at this meeting, the proposals and report would be submitted by December 15. Regarding the first proposal dealing with the question of whether or not the staff of the Division of Professional Practices could use in-house counsel rather than the Attorney General for administrative hearings, Ms. Armstrong said that either the Attorney General's office would have to give its permission to do that, or there would have to be a statutory change. She said a letter from the Attorney General's office made it clear that permission would not be given, so a statutory change would be necessary. She said an estimated \$707,176 would be saved using in-house staff.

Commissioner Lilly said he would like to see the legal services piece on the legislative agenda as quickly as possible. Ms. Armstrong responded it was her understanding that these proposals would be presented to legislative budget committees for the next budget package.

Regarding the second proposal to consider the feasibility of establishing fees for disciplinary reviews and associated actions, Ms. Armstrong said a significant amount of money would be generated if it could be guaranteed that it would be paid. She said the recovery rate ranged between 25 and 60 percent. Also, she said additional staff would be needed to manage the fee recovery process.

**Beverly Tucker, Chief Counsel, California Teachers Association**, said that the discipline fee proposal is terrible public policy and likely to be found unconstitutional, at least in part. She said no other state teacher certification body levies fines as an adjunct to discipline. She said of the other kinds of licensing bodies do levy disciplinary fines in cases where alleged misconduct results in a monetary benefit to the perpetrator. That is not the case with teachers, she said, adding that the main mission of the Commission is to protect the school children of the state by ensuring teachers are prepared and credentialed and not about assessing fines as a deterrent for misconduct. She said the Commission should not implement a system that interferes with a person's constitutional rights to defend themselves and that this proposal would deter more people from entering the teaching profession. She said that the state should be supporting the disciplinary system because it is the state's charge to protect school children and urged rejection of this proposal.

Commissioner Bustillos announced that, in order to maintain a quorum after Commissioner Grant had to leave, Ex-Officio Waite would fill in for the rest of the meeting.

Mr. Janssen spoke to the third item. He updated the progress being made in automating the online recommendation process for the universities. He said the system is fully operational and being used on a daily basis. He anticipated that some 50,000 applications would now be handled online, saving approximately 1,600 hours of work. The second part of his report dealt with efforts to streamline the processing of Child Development permits submitted by community colleges. He said there are currently 12 community colleges that have had programs verified for about 900 people.

Ex-Officio McGrath asked Mr. Janssen how long it took community colleges to issue permits. Mr. Janssen said without this approval, they are not really directly involved in the process. He said when individuals complete their program they submit their application directly to the

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

Commission. He said the streamlining effort has the community college verify and submit the application, reducing the Commission's work with respect to data entry.

Commissioner Lilly said that he thought that fines for disciplinary actions would be a disastrous way to go. He asked what it meant to impose separate fees for all applications requiring a character and fitness review in stage one. Ms. Armstrong answered that would be all applications where there was a Yes answer on the character part.

Commissioner Lilly said therefore a "yes" answer means an applicant would have to pay a fee to get through the licensing process.

Ms. Armstrong said the "yes" answer brings up two issues, first with initial applications and then with the five-year renewal. She said if applicants answered "yes" the first time, then they should answer "yes" on the renewal but at that point they do not undergo a full review. She said that a quandary exists over whether to charge the same amount on the renewal as the initial review.

Commissioner Lilly said he was not ready to dispose of stages 1, 3, and 5, but that the second and fourth stages were problematic. He said the notion that the Commission would ask someone requesting an administrative hearing to pay a recovery fee (stage 3) was not unreasonable, nor were stages 1 and 5.

Commissioner Lilly asked if by supplying the reports the Commission was endorsing all proposals. Ms. Armstrong said the Commission had already approved the concepts at its April meeting and was just approving the content of the report.

Commissioner Lilly asked if the report could be submitted with the addition of language that would express the concerns about the implementation of some of the options and Ms. Armstrong said yes.

Commissioner Banker agreed, saying there are clear issues with the proposals involving due process that are much deeper than the issue of returning funds. She said asking someone to pay for an administrative law hearing would be like asking someone to pay for a jury trial.

Ms. Armstrong clarified that the fee asked for an administrative law hearing would not actually cover the cost of the hearing.

Commissioner Lilly moved approval of the first proposal and the report and Commissioner Banker seconded the motion. The motion carried, with Commissioner Littman voting to oppose.

Commissioner Lilly moved approval of the second proposal, with addition of language making it clear that the Commission does not consider stages 2 and 4 to be feasible for implementation. Chair Schwarze seconded.

Commissioner Banker argued that stage one was not completely fair and that she was only comfortable with stage 5.

Ex-Officio Waite said she had a problem with stage 3, saying she did not think it was fair to pay for stating a case under due process.

Ex-Officio Young questioned if it was fair to solve existing financial problems and budget issues on the backs of teachers.

Commissioner Gomez voiced concerns about imposing fines on teachers.

Dr. Swofford asked Ms. Armstrong to clarify what the Commission was required to submit. Ms. Armstrong said the Commission was required to submit a detailed proposal to consider the feasibility of establishing fees for disciplinary reviews and associated disciplinary actions, with a comprehensive description of the options, how it could be implemented and identify associated cost savings was the requirement.

Ms. Bloom asked Ms. Armstrong if the proposal could be forwarded with a negative vote from the Commission, and Ms. Armstrong responded yes.

Ms. Tucker said the proposal needed to have policy implications and potential negative consequences added to it before submission.

Ms. Armstrong said language expressing all of the concerns around the table could be added.

The Commission voted on the motion. Commissioner Lilly voted yes, all others voted no and the motion failed.

Commissioner Lilly then moved authorization of the proposal, with additional language in the conclusion section saying that, after further consideration, the Commission has serious doubts about the implementation of these options. Commissioner Gomez seconded the motion and it carried without dissent.

**5B: Proposed Expenditure Plan for the Development of a New Subject Matter Examination in the Filipino Language per Assembly Bill 420 (Horton), Chapter 390, Statutes of 2005**

Crista Hill, Director, Fiscal and Business Services Section, and Amy Jackson, Administrator, Professional Services Division, presented Commission members with the proposed expenditure plan as required by AB 420, and asked for approval to submit the plan to the Department of Finance by January 8, 2006.

Ms. Hill said the estimated cost of the proposed plan was \$50,000.

After brief discussion, Commissioner Lilly moved approval with an amendment to the steps identified on page FPPC 5B-2 to ensure that the stakeholders have an opportunity to comment as part of step 10 Field Test, Commissioner Gomez seconded the motion, and the motion carried without dissent.

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **6A: Proposed Addition to California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Section 80033.2 Pertaining to Special Temporary Certificates.**

Terri H. Fesperman, Assistant Consultant, Certification, Assignments and Waivers Division, presented the proposed addition of Section 80033.2 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations pertaining to Special Temporary Certificates, as emergency regulations. She said the Commission will submit the emergency regulations to the Office of Administrative Law to allow the Commission to issue Special Temporary Certificates to replace the Individualized Internship Credentials.

Ms Fesperman noted that approval would allow the Commission to issue Special Temporary Certificates to current holders of Individualized Internship Certificates. She said the need to act on the item stemmed from an August 2005 lawsuit against the Commission where in the court determined the Commission did not have the authority to issue Individualized Intern Certificates and that the certificates were void. The stipulated judgment from the lawsuit required the Commission to establish a Special Temporary Certificate, which would have the same requirements and authorization as the individualized intern certificate. She then briefly reviewed California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Section 80033.2 pertaining to special temporary certificates.

Chair Schwarze then asked Commission members for questions. Hearing none, she recognized speakers from the audience.

**Beverly Tucker, California Teachers Association Chief Counsel**, urged the Commission to adopt the emergency regulations. She said it was vitally important to assure the continued employment status of thousands of teachers issued certificates by the Commission and who are at risk of losing employment as a consequence of the court decision. She also cautioned that the Commission's action to adopt the emergency regulations does not address the other issue of the status of these individuals under federal law. She urged further study of that issue to fully protect the employment status of the people involved.

**Mary Falvey, Director of Student Services, California State University, Los Angeles**, commended staff for responding to her concern about the proposed regulations for the internship for the Education Specialists, but said they were omitted in the emergency regulations. She expressed concern that some people currently teaching on what would have been an IIC will no longer be eligible under the new regulations. She said the Education Specialist subject matter could be met in several different ways, including the multiple subject waiver program, which she said was not specified in the new regulations. She suggested adding them, just as they have been put in the proposed regulations for the internship.

Ex-Officio Young indicated that it was already in the proposed regulation and then read the appropriate passage from 80033.2 (C). Ms. Falvey replied that that was only relevant to the single subject waiver and that the multiple subject waiver was still not allowed. Ms. Fesperman said when staff finalized the internship regulations it would add a clarifying definition addressing Ms. Falvey's concerns.

Commissioner Banker moved to approve the emergency regulations as proposed. Commissioner Littman seconded and the motion carried without dissent.

**6B: Proposed Addition to California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Sections 80033 and 80033.1 Pertaining to Internship Credentials.**

Chair Schwarze postponed this item to the Commission's next meeting, when additional public input could be taken.

**6C: Proposed Addition to California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Sections 80300, 80309.1, 80311, 80314.5 and 80317 and the addition of new Section 80305 Pertaining to the Committee of Credentials.**

Kim Hunter, Staff Counsel, Division of Professional Practices, presented the Commission with the proposed amendments to Sections 80300, 80310, 80311, 80314.5, 80317 and the addition of new section 80305 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations. These sections pertain to the discipline of professional certificated personnel.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the Commission could use the legislative leaders' concerns to leverage additional funding.

Commissioner Lilly asked that if the item is tabled whether the public hearing could still go ahead. Ms. Armstrong said yes. Vice Chair Stordahl suggested tabling both the item and the hearing so they could occur together on a later agenda.

Commissioner Lilly then moved to table the item. Commissioner Grant seconded the motion and it carried without dissent.

**PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Commissioner Banker, serving as acting Committee Chair in the absence of Commissioner Molina, chaired the Professional Services Committee meeting.

**7A: Update on the Field Review for Accreditation**

Elaine Johnson, Commissioner, and Lawrence Birch, Administrator, Professional Services Division, presented a report on activities related to the field review of recommended modifications to the Commission's accreditation system.

Commissioner Johnson said she attended the October 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) as a Commissioner liaison. She said the COA reviewed the accreditation system, including the recommendations presented to the Commission on October 6, as well as a plan for stakeholder feedback. She said a draft survey for stakeholder input was reviewed as well, including a discussion about who should be surveyed and how best to collect the information. It was suggested that part of survey be redesigned to include questions relating to the big ideas contained in the recommendations. She said the draft survey was shared with the Secretary of Education's Office and the Chair of the Commission. Finally, she said some pieces of additional work related to the reviewing of standards – the common standards, the

experimental program standards, preconditions and the idea of required elements – was discussed and a plan for three small workgroups was developed to discuss that work before reporting to the full COA at it's next meeting on February 16.

Dr. Birch said that the survey is almost ready to open on the web and would be posted soon. He said members of the Commission will be notified when that happens.

**7B: Recommended Initial Passing Standards for the California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET): Agriculture, Business, Health Science, Home Economics and Industrial Technology Education.**

Amy Jackson, Administrator, Professional Services Division, and Dr. John Mattar, Senior Area Director, National Evaluation Systems, Inc. presented a report of the standard-setting study conducted on October 17-19, 2005, which considers the establishment of passing standards for subject matter examinations in Agriculture, Business, Health, Home Economics, and Industrial Technology Education.

Ms. Jackson introduced Dr. Mattar and said this was the third phase of a multi-year process to bring these standards to the Commission.

Dr. Mattar said the same process was used in developing the exams and establishing a recommended passing score as used in previous years for CSET. He emphasized that all the recommendations being brought to the Commission were based on the expert judgment of educators who were on the panels. He said those experts rated each question through several iterations prior to making a final judgment over a two-day period. After compilation of the expert judgments, Commission staff considers additional information, including the issue of measurement error. He said all of that data is reviewed by Commission staff in making the recommendations on passing scores to the Commission.

Dr. Mattar added that the pass rates requested in the agenda item are based only on the first administration of these tests, meaning that some of the tests had very few candidates taking them. In addition, he said that the passing scores would be reviewed after 150 candidates had taken each test.

Commissioner Lilly asked how long it would take to get to that 150 mark. Ms. Jackson responded it might take years for a low incidence exam such as agriculture. She reminded Commissioners that students could take course work or the exam.

Commissioner Littman moved to adopt the initial passing standards for the CSET forms administered on September 10, 2005. Commissioner Grant seconded the motion, and the item carried without dissent.

**7C: Annual Report on the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program**

Amy Jackson, Administrator, Professional Services Division, presented a report on the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program which is required to be submitted to the Legislature by Education Code 44393.

Ms. Jackson said this item is an annual report that the Commission is required to prepare for the legislature. She said the primary purpose of the paraprofessional program is to help create local career ladders to assist non-credentialed positions to become credentialed. The program provides \$3000 per year per paraprofessional, which is not enough to cover expenses due to rising tuition fees at many institutions. Further, paraprofessionals who entered the program to be multiple-subject teachers are completing their initial credential but not finding employment. She said that program participants must return to the school district the number of years that the program served the participants, and that if they cannot do that then they are required to reimburse the General Fund.

Ex-Officio Young asked who is responsible for the tracking and monitoring of the repayments. Ms. Jackson said that it is the district's responsibility to get the reimbursement from the candidates. She said that staff has been working to identify candidates who have not fulfilled their obligations and is not sure what will happen when candidates are asked to return, in some cases, upwards of \$30,000.

Ex-Officio Young asked if Class Size Reduction legislation resulted in an increase in teachers, as the report states, or a shortage. Ms. Jackson agreed that it should read "shortage" and flagged the passage for correction.

Ex-Officio Young asked if the \$3,000 was meant to cover all costs, or if it was meant more for encouragement and assistance. Ms. Jackson said prior to 1997 the stipend did cover all expenses, but after 1997 it was capped at \$3,000 due to state funding problems.

Commissioner Littman moved to submit the report with the changes offered by the Commission. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion and it was carried without dissent.

#### **7D: Initial Accreditation and Program Review**

Helen Hawley, Consultant, Professional Services Division, presented this item.

Commissioner Johnson moved to approve University of California, San Diego Mathematics undergraduate subject matter program and California State University, Chico Physics undergraduate subject matter program. The motion died for lack of a second.

Commissioner Lilly said he was willing to move to approve both programs for a two-year period.

Commissioner Johnson moved to approve both programs for a two-year period, which was seconded by Commissioner Lilly.

Ex-Officio Young asked for the rationale for placing a two-year time limit on the approvals.

Commissioner Lilly said it did not make sense to give indefinite approval considering the changes being contemplated to the process, and that it also did not make sense to keep these institutions waiting.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

Ex-Officio Young replied that the Commission needs to stay on track with what the process has been and that it would not be fair to give these programs a substandard level of approval when other programs have been fully approved using this process.

Commissioner Lilly objected to Dr. Young's use of the term substandard, saying it would be approval for a limited period of time but not substandard because it was done for procedural purposes, not substantive purposes.

Commissioner Banker reminded the Commission of the impending direction change in program approvals being contemplated by the Secretary of Education's Office.

**Dr. David Kagan, Physics Department, California State University, Chico**, said 25 percent of his department was in attendance. He said the program was submitted 18 months ago and had been resubmitted many times. He said the program met the K-12 standards. He described the specific evidence including the exact titles of each of the domains he said match exactly the titles of the K-12 Standards in Physics. Referring to the domain matrix in the CSU Chico document, he said commissioners could see each domain and all sub domains were listed, specifically including all classes covering topics in the domains which match to the K-12 standards. He also said the table of contents for every textbook and lab manual in those courses had also been provided. He said finding more high school physics teachers was very difficult and that schools will not have physics in the future if we do not have people teaching the subject in high school. He closed by asking the Commission to consider approving the CSU Chico proposal on its merits.

Ms. Hawley then introduced Dr. Jody Selcoe, Professor of Chemistry, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, one of the CSU Chico program reviewers. She said Dr. Selco could respond if Commissioners had questions about the review itself.

**Susan Westbrook, California Federation of Teachers**, said a change to two-year approval would mean no one starting out as a freshman in the program could graduate and that the Commission needed to re-think approving for just two years.

Commissioner Lilly asked for clarification, saying he thought with a two-year approval any students who started such a program would be covered.

Ms. Hawley said when the Commission begins a new round of standards for programs, they are given by law a two-year notice on the program's sunset date, giving programs time to renew and candidates four years to complete the program. She cautioned Commissioners to be mindful of those time limits when contemplating two-year approvals.

Ex-Officio Young said with a two-year approval, students might start a program as freshmen but then faculty might decide not to continue if the program can only get two years. Then the university is obligated to continue a program that faculty no longer wish to participate in and, therefore, the university might simply reject a two-year approval.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

Commissioner Lilly said the Commission was in an unusual stopgap situation, having to respond to two institutions about two programs without knowing what the future rules will be. He said he was not sure it would be responsible to give unlimited approval at this point.

Chair Schwarze asked for clarification from Dr. Swofford on what the Commission's best course might be.

Dr. Swofford said the Deputy Secretary of Education, Scott Himmelstein, had asked for postponement during the Executive Committee. He said he felt the Commission could either postpone any action or give a approval for the two programs. He said that nothing Mr. Himmelstein had said earlier in the meeting precluded the Commission from approving the two programs before it.

Commissioner Lilly said he heard Mr. Himmelstein ask the Commission not to change its procedures. He then asked Commissioner Johnson if she would accept a friendly amendment to her existing motion to take off the two-year limit. She accepted and reverted to her original motion to approve the programs, with a second by Commissioner Lilly. Commissioner Banker then called the question. She then called for a roll call vote to clarify the result.

The Recording Secretary called the roll. The vote was as follows:

Banker, No;

Bustillos; Yes;

Gomez, No;

Grant, absent;

Johnson, Yes;

Lilly, Yes;

Littman, Yes;

Schwarze, No,

Stordahl, No.

The motion failed on a tie vote.

Chair Schwarze moved approval of the CSU Physics program. Commissioner Bustillos seconded. The motion carried with Vice Chair Stordahl dissenting.

Commissioner Johnson moved approval of the University San Diego Mathematics program. Commissioner Lilly seconded.

Commissioner Lilly said he could not believe the Commission was considering approving one program and disapproving another without evidence or report from the reviewers or the institution.

Vice Chair Stordahl said he heard Mr. Himmelstein differently than Commissioner Lilly and that his "read" on what was said was that something is coming from the Secretary of Education and that he wanted to hear from the Secretary at the January/February meeting first before moving ahead.

Commissioner Johnson said that the Commission is an autonomous licensing body and the process should not be changed mid-stream. She said she heard Mr. Himmelstein say the Commission should do what it thinks it should do, and therefore it would be fair to approve both programs.

Vice Chair Stordahl said waiting an additional 60 days to hear from the Secretary of Education would not be onerous and would not impact the program significantly.

Ex-Officio Young agreed with Commissioners Johnson and Lilly that Mr. Himmelstein said the Commission should not change its process. She said if Vice Chair Stordahl's "No" vote was a vote related to the process he could have abstained. She then suggested hearing from the people representing the University of San Diego mathematics program.

Vice Chair Stordahl asked Dr. Swofford for further clarification on what Mr. Himmelstein had said earlier. Dr. Swofford reiterated that Deputy Secretary Himmelstein asked the Commission not to change the process until it hears from the Secretary of Education. He said it was left up to the Commission to make a decision on the programs before it today.

Ms. Hawley introduced Dr. Lynn Small as a representative of the University of San Diego Mathematics Department. Dr. Small said faculty at the University have worked very hard for the last two years as a small university producing good math teachers. She said the department had worked hard to meet the new standards and she had no idea how she could go back and tell the faculty that CSU Chico was approved and their program was not.

Commissioner Lilly said the motion was not about what Mr. Himmelstein said earlier. He said it was about whether the Commission was going to apply standards differentially to two different programs in the matter of a half hour, and urged the chair to call the question.

**Ken Burt, CTA**, commented that the Commission was an autonomous body fully capable of acting independently.

The question was called. The Commission voted to approve the University of San Diego Mathematics undergraduate subject matter program without dissent.

Commissioner Banker then asked for motion to return to agenda item 7C to hear from previously overlooked speakers. Chair Schwarze made the motion. Commissioner Gomez seconded the motion, and it carried without dissent.

**Dr. Nina Winn, Orange County Department of Education**, spoke about the fragile nature of the paraprofessional population. She said the \$3,000 grant to help paraprofessionals through course work no longer covers the costs of the program. She said there were currently 140 in Orange County program, many of them from less affluent communities. Regarding repayments of the grants, she said some have done everything they were asked to do but have not been able to pass the CSET and thus probably will not make it through the program. She said these people

should continue to be paraprofessionals but should not be required to pay back the money if they do not make it through the program.

**David Simmons, Director of Teacher Support Programs, Ventura County Superintendent's Office**, spoke on the paraprofessional issue. He said they have 152 paraprofessionals in his program and graduated 25 this year. He said it would be helpful to have the pass rates for the CSET disaggregated so that the program could best determine how to help participants pass the exam by focusing on specific needs.

**Darlene Anderson, parent**, said she has great a concern stemming from 1997 when state legislators and education officials took steps to ensure all teachers were highly qualified, but special education teachers were not included. She told the Commission about her son's experience in a communication handicapped class for four years where he was not taught to read or write. She moved him out of that school and that class and said he is now reading and writing. She said she has written and talked to many people about the problems in special education but has not gotten any satisfactory answers. She urged the Commission to ensure that all special education teachers are included in paraprofessional programs so that all children, including special education children and children from poor families and communities are treated equally.

Ms. Jackson said that special education teachers are not part of the paraprofessional program but there was a need to revisit the special education credential.

Ex-Officio Young said Ms. Anderson's issue wasn't particularly about this agenda item.

Ms. Anderson said new teachers coming in with a special class authorization are walking straight into the classroom and beginning teaching without a multiple or single subject credential and that they do not know how to teach language arts and math.

Commissioner Lilly said Ms. Anderson's issue stemmed from the decision a few years ago to separate the special education credential from the multiple and single-subject credential, which he considered to be a major mistake at the time and still does. Marilyn Fairgood, Manager of the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program, Professional Services Division, added that the document Ms. Anderson was speaking about is the Clinical Rehabilitative Services Credential that includes a special class authorization. She said it is a services document with a teaching authorization attached to it.

Commissioner Banker assured Ms. Anderson that she would find someone to respond to her issue at the end of the meeting.

Commissioner Banker asked for a motion to revoke on moving the Annual Report on the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program to the Legislature. Commissioner Littman moved, Commissioner Lilly seconded, and the motion carried without dissent.

#### **7E: Validation Study of the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA)**

Amy Jackson, Administrator, Professional Services Division, presented information about the application and selection process to be used in the appointment of a design team that will provide

recommendations concerning the revalidation of the Reading Instruction Competency Assessment (RICA).

Ms. Jackson said this item offered the opportunity to review a nomination form for individuals to participate in the RICA validity study and approve it so that staff could send it out.

Ex-Officio Young could not recall an agenda item that prompted the study or where the impetus for doing the study came from.

Ms. Jackson said it was part of the contract currently held with National Evaluation Systems (NES) as part of the routine test development process. She said the current RICA exam was several years old and due for a validity study under that contract.

Commissioner Lilly said that items 4, 5, and 6 ask for substantive narrative input on qualifications. He expressed concern that item 6 asked indirectly about a person's depth of understanding of, knowledge of, and work with the reading language arts frameworks and the English language arts content standards and wondered if another item was needed that asked more directly about people's depth of understanding and direct work with and knowledge of those two topics.

Ex-Officio Waite asked about the December 21 due date. She said considering the time of year it seemed awfully short and is likely to impact the number of people applying. She also expressed concern regarding the qualifications, saying it seemed the eventual design team could be filled without having a university representative on it and that thought needed to be given to expanding the team's diversity.

Commissioner Grant said she thought speakers of African American vernacular English needed to be added as a group to the item.

Representative Bloom asked how many people would comprise the design team. Ms. Jackson responded that typically it would be 12-16, drawn from possibly 50-100 volunteers.

Chair Schwarze said within the actual application, she did not see where candidates could show their recent professional development.

Commissioner Banker suggested adding intervention program experience.

Commissioner Littman suggested that perhaps all of those types of training responses could be added to the shaded box for Experience and Education.

Ex-Officio Young asked if the form was to be sent out without specifically asking stakeholders for nominations.

Ms. Jackson said in the area of examinations everyone is invited to apply. She said typically there is agreement on the nomination process, the form is posted on the web and everyone is invited to respond.

Ex-Officio Symms Gallagher asked how the process for the Commission's review and selection of applicants would work. Ms. Jackson responded that staff needed direction on that, but that in the past, after staff goes through the nominations and selects the strongest candidates, they are forwarded to the Executive Director for his signature, after which those candidates are invited to participate.

Commissioner Lilly suggested using the same procedure for the RICA study.

Commissioner Banker suggested a subcommittee to advise the Executive Director.

Representative Bloom suggested using a subcommittee to advise the Executive Director, and then having the Commission formally appoint candidates.

Commissioner Lilly said that was a precedent he did not want to see the Commission set. He said over time, having the Commission make the appointment of these kinds of committees and panels would politicize the process by going against the grain of established policy where the Executive Director makes the appointments.

Commissioner Banker expressed her preference for using an advising subcommittee because it would allow Commissioners to be involved and for more public participation.

Representative Bloom said she was not sure about opening the process up to the public and if that was where the discussion was headed then she would retract her previous statement.

**Kathy Harris, California Teachers Association**, noted that there are reading experts that have never worked with Reading First. She also noted that if there is to be weighting of qualifications, that it be made clear. However, she was not suggesting that weighting occur.

Commissioner Banker asked if the application form eliminated people who aren't classroom teachers from participating, so that, for instance, a psychometrician who is not public school teacher would not be able to participate.

Ms. Jackson said no, she did not think institutions of higher education faculty with special expertise were left out, even though they might not hold a K-12 teaching credential.

Commissioner Lilly said he thought adding another bullet to the qualification list would clarify that.

Ex-Officio Young suggested changing the qualifications language to something more inclusive than the language as presented.

Vice Chair Stordahl said he thought placing the qualifications in a weighted order made sense.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

Commissioner Bustillos urged adding another question under the section for experience that would provide more information of a candidate's background, knowledge base and experience with reading instruction.

Commissioner Grant thought the added question should also query a candidate's knowledge of current reading research.

Ms. Harris, clarifying her earlier comments about qualifications, said she did not think they should be weighted, only that if they were, it be made clear to applicants.

Ex-Officio Young said questions 4 and 6 as written would not apply equally to teachers and researchers, who possess essentially different backgrounds.

Commissioner Lilly said he was thinking of a question such as: "How have you developed your knowledge and understanding of the reading frameworks and English and Language Arts content learning standards, and how have you applied those in your work?" He said no matter what a candidate's background, they could respond to a question like that.

Ex-Officio Symms Gallagher asked if the deadline could be extended and still make the January/February Commission meeting. Ms. Jackson said no, the next opportunity to discuss this topic would be the April meeting.

Chair Schwarze suggested substituting the existing question in the form's item 6 with Commissioner Lilly's revised question.

Commissioner Lilly moved that staff move forward with the Commission's recommendations for the application. Commissioner Gomez seconded the motion and it carried without dissent.

Commissioner Bustillos asked for a clarification on the timeline and Ms. Jackson said December 21 would still be the application deadline.

Ms. Jackson clarified that staff would rework the application form and submit it to a subcommittee for final approval, then asked who would be on that subcommittee.

Commissioner Banker asked for subcommittee volunteers. Commissioners Gomez, Grant, Molina, were named.

Commissioner Lilly said he did not think candidates would have enough time to respond if the deadline stayed at December 21 and suggested moving it to January 30.

Ms. Armstrong said that the rules governing subcommittees required public noticing of all meetings and gatherings if there were more than two Commissioners on a committee. She said having an Ex-Officio Representative replacing one of the named Commissioner subcommittee members would not require public noticing of the subcommittee meetings, however.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

After a short discussion, Commissioner Grant removed herself from the committee and was replaced by Ex-Officio Young so that the subcommittee became Commissioners Gomez and Molina, and Dr. Young.

Ms. Jackson summarized the actions staff needed to take as follows: revise the current application form per the Commission's instructions; convene the just-named subcommittee for final approval of the form, post the nomination form on the web, staff review applicants and identify a group of 12-16 for the subcommittee's review.

Commissioner Lilly said staff should make panel recommendations to the Executive Director and not to a Commission subcommittee. He said the process should be that the subcommittee would help with the form, the form is posted, the applications come in by January 30, staff submits a slate for the design group to the Executive Director, and he would pass that slate by the Commission's Chair and Vice Chair prior to his appointment of the design group.

Commissioner Littman asked if the Commission was now ignoring the policy it has just talked about in that morning's Executive Committee meeting.

Commissioner Lilly said the Commission was operating within policy because the design panel would not be coming back to the Commission for approval and that the Executive Director would be consulting with the Chair and Vice Chair prior to making the appointments. He said the Commission itself should have a liaison with the design team. Chair Schwarze volunteered for that position.

**Ken Burt, California Teachers Association**, asked the Commission to make a clear motion so that it would be plain for all to see in the final minutes.

Commissioner Lilly restated the motion as directing staff to revise the draft application form consistent with the Commission's wishes, to consult with the named subcommittee of Commissioners Gomez, Molina and Dr. Young, to distribute the form and solicit applications due January 31, to provide the slate for design team to the Executive Director, and to have the Commission designate a liaison to the design committee at its January/February meeting. Commissioner Gomez seconded the motion and it carried without dissent.

## **RECONVENE GENERAL SESSION**

Chair Schwarze reconvened the General Session.

### **2J: Commission's One-Year Response to the Bureau of State Audits Report**

Chair Schwarze asked that this item be tabled until the January/February meeting. Members of the Commission agreed.

### **2K: Report of Executive Committee**

Chair Schwarze presented the Executive Committee's recommendations.

November 30-December 1, 2005 Commission Meeting  
Approved Minutes

The committee approved the minutes from May 31, 2005 meeting, discussed the selection of advisory panels and directed staff to prepare revised draft language for the appropriate section of the policy manual consistent with of the comments made during the meeting, and to include the proposed revised language in the January/February Commission meeting for consideration and further discussion. The committee discussed the quarterly agenda and asked staff to add regular updates on accreditation at all Commission meetings and to add accreditation as an action item for the summer of 2006. Further action on the undergraduate subject matter program review process was tabled. The Committee also asked that the policies related to the review of the Executive Director be included at the next meeting of the Executive Committee. The Commission approved the report.

**2L: Report of Closed Session Items**

The Commission denied the following Petitions for Reinstatement:

Charles Jimenez  
Dora Chavez

The Commission rejected the Proposed Decision and called for the transcript in the matter of Patrick Kercheval.

Pending litigation was discussed.

**2M: Report of Appeals and Waivers Committee**

Commissioner Gomez said the committee recommended approval of the October 6, 2005 minutes, the consent calendar, the conditions calendar, and the denial calendar. All were unanimously approved.

**2N: New Business**

- The Quarterly Agenda for-January, February, April, and May/June 2006 was presented.
- There were no audience presentations.
- Chair Schwarze announced that the next Commission meeting will be January 31-February 1, 2005.

**2O: Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned.