

Commission on Teacher Credentialing Minutes of the March 2007 Meeting

COMMISSION MEMBERS ATTENDING

P. David Pearson, Faculty Member, Chair
Josie Calderon, Public Representative
Caleb Cheung, Teacher Representative
Paula Cordeiro, Public Representative
Margaret Gaston, Public Representative
Guillermo Gomez, Teacher Representative
Gloria Grant, Teacher Representative
Leslie Littman, Designee, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Aida Molina, Administrative Service Representative
Lillian Perry, Teacher Representative
Leslie Peterson Schwarze, School Board Member
Jon Stordahl, Teacher Representative
Athena Waite, Ex-Officio, University of California
Loretta Whitson, Non-Administrative Services Credential Representative
Beverly Young, Ex-Officio, California State University

STATE BOARD LIAISON

Alan Bersin, Member, State Board of Education (absent)

COMMISSION MEMBERS ABSENT

Catherine Banker, Public Representative
Karen Symms Gallagher, Ex-Officio, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities
Marilyn McGrath, Ex-Officio, California Postsecondary Education Commission

Thursday, March, 8 2007

GENERAL SESSION

2A: Convene General Session

P. David Pearson, Chair, convened the March 8, 2007 General Session of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. Roll call was taken and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Chair Pearson announced that this meeting was again being broadcast via the web in real time. He also noted that staff would make audio recordings of each item available on the web shortly after the meeting. He thanked staff for their continued work on this project.

2A: Approval of the February 2007 Minutes

Commissioner Littman moved approval of the February 2007 minutes. Commissioner Molina seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

2B: Approval of the March 2007 Agenda

Chair Pearson noted that there were four agenda inserts. He asked the Commission to adjust the schedule to go through General Session up until item 2H, the Report from the Committee on Accreditation, and then take item 6D out of order. He noted that after item 6D, the Commission would resume with the presented order.

Commissioner Stordahl moved approval of the March 2007 agenda with the inserts. Commissioner Gaston seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

2C: Approval of the March 2007 Consent Calendar

Commissioner Whitson moved approval of the March 2007 Consent Calendar. Commissioner Littman seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

For the approved Consent Calendar, see the attached appendix.

2D: Chair's Report

Chair Pearson noted a recent report from the bipartisan No Child Left Behind Commission and said there were many implications for teacher education and effectiveness in the report. He suggested that it be a topic of discussion at a future two-day meeting.

Chair Pearson explained that he wanted to have presentations to the Commission from classroom teachers to complement the study sessions that were planned for the two-day meetings. He introduced Marie Robb, a French teacher from Center Unified High School District who started the French program at Center High School, and two of her French 4 students.

Marie Robb, Teacher, thanked the Commission for allowing her to speak. She noted that language classes have changed significantly over the years. She said that language classes now focus more on communication skills. She said it was important to give the students opportunities to show what they have learned and to use their skills in new ways. She demonstrated some of the teaching strategies and techniques she uses to teach her students. She presented her students Lucy and Nicole who dialogued in French and explained why they enjoyed taking French classes.

2E: Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Dale Janssen congratulated Chair Pearson and Commissioners Calderon, Cheung, Gaston, Perry, and Whitson for being recommended for confirmation by the Senate Rules Committee. He indicated that their appointments will now move to the full Senate for approval.

Mr. Janssen announced that this meeting would be Chikul Patel's last day at the Commission because she had accepted a Staff Services Analyst (SSA) position with the Department of Consumer Affairs. He congratulated her on the promotion, wished her well, and thanked her for her contributions to the Commission.

Mr. Janssen gave an update on the Strategic Plan, noting that the Commission is continuing to receive input from stakeholders and that staff had held a stakeholder meeting on March 7. He said there would be another stakeholder meeting on March 20 at California State University, Dominguez Hills. He said an initial update on the Strategic Plan would be presented to the Commission at the April Commission meeting.

2F: Commission Member Reports

There were no reports.

2G: Liaison Reports

There were no reports.

2H: Annual Report of the Committee on Accreditation

Teri Clark, Administrator, Professional Services Division, Lynne Cook, Co-Chair of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and Dean of the School of Education at CSU Dominguez Hills, and Dana Griggs, Co-Chair of COA and Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources at Ontario-Montclair School District, presented this report. Ms. Griggs said that this report would cover the COA activities for the 2005-06 year. She noted that in addition to making accreditation decisions, the COA also worked with the Accreditation Workgroup and did an extensive review of the accreditation system. She reminded the Commission that the COA reviews site visit reports and makes recommendations on institutional accreditation. She indicated that there was only one site visit (CSU Fresno) during the 2005-06 year due to the suspension of accreditation visits for all non-NCATE institutions. She noted that the Committee's decision for CSU Fresno was "accreditation."

Ms. Griggs said that another major responsibility of the COA is to give initial approval to new preparation programs. She said that in 2005-06 the COA approved 60 professional preparation programs as follows: 17 Administrative Services programs, 21 Education Specialist programs, 3 Multiple and Single Subject programs, 16 Pupil Personnel Services programs, 1 Library Media program, and 2 Fifth-Year programs.

Lynne Cook stated that a major focus of the COA for 2005-06 was reviewing and recommending revisions to the accreditation system. She said the COA continues to focus on that process and on implementing the revised accreditation system. She presented three areas that the COA has been working on: accountability, ongoing evaluation of the revised accreditation system, and planning for revised training for institutional reviewers.

Commissioner Whitson asked what strategies were being used besides the website to recruit people to the Board of Institutional Reviewers (BIR). Ms. Cook responded that

they had contacted faculty at higher education institutions, and had done recruitment during the Accreditation/TPA technical assistance meetings that were held recently throughout the state. She noted staff has just begun recruitment efforts.

Commissioner Gomez said he felt it was important to let people know the importance of serving the state in this way.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Paula Cordeiro convened the Professional Services Committee.

6D: Update on the Implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment Requirement for Preliminary Multiple and Single Subject Teacher Preparation Programs

Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, Professional Services Division, Drew Gitomer and Jerry DeLuca, Educational Testing Service (ETS), presented this item. Ms. Jacobson presented background information on the California Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA) and discussed a meeting that was held on February 21st with TPA users who had piloted all four tasks of the CA TPA. She explained Task One in some detail. She said that programs were asked to explain how they used Task One as well as their opinions about the task. She said the responses showed a great deal of variance in how programs used the task.

Ms. Jacobson presented three possible options for Commission consideration:

- Remove Task One as a scored task. This would mean the CA TPA model would have three scored tasks and a passing score would be a total score of nine with no task having a score below two. Task One information would not be completely lost, but would be transferred to a Foundations/Orientation Day training. She said that this option would not require any additional work, but raises questions about content validity and scoring reliability.
- Retain Task One, but fully develop the task to include all single subject areas and additional multiple subject areas and the development of additional scenarios. This would allow Task One to continue to be a part of the TPA while being fully developed by content experts under the direction of an assessment contractor. A Request For Proposal (RFP) would need to be released for a contractor as soon as possible if this option were to be chosen. This option would also require periodic redevelopment of scenarios.
- Retain Task One in a redeveloped manner that would be more similar to the other tasks. A new Task One would need to be developed to cover the same material, but in a different manner. An RFP would need to be released for a contractor as soon as possible if this option were to be chosen.

Ms. Jacobson stated that with regards to Option 1 (removal of Task One), ETS and Commission staff hosted a meeting with TPA users to look at the content validity of Task

One. The group looked at the reliability and validity of the TPA if Task One were removed; and if the task were removed whether the Teacher Performance Expectations (TPEs) were sufficiently covered in the other tasks. There were three important questions looked at regarding the TPEs:

- Are each of the TPEs covered in Task One sufficiently covered in the other tasks?
- If not, what is being measured in Task One that is not being measured in the other tasks?
- And if not, is there still adequate information covered in the other tasks to assess those TPEs appropriately?

Ms. Jacobson said that after the meeting, ETS analyzed the information and found that 17 out of the 18 respondents said that all six TPEs covered in Task One were covered sufficiently in the other tasks if Task One were to be removed. They also found that Task One isn't uniformly administered across programs, so standards of reliability may not be appropriate.

Commissioner Stordahl asked if there was any language in law that specified what TPA had to look like. Ms. Jacobson replied that the law requires an assessment that covers the TPEs, but does not specify in what manner.

Chair Pearson said that he felt the decision accuracy was important to consider. He asked if the Commission removes Task One whether it sends a message that subject-specific pedagogy is unimportant.

Commissioner Young said that the Commission and various institutions made a promise to the legislature to continue to work on the development of TPA even though it had been suspended due to lack of resources. She expressed concern that the Commission may not have done an adequate job of oversight if Task One has been used so differently in various programs. She also expressed concern that staff had already announced to the field that Task One would be removed from the TPA. She noted that during the meetings held around the state, it was stated that Task One had been removed from the TPA. She said that this announcement was only stopped once it was brought to the attention of the staff that the Commission had not made that decision. As a result, a lot of people in the field believe that Task One has already been removed from the TPA.

Commissioner Young said the options presented in the item do not sufficiently provide the Commission with the information they need to make an informed decision. She said that Task One is the only task that has been designed specifically to assess content pedagogy and it is critical for candidates to do. She also indicated that she believes the validity and reliability issues need to be addressed by experts who are not under contract with the Commission. She asked that staff present new options for Commission action that provide more detailed information.

Commissioner Gomez agreed with Commissioner Young's comments and noted that subject specific pedagogy is the key to closing the achievement gap.

Ms. Jacobson also clarified that the TPA has been in a pilot phase with voluntary users who were allowed to try out different ways in which the TPA could be implemented within programs, and that Commission staff has been in close touch with these programs throughout the pilot process and had continued to provide training to programs and to facilitate a TPA User Community network. Ms. Jacobson also stated that ETS was not in a contractual relationship with the Commission as ETS' contract for work on the TPA had ended several years ago, and that during training it was indicated that Task One was under discussion but not that it had been decided to remove it from the CA TPA model.

Commissioner Pearson said that it was important to keep in mind the role of the TPA in an institution's recommendation of a person for a credential. He asked whether a person could be recommended for a credential if they did not pass the TPA, and whether a person who passed the TPA could then be denied a recommendation for a credential. Ms. Jacobson responded that a candidate must pass the TPA to get a credential just as they must pass any other course requirement or required examination.

Commissioner Molina asked for clarification about whether the intent was that the TPA results would be used in an induction program. Commissioner Young answered that the intent was that the results would be used by induction programs to help determine the new teacher's individual induction plan.

Commissioner Young said that TPA is a state requirement that is implemented by local institutions so it makes the recommendation issue somewhat complicated.

Commissioner Grant asked for clarification about what the TPA assesses. Ms. Jacobson replied that the TPA is an assessment of the candidate's ability to meet the TPEs that are expected of someone entering the teaching profession. Commissioner Grant asked if the TPA also shows what a person was taught during their program. Ms. Jacobson said that there is an assumption that the program helps the candidate to prepare and practice for the TPA. Commissioner Grant asked if Task One were taken away, would the assumption that programs teach subject-specific pedagogy also be taken away. Ms. Jacobson responded that the TPEs are measured in more than one task and that all of the TPEs measured in Task One are also measured in the other tasks including subject-specific pedagogy.

Commissioner Grant then asked if Task One is the task that focuses specifically on content-specific pedagogy. Dr. Gitomer replied that Task One is not necessarily the only task that focuses on content-specific pedagogy, but that it is covered in a more realistic setting within the other tasks. He indicated that in the meeting, attendees were not asked whether or not Task One should be removed. They were only asked if the TPEs were sufficiently covered in the other tasks.

Commissioner Grant said that it was important to do some serious study before eliminating a task, and felt that it was better to keep the task because it provides more opportunity for assessment.

Ms. Jacobson said that it was important for candidates to know how to deliver content-based instruction. She noted that this was covered in the other tasks because they were required to submit lesson plans indicating the student academic content standards on which the lesson plans are based. They also have to show how the plans will be adapted for EL students and special needs students. She said this was required in all three of the other tasks and in multiple ways.

Commissioner Molina said that content-specific pedagogy was important.

Commissioner Young said that the TPA is only evidence of a candidate's performance, but there is the assumption that the program delivers the required information to them. She said that even though this was not designed for program accountability, that it may end up being used in that manner. She said by removing a task, it is likely that it could impact what is covered in the program. She also said that she does see Task One as the one task that focuses specifically on content-specific pedagogy.

Dr. Gitomer said that the other tasks do look at content-specific pedagogy because they look at instruction and assessment, as well as tying assessment and pedagogy together. He clarified that what the other tasks do not do is give a controlled assessment. Because Task One is looking into a specific response to a specific situation, it offers a more direct measure.

Commissioner Gomez said that the ability to know how to deliver certain information is important for beginning teachers to know.

Commissioner Littman asked if Task One occurs at the beginning of the program and the reason for the use of a hypothetical situation is because the candidate has not yet been in a classroom setting. Ms. Jacobson replied that the intention behind Task One was that it did not require the candidate to be in a classroom to complete the Task activities.

Commissioner Littman asked when institutions were doing Task One. Ms. Jacobson said it varies across programs. She noted that Task One was originally intended to be foundational in nature and to be centrally and securely administered and scored. Ms. Jacobson clarified that since the TPA was no longer intended to be implemented in that manner but instead to be entirely locally implemented, the task would no longer be serving the same purpose as originally intended when it was developed. She also stated that because the TPA has been being implemented in a pilot testing phase, institutions have been free to implement it as best fits their particular program. As a result, institutions report doing Task One at various points in time.

Commissioner Littman asked if once the TPA was officially implemented, would institutions still have the freedom they do now with regards to Task One. MS. Jacobson said that she believed the tasks would be done in specified order.

Commissioner Littman said she felt that Task One should be included if the tasks had to be done in order because it provides important information.

Kathy Harris, California Teachers Association, said she felt it was important to keep Task One because it was something that was standard across all programs. She said it was important to ensure that the TPA does not become a barrier to the teaching profession.

Liz Guillen, Public Advocates, said that it was important for teachers to know how to deliver content-specific information and be able to demonstrate that they can do so.

Pandora Sibley, Student California Teacher Association, said that it is important for candidates to have program preparation opportunities to help prepare for the TPA tasks.

Commissioner Stordahl asked how Task One is currently assessed and how many times a candidate is allowed to take the assessments. Ms. Jacobson responded that candidates have multiple opportunities. She said that there are four different activities in Task One with different scenarios for each. She said the scenarios were based on real students at the time the scenarios were developed. She indicated that since the scenarios don't change, there has been conversation among candidates about what is involved in each scenario and each required TPA activity related to that scenario. She said this issue does not happen in the other tasks because the candidate is working with a real, current group of students.

Commissioner Stordahl said that he believed Task One should not be removed. He said he was in favor of redeveloping Task One to use current situations as opposed to static situations created in the past.

Ms. Jacobson said that the reason staff was not able to provide a development cost was because the Commission no longer has a contract for this assessment and would need to do an RFP for bids.

Commissioner Pearson said the he felt it was the legislature's intent to have TPA be a locally funded and run program and that to change would likely require legislative action. He recommended that staff come back to the Commission with additional information regarding Option 2. Ms. Jacobson said that Option 2 still offers some concerns regarding static situations that could be shared among candidates and would require a continued cost of development.

Commissioner Cordeiro said that she had several concerns with Task One because there were other ways to measure what is being measured in Task One.

Commissioner Perry said the Commission should be sensitive to different types and levels of students. She said she supported keeping Task One.

Ms. Jacobson said that when institutions were asked whether they preferred having Task One be a scored task or having the task embedded in coursework, 12 of the 18 institutions said they would prefer it be imbedded in coursework and not a scored task.

Commissioner Cheung said he didn't believe eliminating Task One would eliminate content-specific pedagogy because it is in the other tasks. However, he said he wondered if eliminating Task One would cause programs to place less emphasis on content-specific pedagogy.

Commissioner Young noted that the original bill for TPA said that it would be implemented if funding were available. She clarified that it was not originally intended to be locally funded. She asked for more information regarding the original intent of having Task One centrally scored and what the current status of that is.

Ms. Jacobson said that when it was determined that the TPA would be locally administered, the intended role of Task One as a centrally scored task also changed. The statute does not specify how the test will be scored – that decision is within the purview of the Commission. While a centralized scoring model is certainly possible under the language of SB 1209, insufficient funding makes such a model prohibitive at this time.

Commissioner Cordeiro noted that this item will return for further discussion at the next meeting. She recessed the Professional Services Division.

Reconvene General Session

Chair Pearson reconvened General Session.

2I: Update on the SB 1209 (Chap. 517, Stats. 2006) Implementation Plan

Teri Clark, Administrator, Professional Services Division (PSD), and Terri Fesperman, Consultant, Certification, Assignment, and Waivers (CAW) Division, presented this item. Ms. Fesperman updated the Commission on the six items in SB 1209 that were being implemented in the CAW Division: professional growth, out-of-state trained teachers, individuals prepared outside the United States, the sixth year private school teachers, out-of-state English Learner (EL) authorizations, and basic skills. She indicated CAW has sent several correspondences to the field about changes and updates, has been answering several questions from the field, and is making presentations to various groups.

Ms. Clark said that the Commission has a special SB 1209 webpage where all updates regarding implementation of the law are posted. She noted the Commission had moved forward with the public study sessions regarding Commission exams required by SB 1209. She gave a brief update about TPA implementation and training, and noted that a TPA webpage was under development. She discussed the creation of the Education Specialist panel which will be meeting on a monthly basis.

Commissioner Stordahl asked for more information about the difference between a district administered basic skills exam and a state administered exam. Ms. Fesperman said that staff could only speak about the state exam. Mr. Janssen said the district test would only allow the person to work for one year, and the person would need to take California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) within that year.

Commissioner Schwarze asked about how the Superintendent of Public Instruction was proceeding with setting the passing score standard for the other alternatives to the CBEST (i.e., the SAT Reasoning, the ACT plus Writing, and the GRE examinations). Executive Director Janssen indicated that the Commission had offered to meet with the CDE and to discuss this issue. Dr. Jacobson further responded that Commission staff had held one meeting with CDE staff to discuss this issue, but that no further discussions had taken place since that time. Commissioner Schwarze indicated she would like to have an update on this process and a timeline, if possible, for when the decision would be made.

Commissioner Young discussed the inequity in the score standards on the SAT and ACT used for admission purposes at the university level with the passing score on the CBEST. She said it would be important to carefully evaluate the scores standards if they are to be used as a substitute for the CBEST.

Chair Pearson said he would be more comfortable with the proxy tests if he had a better idea of what those scores translate into on the CBEST.

Liz Guillen, Public Advocates, thanked staff for the work that they have done related to SB 1209.

FISCAL POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Guillermo Gomez convened the Fiscal Policy and Planning Committee.

3A: Establishment of the Fee Structure for Commission Examinations for 2007-08

Crista Hill, Director, Fiscal and Business Services Section, presented this item. She gave the Commission some background information on how exam fees are determined. She noted that fees must be balanced to cover the costs to the contractor and the costs of the Commission. She said the contractor presented in its response to the recent RFP for examinations administration a reduced fee schedule for consideration as a result of no longer needing to cover test development costs. She said that staff recommends a reduction of exam fees for the 2007-08 test series.

Susan Westbrook, California Federation of Teachers, expressed her support for reducing the exam fees.

Commissioner Stordahl said he thought the reduction was a good idea, but that the Commission should be certain of the long term budgetary effects of significantly reducing fees, noting the reductions the Commission had to make in April of 2005.

Ms. Hill said staff makes projections on budgetary issues based on previous years and on developing trends.

Mr. Janssen said that he felt that the fee reduction is not so large that it would create a problem should test numbers drop.

Chair Pearson noted the importance of maintaining an acceptable level of reserves, without building it too high.

Commissioner Littman moved approval of approving the examinations fee structure for Commission examinations as presented in the agenda item. Commissioner Grant seconded the motion.

Commissioner Cheung asked if there was a policy for how much reserve the Commission has. Ms. Hill responded that the law allows for up to a 10 percent reserve.

The motion carried without dissent.

CREDENTIALING AND CERTIFICATED ASSIGNMENTS COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Caleb Cheung convened the Credentialing and Certificated Assignments Committee.

4A: Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 80001, Pertaining to Definitions and Term

Terri Fesperman, Consultant, Certification, Assignments, and Waivers Division, presented this item. She noted that the item contains several provisions to adjust various definitions and terms, but that the most significant proposed provision was to make the Commission's website document an official record for credentials. She said that in the future the Commission will stop printing paper documents, but will continue to post documents electronically.

Commissioner Littman moved approval of the amendments to the California Code of Regulations Title 5 Section 80001. Commissioner Stordahl seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Gaston convened the Legislative Committee.

5A: Status of Legislation

Mary Armstrong, Director, Office of Governmental Relations, presented this item. Ms. Armstrong gave an update on Commission-sponsored legislation including:

- SB 193 which proposes to increase the paraprofessional funding. This bill has been sent to the Senate Education Committee.

- SB 196 which proposes the elimination of the sunset date for the district intern programs for the Education Specialist credentials. This bill has been sent to the Senate Education Committee.

5B: Analyses of Bills

Mary Armstrong, Director, Office of Governmental Relations, presented this item. She gave an update on AB 469 (Horton), which moves credentialing requirements to IHEs and county offices of education. These entities would be required to submit electronic applications to the Commission. She said this bill also moves fingerprinting requirements to county and district offices instead of the Commission. She said that staff recommended an oppose position to the bill.

Commissioner Stordahl asked if this bill was the same as a bill the Commission opposed in the previous year. Ms. Armstrong responded that it is very close in language to Assemblymember Pavley's bill from last legislative session.

Commissioner Stordahl moved to oppose AB 469. Commissioner Molina seconded the motion.

Commissioner Young asked if Credential Counselors and Analysts of California (CCAC) had taken an official position on the bill.

Tedi Kostka, Credential Counselors and Analysts of California, said CCAC does not support AB 469 and recommended the Commission oppose the bill.

Bruce Kitchen, School District Personnel and Human Resource Administrators of San Bernardino and San Diego Counties, expressed opposition to the bill and encouraged the Commission to take an oppose position.

Susan Westbrook, California Federation of Teachers, voiced opposition to the bill and recommended the Commission oppose the bill.

Derek Ramage, Los Angeles Unified School District, said he opposed this bill and asked the Commission to do the same.

The motion carried.

5C: Other Legislative and Policy Items

Anne Padilla, Consultant, Office of Governmental Relations presented this item. She gave an update on the legislative session and the bills introduced during this session. She said that staff is reviewing the bills to find items of interest to the Commission. She said that career technical education, administrator training, teacher recruitment, and special education seemed are important themes in this session.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Paula Cordeiro reconvened the Professional Services Committee.

6A: SB 2042 (Chap. 548, Stats. 1998) Update on the Implementation of Teacher Preparation Standards

Larry Birch, Director, and Teri Clark, Administrator, Professional Services Division presented this item. Mr. Birch provided background information on SB 2042 which was signed into law in 1998. He noted that the Commission had expended a great deal of effort on the implementation of SB 2042. He noted that this item provides an update on various aspects of the Commission's progress on SB 2042. In addition, staff noted items that require additional work.

Ms. Clark discussed the areas that required additional implementation activities. She said that staff planned to discuss various issues at future meetings. At this meeting, the Commission is scheduled to discuss standards; pedagogical teacher preparation would be brought back at the April meeting; professional preparation would be brought back at the June Commission meeting; and subject matter preparation related issues would be brought back to the Commission at the August meeting;

In beginning the discussion about standards-related issues in the agenda item, Ms. Clark commented that there are approximately 20 sets of program standards. She noted that there appears to be some overlap between the Common Standards and specific 2042 Program Standards. She also noted that the format of the standards from previous standards for SB 2042 is different, which added required elements to each of the standards. She presented the possibility of publishing hard copies of the standards to send out to the field instead of simply using the electronic version. She also presented the possibility of bringing a comprehensive long-term schedule for standards review and revision.

Ms. Clark said that staff would like direction from the Commission on the following items:

- To get additional stakeholder input on the standards;
- To publish the standards in hard copy format; and
- To bring back a schedule related to future events with the standards.

Karen Cadiero Kaplan, California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL), said that she felt the April deadline to look at pedagogical teacher preparation could hinder the work of the Bilingual Design Team because the design team will not have completed their work until June.

Ms. Clark responded that she did not believe the April agenda item would inhibit the work of the Bilingual Design Team in any way, and that the April meeting would be mostly for information with recommendations for staff to do more research and work.

Harold Acord, California Teachers Association, agreed with the comments of the previous speaker. He said he felt it was important for the Bilingual Design Team to have the opportunity to complete its work.

Susan Westbrook, California Federation of Teachers, thanked the Commission for the progress it has made. She said that the standards do constrain programs in some ways and that it was important to look at those standards. She supported having the standards published. She also supported regular review of the program standards.

Commissioner Littman said it might be a good idea to have a comprehensive publication that covers more than just the standards. She described some items she felt might be worth including in a more comprehensive document of the Commission's roles and responsibilities. She said this could become somewhat of a handbook.

Commissioner Young thanked staff for their work. She asked if the Accreditation Workgroup would be the stakeholder body the Commission works with. Ms. Clark said that both the Accreditation Workgroup and the COA would be invited, but that they would probably not be the only people invited.

Commissioner Young suggested that staff create an ongoing, set workgroup to address these issues. Commissioner Young supported the idea of publishing the standards.

Commissioner Gaston moved to accept staff recommendations. Commissioner Cheung seconded the motion. The motion carried.

6B: Program Approval and Initial Accreditation

Helen Hawley, Consultant, Professional Services Division, presented this item, which included the following three subject matter programs for approval.

- California State University, Fullerton, Mathematics
- Loyola Marymount University, English
- Point Loma Nazarene, Art

Chris Renne, CSU Fullerton, discussed the CSU Fullerton mathematics program and supported the staff recommendation to approve the program.

Commissioner Perry moved to approve the three subject matter programs. Commissioner Gomez seconded the motion. The motion carried.

6C: Implementation of the Accreditation System

Teri Clark, Administrator, Cheryl Hickey, Consultant, Jo Birdsell, Consultant, all of the Professional Services Division presented this item.

Ms. Clark covered the first part of this item which was an update on the implementation of the revised accreditation system. She discussed the efforts of Commission staff to communicate with the field in several ways. She discussed the technical assistance

meetings and information on the Commission's website. She discussed the new PSD e-mail listserve and how that will be used to better communicate with districts, county offices of education, and institutions of higher education. She noted that the staff has also developed a new cohort specific mapping that allows institutions and program sponsors to more easily understand accreditation activities expected of them and noted efforts to communicate specifically to particular cohorts of program sponsors. She discussed the Brown Bag Seminar that was held with legislative staff. This seminar covered the revisions to the accreditation system. Ms. Clark informed the Commission that staff intends to bring to a future Commission meeting the proposed revised *Accreditation Framework* and proposed Experimental Program Standards.

Ms. Hickey presented part two of this item, which addressed communication between the Committee on Accreditation (COA) and the Commission. She said that part of the recommendations presented by COA and the Work Group and adopted by the Commission was to improve communication and collaboration between the Committee and the Commission.

Ms. Hickey noted that staff needed direction from the Commission as to possible strategies and actions to ensure that this improved communication is achieved. She outlined five possible options for Commission consideration.

She noted that the Annual Report to the Commission should be maintained. She commented that this is required by the Education Code so that it is not a true option, but rather something that will continue to be done. However, this effort alone was considered not sufficient during discussions with COA and the Accreditation Study Work Group.

She then discussed the second option, which is to alter the Annual Report to the Commission to reflect the revised system, noting that a new report could include information about new components of the revised accreditation system, not simply the results of accreditation site visits.

The third option is for the COA Co-Chairs or their designees from the Committee to make additional presentations to the Commission regarding Committee activities at critical points throughout the year.

The fourth option is that the Commission Chair could appoint a liaison from the Commission to the COA. She noted that the Commission seemed to express some support for this option in previous meetings.

And finally, the last option is that informal communication between the Chair of the Commission and the COA Co-Chairs could be expanded.

Commissioner Whitson questioned how often the COA meets. Ms. Clark said there were five meetings this year but six meetings are planned for this upcoming year.

Commissioner Cordeiro asked what staff considers as the critical items to be communicated. Ms Hickey said that Commission might want to know not only what decisions have been made, but what the nature of stipulations were and, what kinds of trends are being seen. In addition, she said that the Commission may find useful what the workplan is for the Committee prior to embarking on that workplan. Ms. Hickey added that implementation issues would also be critical in the first few years of the new revised system; what the challenges are in implementing the new system and what aspects are working well.

Commissioner Gaston said it is very helpful to keep these lines of communication open because of the complexity of this system. However, she noted that she is cognizant of the time that volunteers contribute to make the process successful and cautioned that the Commission not ask for too much more of a time commitment from these volunteers. She suggested that the respective Chairs could make a presentation on an as needed basis, but that some of the information might be conveyed using the Executive Director's report when appropriate. She noted that might be a better strategy rather than to schedule many more additional meeting for the individuals.

Commissioner Young said she would like to continue the Annual Report but that it should be modified to better reflect the new structure. She said that the COA chairs should meet with Commission when issues arise and staff would need to ensure that issues are added to the agenda when appropriate. She agreed that the Executive Director's reports could be a good way to ensure regular communication.

Commissioner Schwarze noted that she was concerned that the Commission had only an indirect role in the accreditation process. She said that she believed that a Commissioner liaison is the only way to achieve the linkage that is necessary for the Commissioners to be involved in accreditation. She mentioned the TPA discussion from the last commission meeting and the need to ensure its consistent implementation across the state. She also noted that she wanted to discuss further the issue of reviewers and training of reviewers to ensure that those who are selected possess sufficient qualifications.

Commissioner Whitson suggested that the Commissioners might rotate the responsibility of attending COA meetings.

Commissioner Gaston also suggested that the *Weekly Update* can also be a good place to carry the information.

Commissioner Perry agreed with Commissioner Schwarze on the need for a liaison and said that this was a good way to get involved.

Commissioner Grant advocated that if the Commission decided to have a liaison position, that it should be designated to one individual because the communication needs to be consistent.

Committee Chair Cordeiro asked whether staff had sufficient information to proceed. Ms. Hickey asked whether the Commission wanted this one item related to a liaison to be brought back for further discussion. Committee Chair Cordeiro responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Young asked the staff to include in that future agenda item a clarification roles and authority of COA and the Commission as it relates to accreditation.

Commissioner Perry suggested that in the future both the COA meetings can be scheduled near Commission meetings so Commissioners can attend. She asked that the schedule of meetings be provided to the Commission.

Ms. Birdsell covered the third part of this item, the proposed revised Common Standards. She said the Common Standards were reviewed at the direction of the Commission as part of the action on the recommendations from the COA and work group. A review of the Common Standards is necessary so they might be in better alignment with the revised accreditation system. The revisions reflect the focus on using evidence gathered about candidates' competence to make programmatic and/or unit decisions. Approval of these revisions will enable staff to take the next step in gathering additional stakeholder input into the standards. Once the input and deadline have been reached, the items will be taken back to the COA for review, and next revisions would be presented at the June meeting.

Tedi Kostka, Credential Counselors and Analysts of California, said she supports the new accreditation system. She discussed the new on-line process for credentialing and noted that the accreditation system should be the mechanism for oversight of that process. She presented language drafted by CCAC for possible inclusion in the Common Standards that would ensure that a review of an institution's recommendation process was completed during an accreditation review.

Mel Hunt, Credential Counselors and Analysts of California, spoke in support of the CCAC language and said the new system relies on the recommendation from the program sponsor and that there is no checking of each recommendation at the Commission level. As such, he said the Common Standards review should include an examination of whether the program sponsor does an adequate job of assessing whether candidates have completed all requirements and should, in fact, be recommended for a credential.

Carol Riley, Credential Counselors and Analysts of California, said the new on-line renewal process is wonderful. However, there is a need for both ongoing training as well as accountability of the process. By adding this language to the Common Standards, the accreditation process could be used to provide a level of accountability.

Commissioner Schwarze expressed support for CCAC's suggested language.

Commissioner Young said that the accreditation standards are often used as leverage on the campus within the program to make sure the resources are allocated appropriately in

all different parts of the program. She suggested that the Common Standards related to Resources might be an appropriate place to include CCAC's idea.

Mr. Hunt replied that although resources are important, it is also an issue of oversight. It is important there be accountability for the process that leads the reviewer to make a recommendation for an individual.

Ms. Clark said that when the Commission staff seeks feedback from the field on these standards, it could also seek feedback on CCAC's proposed language.

Commissioner Littman voiced support for including the language in Standard 2 primarily but she said she thought that perhaps it could be in both standards.

Mr. Janssen noted he believes the CCAC language needed to be added to the accreditation system. Ms. Clark said the plan is that Commission will gather stakeholder input and come back at the June meeting for action and adoption. There will be a possibility that, if adopted, the revised standards will take effect for the 2008-09 site visits.

Commissioner Cordeiro asked if it is in Education Code or whether it is merely practice of the Commission to have joint visits with NCATE. Dr. Birch responded that the Commission has a partnership agreement with NCATE. He noted that the decision was made in the mid 1990's that all NCATE visits in California will be merge visits. Commissioner Cordeiro further asked if it was ever a discussion that an institution could only have NCATE accreditation and would not need CTC accreditation. Dr. Birch said NCATE requires that program accreditation needed to take place. It was clarified that state accreditation was required of all institutions offering credential programs.

Ms Clark added that part of the recommendations that the work group and COA presented to the Commission was that national accreditation was acceptable but that California-focused accreditation activities also had to be done to ensure proper attention to the K-12 student content standards.

Committee Chair Cordeiro noted that this item would return to the Commission after field input.

The Professional Service Committee was adjourned.

Reconvene General Session

Acting Chair Cheung reconvened General Session.

2J: Report of Closed Session

Since there was no closed session held, there was no report of closed session.

2K: Report of Executive Committee

Acting Chair Cheung moved to approve the Executive Committee Minutes of February 2007. Commissioner Gaston seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Acting Chair Cheung reported that the Executive Committee discussed proposed revisions to the Policy Manual and recommended adoption of the following:

- A new section 602 and a revised section 310 relating to yearly evaluation of the Executive Director;
- Revisions to sections 402, 405, 406, 407, 410, and 411 relating to separate standing committees; and
- Revisions to section 530-532 relating to the Committee of Accreditation

Commissioner Gaston moved to approve the Executive Committee recommendation as described above. Commissioner Cordeiro seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Finally, he said the Committee discussed the inclusion of the Vice Chair to all references that include the Chair. He said staff was directed to add language to the Duties of the Chair encouraging communication and collaboration as a consistent and regular duty of the Chair and bring the matter back for action in April.

Acting Chair Cheung also said that the Committee discussed a proposed new section 320 relating to attendance of Ex-Officio Members in closed session, as well as revisions to section 321. Staff was asked to bring this back for action in April.

2L: New Business

The Quarterly Agenda was presented.

Audience Presentations

There were no audience presentations.

2M: Nominations for the Commission on Teacher Credentialing's Vice Chair for 2007

Dale Janssen opened nominations for Vice Chair and indicated that the nominations will be held open until the April meeting.

Commissioner Gaston nominated Commissioner Cheung for Vice Chair. No additional nominations were made.

Adjournment

Acting Chair Cheung adjourned the meeting and announced that the next meeting would be April 26-27, 2007.

Consent Calendar

Division of Professional Practices

For your approval, the following items have been placed on the Consent Calendar for the March 8, 2007 meeting of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE OF CREDENTIALIAL

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. **ALBERTS, George H. Jr.** Santa Ana, 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.
2. **ALEXANDER, Heidi L.** Redondo Beach, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of seven (7) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, effective April 1, 2007.
3. **ALI, Jamla** Dinuba, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of seven (7) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
4. **ALLEN, Shanea L.** Sacramento, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of seven (7) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
5. **BINGHAM, Craig G.** Escalon, 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.
6. **BRITO, Jose B.** Anaheim, 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.

7. **BRUCE GREEN, Cynthia A.** Riverside, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of fourteen (14) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
8. **CALABRETTA, Mara G.** Las Flores, CA
Ms. Calabretta is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
9. **CAPIZZI, Marie E.** Richmond, 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.
10. **CINO, Christopher J.** Long Beach, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of ninety (90) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
11. **GALLEGOS, Alicia M.** Tulare, 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.
12. **GARAMVOLGYI, Emeric C.** Los Angeles, CA
Mr. Garamvolgyi is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
13. **GONZALES, Delfina A.** Clearlake, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **revoked** and any pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
14. **GONZALES, Osbaldo** Tulare, 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.
15. **GROSS, Pamela L.** Santa Monica, CA
Ms. Gross is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
16. **HALL, Michael T.** San Diego, 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.
17. **HOWELL, Robert G. Jr.** Benicia, 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.

18. **HURST, Raymond T.** Hemet, 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.
19. **LANGIS, Estelle D.** Arcadia, CA
Ms. Langis is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
20. **MARTINEZ, Gregory L.** San Fernando, 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.
21. **MOTTAZ, Robert A.** Indio, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of twenty-one (21) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
22. **ODIL, Carrie I.** Temecla, 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.
23. **OJEDA, Kelly D.** Hollister, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of seven (7) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
24. **PAUL, George E.** Helena, MT
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of seven (7) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, effective immediately.
25. **PERRY, Victoria E.** San Leandro, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of seven (7) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, effective immediately.
26. **REYES-BARRERA, Ruth G.** Riverside, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of fifteen (15) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44420.
27. **SMITH, Nicole L.** Sanger, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of fourteen (14) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

28. **SOTO, Laura** Merced, CA
Ms. Soto is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
29. **TIDMORE, Brenda K.** Redondo Beach, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of forty-five (45) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
30. **TOMASELLI, Jorge A.** Long Beach, CA
Mr. Tomaselli is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
31. **WHITE, Richard Jr.** Riverside, 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.
32. **WHITING, John W.** Sylmar, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of ninety (90) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
33. **WITTE, Laura P.** Brea, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of fourteen (14) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

CONSENT DETERMINATIONS

34. **PERDOMO, Victor R.** Whittier, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that Mr. Perdomo is the subject of **public reproof**, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
35. **THOMPSON, Christopher D.** Riverside, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that his applications are **granted** and **revoked**; however, the **revocation is stayed**, and he is placed on **probation for a period of five (5) years**, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.

PRIVATE ADMONITION

Pursuant to Education Code section 44438, the Committee of Credentials recommends **one (1)** private admonition 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.

36. **BRODKEY, David S.** Santa Cruz, CA
Upon his written request, pursuant to Education Code section 44423, his Professional Clear Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is **revoked**.
37. **OJEDA, Kelly D.** Hollister, CA
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).
38. **TRAVE, Peter H.** Petaluma, CA
Upon his written request, pursuant to Education Code section 44423, his supplementary authorization in Biology on his Professional Clear Single Subject Teaching Credential is **revoked**.

DIVISION OF PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES

MANDATORY ACTIONS

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

39. **ADAME, Jose S.** Los Angeles, CA
40. **BERRYMAN, Robert F.** Crescent City, CA
41. **BLAINE, Oliver** Coachella, CA
42. **BLAKELEY, David L.** Vacaville, CA
43. **ELF, Douglas R.** Davis, CA
44. **ESPINOZA, Mark A.** Paramount, CA
45. **HARDIN, Teresa** Manteca, CA
46. **HEZZELWOOD, David W.** San Jose, CA
47. **LASAGNA, Gordon J.** Lancaster, CA
48. **NELSON, Paul S.** El Cajon, CA
49. **SISSINE, Jodelle M.** Westlake Village, CA
50. **TRAVIS, Larry** Rialto, CA
51. **TULLIS, J. Douglas** Visalia, CA

52. VALENZUELA, Juan C. Los Angeles, CA
53. WOOD, Osie L. Jr. Long Beach, 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).

54. MARSIC, John W. Sonoma, CA
55. SEYMOUR, James S. II Cloverdale, CA
56. SUTLIFF, Phillip M. Alhambra, CA
57. THIES, Bryan D. Modesto, CA
58. WILSON, Hugh S. Anaheim, CA

TERMINATION OF AUTOMATIC SUSPENSION

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

59. GORMAN, Michael R. Sacramento, CA

TERMINATIONS OF PROBATION

60. DODGE, Janice Palm Desert, CA
Ms. Dodge's Consent Determination and Order was adopted by the Commission at its September 13-14, 2006 meeting. Pursuant to her request, her **probation is terminated, the stay is lifted, and her credentials are suspended for a period of one hundred fifty (150) days.**
61. FOLSOM, Kathryn Laguna Hills, CA
Having violated the conditions set forth in the Consent Determination and Order adopted by the Commission at its November 30, 2004 through December 1, 2004 meeting, her **probation is terminated, the stay is lifted, and her credential is revoked.**
62. UNGS, Robert Lakewood, CA
Having violated the conditions set forth in the Consent Determination and Order adopted by the Commission at its July 31, 2006 through August 1, 2006 meeting, his **probation is terminated, the stay is lifted, and his credentials are revoked.**

Certification, Assignment and Waivers Division

VALIDATION OF SERVICE RENDERED WITHOUT A CREDENTIAL

March 2007

The service rendered by the following persons is approved pursuant to the provisions of the California Education Code, Section 45036.

Name	School District	County	Period of Service
Ando, Christopher Shiego	Ojai Unified School District	Ventura	1.01.07-1.10.07
Bushman, Johanna Manak	Clovis Unified School District	Fresno	9.01.06-10.08.2006
*Chambers, Bobby Dale	Orland Unified School District	Glenn	1.01.07-1.08.07
*Chambers, Bobby Dale	Orland School District	Glenn	1.01.07-1.08.07
Corrigan Lile, Gretchen Kay	Atwater Elementary School District	Merced	12.01.06-12.6.2006
Eaton, Mariam M.	Templeton Unified School District	San Luis Obispo	10.01.2006-10.12.2006
Fredrick, Lucinda M.	Oxnard Union High School District	Ventura	1.01.07-1.05.07
Gooechea-Smith, Esperanza	Simi Valley School District	Ventura	1.01.07-1.17.07
Grajeda, Suzanne	Oxnard School District	Ventura	1.01.07-1.12.07
Kutz, Michelle	Clovis Unified School District	Fresno	10.01.2006-11.7.2006
Marcus, Terri Kemp Barrett	Conejo Valley Unified School District	Ventura	1.01.07-1.09.07
Maricruz, Hernandez	Oxnard Union High School District	Ventura	1.01.07-1.06.07
Messina, Michelle	Simi Valley Unified School District	Ventura	11.14.06-12.19.2006

***Two Credentials: Multiple Subject and Specialist Instruction Credential in Special Education**

April 2007