
2A

Action

General Session

Approval of the June 2007 Minutes

Executive Summary: The Executive Director will recommend that the Commission approve the minutes of the June 2007 meeting of the Commission.

Recommended Action: Approve the minutes of the June 2007 meeting.

Presenter: None.

Strategic Plan Goal(s): 2

Continue to refine the coordination between Commissioners and staff in carrying out the Commission's duties, roles and responsibilities.

- ◆ Continuously improve the development, distribution and dissemination of agenda and information to the Commission.

August 2007

Commission on Teacher Credentialing Minutes of the June 2007 Meeting

Commission Members Attending

P. David Pearson, Faculty Member, Chair
Paula Cordeiro, Public Representative
Karen Symms Gallagher, Ex-Officio, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (6/27 only)
Margaret Gaston, Public Representative
Guillermo Gomez, Teacher Representative
Leslie Littman, Designee, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Marilyn McGrath, Ex-Officio, California Postsecondary Education Commission
Lillian Perry, Teacher Representative
Leslie Peterson Schwarze, School Board Member
Jon Stordahl, Teacher Representative
Loretta Whitson, Non-Administrative Services Credential Representative
Beverly Young, Ex-Officio, California State University

State Board Liaison

Alan Bersin, Member, State Board of Education

Commission Members Absent

Catherine Banker, Public Representative
Josie Calderon, Public Representative
Caleb Cheung, Teacher Representative
Gloria Grant, Teacher Representative
Aida Molina, Administrative Services Representative
Tine Sloan, Ex-Officio, University of California

2A: Approval of the April 2007 Minutes

Commissioner Gomez moved approval of the April 2007 Minutes. Commissioner Gaston seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

2B: Approval of the June 2007 Agenda

Commissioner Littman moved approval of the Commission's June 2007 Agenda. Commissioner Stordahl seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

2C: Approval of the June 2007 Consent Calendar

Chair Pearson noted that item 78 of the Consent Calendar was being pulled. Commissioner Cordeiro moved approval of the Consent Calendar with the exception of Item 78. Commissioner Whitson seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

2D: Chair's Report

Chair Pearson noted that he has had few official Commission-related duties since the last Commission meeting. He shared with the Commission that he has recently visited South Africa and noted that he had the opportunity to visit schools in South Africa.

2E: Executive Director's Report

Executive Director Janssen discussed the reduction in credential processing time, noting that the Commission is well under the 75 day period required by regulations. He added that credentialing processing time averages near 50 days and those processed via the online system are done in less than 10 days.

Director Janssen informed the Commission that the Superintendent of Public Instruction had provided a letter noting that the California Department of Education could not comply with the provision of SB 1209 that requires the establishment of a passing score for specified standardized tests to serve as a proxy for the CBEST examination.

Director Janssen said that Commission staff members Teri Clark and Cheryl Hickey had presented a workshop at the annual meeting of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Credentialing (NASDTEC) in Salt Lake City, Utah in May. He thanked staff for sharing the Commission's new accreditation system at a national conference that was attended by more than 40 states.

2F: Commission Member Reports

Commissioner Lillian Perry shared with the Commission that she recently renewed her credential and complimented staff for the very quick turnaround time.

2G: Liaison Reports

State Board Member Alan Bersin brought greetings from the State Board of Education. He noted that the Board continues to "harmonize" the implementation of the various provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act. He also shared with the Commission his personal and professional congratulations for achieving the reduction in the credential processing time. He noted that this goal has been elusive for a very long time and it is a great tribute to the staff of the Commission that the goal has been achieved.

2H: Public Study Session on the Implications of Modifying the CSET: Single Subject Examinations (CSET: SS) to Assess Basic Skills in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics

Chair Pearson stated that this is the second of the public study sessions required by SB 1209, and staff would take the comments provided at this meeting and develop a report that would be submitted to the Legislature.

Phyllis Jacobson, Administrator, Professional Services Division presented this item. She stated that this study session is mandated to look at the implications of modifying the series of CSET: SS examinations to also include an assessment of basic skill in reading, writing, and mathematics.

Dr. Jacobson said the CSET was developed to meet the requirements of the Education Code for subject matter examination that would determine the candidates' subject matter competence, and the CSET: SS series covers 31 different content areas. As the part of the development process for the CSET: SS examinations, a very close alignment was assured between the examination content specifications and the K-12 student academic content standards; and in addition a job analysis was performed in order to assure that these examination specifications did reflect the subject matter knowledge needed by a beginning teacher in the profession. The chart from pages 2H-2 to 2H-4 indicated the range of the subtests and contents covered by each of the individual examinations. The CSET: SS examinations were designed to be administered in a single testing session that lasted up to five hours, and candidates could take all of the subsections during that time period or they could chose to take one or more subtests during the time period. Dr. Jacobson also said that in order to pass the CSET: SS examination the candidate must pass each of the required subtests with a passing score. The Commission has adopted a passing score standard of 220 on a scale score of 100-300. The examinations are administered up to six times per year depending on the single subject area, and they are typically offered every other month.

Dr. Jacobson stated the CBEST examination serves a different purpose, which is to assess the basic skills of the candidates and not their specialized subject matter knowledge. The content specifications for the CBEST are lengthy, and are related to the job of a beginning teacher. These examinations are scored based on a compensatory scoring model and candidates must earn a total score of 150 or higher, with no subtest score lower than 37. The CBEST is also offered six times per year, on the opposite months from the CSET examinations.

Dr. Jacobson said regarding to the possibility of modifying CSET to also include an assessment of basic skills, that it is a very complex subject because of considerations of examination validity, reliability, and other psychometric properties. It is important to note the different purposes and different audiences for the two examinations. All candidates are required to pass the CBSET examination but not all single subject candidates need to pass the CSET examinations. Single subject candidates also have the option to establish their subject matter competence through completing a Commission-approved single subject matter preparation program. At the present time approximately 56% choose the CSET examination route and the remainder choose the program route.

One starting point might be to ask whether the CSET: SS examinations might already assess some of the basic skills. Considering that the candidate has to be able to read and write in English to pass the examinations of the CSET, with the exception of the examinations in languages other than English, a possible policy approach could be to say that candidates who pass the CSET: SS English examination would also have met the basic skills requirement in reading and writing. An extension of this possible policy approach could be to deem that candidates who pass the CSET: SS Mathematics examination would also have met the basic skills requirement in math. A third possible extension of this potential policy approach could be to deem that candidates who pass any of the CSET: SS examinations would also have met the basic skills requirement in reading.

Any of these policy approaches would have some further implications; one of these would be that the content of the questions to which the candidates are responding do not necessary match

the two statutory purposes, namely, establishing a candidate's subject matter competence and basic skills competence. In establishing the validity of the examination all of the questions must track back to one or more specifications adopted by the Commission. The CSET examination in English tracks back to the content specifications adopted for English, and it does not track back to the content specifications adopted for basic skills. It is possible deeming that a candidate who took the English examination also meet the basic skills in reading might not meet the statutory requirement of SB 1209 that the examination modified must assess the basic skills at least as comprehensively and to the level that these skills are assessed in the basic skills examinations itself. The final implication of the policy approach would be that would not necessarily be a cost reduction to the candidates since they still need to pass the basic skills exam in those areas not covered under CSET.

Another possible approach might be posed as to whether the CSET: SS examinations could be modified to include questions that specifically address the basic skills content specifications. With this approach, there would be a modification of the questions themselves in that some of the subject matter-related questions would be removed in favor of adding some questions that would relate specifically to the content for basic skills. However, this approach would entail some complex and potentially costly examination redevelopment and revalidation work, and the weighting of the different sections of the examination as well as the difficulty levels within the examination would also need to be reviewed. If a revalidation process was to result in a determination that the modified examination were no longer valid for the intended purpose that would be a problematic situation to resolve.

A third implication is there would be a necessary reduction in content in order for the examination to still be finished by candidates within the allotted time, as some subject matter questions would have to be removed in order to replace them with basic skills questions. This approach might not meet the requirement in law that the modified examination assess to the basic skills to the same degree as comprehensively as is presently done in the state basic skills test.

A fourth implication is that there might be a need to maintain two versions of the CSET: SS examinations since not all candidates who take the CSET: SS examinations would need to also take the CBSET. Some of the candidates might have already met the basic skills requirement and some might be from out of state and already have satisfied the basic skills requirements. Both of these types of candidates would not need to take the modified examination for purposes of meeting basic skills.

One more possible approach would be to add one or more additional subtests to the CSET: SS examination. In that way, both examinations could maintain their content validity and it would not be more costly; however, it would need to be taken into consideration that candidates would have a very long testing session and would have to study two different sets of examination content.

Lastly, regardless of what potential modification approach that one might wish to adopt there still would be the consideration that the basic skills (i.e., CBEST) examination would still need to be available separately because of the needs of other candidates who are not necessarily single

subject candidates, such as candidates for other service credentials who do not need to establish subject matter competence. There would unlikely to be any cost saving either to the candidates or to the Commission with any of these modification routes, given that the each one entails some other implications for additional work and/or cost to candidates.

Commission Stordahl stated he liked the first proposal because the idea of being able to remove redundancy. He also questioned whether the writing within the CSET: SS was comparable to or even beyond that assessed within the basic skills examination. If so, Commissioner Stordahl thought it might meet a portion of the CBEST, along with the candidate's ability to demonstrate competency in the mathematics area within the CSET: Math examination. Dr. Jacobson said the difficulty with that proposition would be that there are differences in the kind of writing asked of candidates on the single subject exams and on the CBEST. She further noted the answers on the single subject examinations are short answer constructed responses and not essays that are well thought out and fully developed. Since on the CBEST candidates are writing fully developed essays on two different topics, the CSET: SS is not really accessing the same rhetorical and composition skills even both candidates are providing written answers.

Commissioner Schwarze raised a question as to the chart on page 2H-2 regarding the description of the different subtests in English in which subtest I and subtest II appeared to be identical. Dr. Jacobson said that staff would double check that.

Commissioner Whitson said the reason that her daughter went to get a teaching credential from Washington D.C. was that she thought the California testing was too difficult and the combination of required tests was burdensome.

Chair Pearson said the reason that all these issues of testing were before the Commission was because of SB 1209, and that there was a perception on the part of the Legislature that the required credential testing was too much of a financial and professional burden. As the Commission evaluates those issues, it is nonetheless hard to make a single test stretch to meet more than one purpose.

Commissioner Gaston said another issue was the bureaucratization of the teaching profession. If the Commission were to keep everything the same it would be difficult to address the issue of teaching excellence, but that she was not sure if this area is under Commission's purview. For all the reasons that were cited in the agenda item, Commission Gaston indicated that if it was going to be impossible to overcome the difficulties in eliminating redundancies in a particular test or of substituting one for another, then something should be done to address that situation.

Commissioner Cordeiro asked how long it took to take the CBEST test. Dr. Jacobson said the candidates could take up to four hours. Commissioner Cordeiro then asked about the length of other professional exams. Dr. Jacobson said our examination structure responds to the requirements in the Education Code which mandate the Commission to have certain examinations but that she did not have information on other professions.

Commissioner Perry asked whether there is a Federal model that under the No Child Left Behind legislation which could give us a guide to how we can incorporate all these concerns and ensure

that the children are getting a quality teacher who is able to provide effective reading and writing instruction across the curriculum in these various single subjects.

Chair Pearson thought that the purpose of the CBEST is guarantee that a candidate is minimally competent in reading, writing and mathematics, and does not guarantee anything about the quality of teaching. He questioned whether or not the California High School Exit Examination might serve the same function as the CBEST. Dr. Jacobson said the purpose of the CBEST is to establish the candidates can read, write and compute in English appropriately to the job of a teacher, and that the Commission's teacher preparation program standards do assure that both multiple subject and single subject candidates are instructed in the skills of reading and teaching reading across the content areas. Thus, if these topics are not covered specifically by a particular examination they are nonetheless covered by the approved teacher preparation program that is required by the Commission's standards to address these areas. Dr. Jacobson also said that in terms of the High School Exit Examination that could certainly be one of the alternatives to be look at in terms of CBEST proxies.

Chair Pearson asked that why we take basic skills and put that as a test for everyone to take rather than to put the responsibility on the universities to demonstrate with evidence that they are producing candidates who actually possess these kinds of basic skills and make it a program standard as part of the accreditation process for which they might provide evidence such as the High School Exit Exams or perhaps other exams as well.

Commission Gomez said the CBEST exam is at the minimum level of reading and mathematics demands that we should have as a measure of competency. He stated that the Commission should look at not just the possibility of consolidating but also making sure that the examinations mirror those conditions that we are asking our students to address.

Commissioner Young said there are two general areas in most examinations for teacher competence, which include subject matter to assess whether you know what you are teaching in a content area of significant depth, and also whether you know the pedagogy of how to teach. In California it is necessary for our teachers to demonstrate the basic skills, not knowledge of what they are teaching and not how they are teaching, but just the basic high school level of reading and writing and it is very insulting. She said that when we talk about consolidating with the existing exams we need to recognize that the two exams are measuring something very different that is not really dealing with teaching, and that probably the more reasonable way to streamline testing would be to return to the requirements of SB 1209 to ask the Superintendent of Public Instruction's office to do as the legislation required concerning other examination options, and that that is a more viable option than combining the CBEST with the CSET.

Chair Pearson questioned whether the exams that exist within the universities such as those used to get into certain courses presupposes the level of literacy in English.

Commissioner Young said that her presentation about the CSU placement examination would present another good proxy.

Commissioner Littman said it would be sad if the only thing to come out of the SB 1209 legislation is just dropping the 150 hour requirement for professional growth, and that the Commission might need to think about adding a subtest that addressed the basic skills to a CSET examination and drop or offer the regular CSET on those off months, which would split the time over a two month period for a candidate to take all the tests. She also thought might be appropriate to give up the CBEST test as requirement for the credential because something has to be done to reduce the amount of test taking which is an unfair burden to the candidates financially and preventing people from entering this profession.

Commissioner Gallagher said regarding the Chair's comment about accountability whether the Commission gets back knowledge of what the candidates do well on the exams. Dr. Jacobson said after each administration of the CSET examination series, the Commission gets a complete report back that indicates item statistics and candidates performance, and staff would able to look at which items perform in certain ways with different characteristics. Dr. Jacobson asked about the purpose for which Commissioner Gallagher would like to use the information.

Commissioner Gallagher then asked whether the institution could get the information on which areas the candidates did not pass but still met the cut score. Dr. Jacobson replied that the candidates cannot pass without meeting the cut score. Commissioner Gallagher then asked whether we know what the candidates knows within that subject area by institution. Dr. Jacobson said there is a detailed report that goes back to each institution indicated by the candidates when they sign up for the exam, but she is not familiar with exactly what the report covers.

Commissioner Stordahl asked whether the CSET testing occurs the same way as the CBEST. Dr. Jacobson replied yes. Commissioner Stordahl then said he agreed Commissioner Littman's suggestion to add the other subtest which meets basic skill as an option. Dr. Jacobson said one of the major implications would be that if we put both examinations on the same testing date, we do not want to reduce the amount of time available for the subject matter competency exam, and it makes the testing day extremely long for the candidates by adding another subtest. Commissioner Stordahl asked whether the test could be separated over a multiple day period. Dr. Jacobson said one could do that now since the candidate could take the subject matter examination one month and basic skills examination the next month.

Mr. Bersin said the CBEST is perceived by outsiders as being the teacher qualification test and not a basic skills test, which does enormous damager to our profession by suggesting that the certification test is actually geared to high school exit exam standards. He urged that all the technical difficulties need to be seriously examined without sacrificing the content of the CBEST.

Franell Prather, Credential Counselors and Analysts of California, said she supported the SB 1209 reforms pertaining to streamlining and reducing the number of the examinations required for the credential candidates, and the result of the CSET: MS adding the writing was positive for students who have not already taken the CBEST. She further said the time and cost associated with developing basic skills assessments to be incorporated into the CEST: SS exams would not be consistent with SB 1209, and CCAC does not support trying to combine these exams.

Susan Westbrook, California Federation of Teachers, echoed the concerns of her colleagues with the validity, liability and possible addition of cost to combine these tests.

Sharon Robison, Association of California School Administration, raised her concern on modification and consolidation of the CBEST and CSET: SS exams which assess two totally different purposes.

David Simmons, Ventura County Office of Education, said it would not save the money and time to create addition subtests under the CSET: SS.

Mel Hunt, Credential Counselors and Analysts of California, also raised his concern on combining the exams, using the example of combining the MSAT with the CBEST.

Chair Pearson asked for clarification on the MSAT [i.e., CSET: MS] option. Dr. Jacobson said that was a policy decision that was incorporated within SB 1209 that adopted the position that candidates who successfully pass the CSET: Multiple Subjects examination would be deemed by virtue of having passed to have also met basic skills in the areas of reading and math, but one major difference is that the CSET: MS examination does specifically address some mathematics and reading content. She further noted concerning the question of the writing assessment with the CSET: MS examinations that the writing aspect was not comparable to the CBEST exam, and therefore the CBEST writing section was added to comply with SB 1209 as an additional subtest to the CSET: MS examination. The case of CSET: SS is quite different because of the nature of the in-depth subject matter content and focus of those examinations.

Nancy Proclivo, California State University of San Marcos, said it would be very difficult and complicated to incorporate the CBEST into the CSET: SS.

Commissioner Gaston asked for clarification for the cut scores that were to be set by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and whether the Commission could get a short summary on that from the CDE. Director Janssen said the letter from Superintendent Jack O'Connell will be attached in the Friday Weekly Update to commissioners.

Chair Pearson said the main problem would be that we don't have any validity data to be able to translate the score on any of those tests into what score a person would get if they took the CBEST, and it's the matter of both psychometric work and cost of doing the validity study. Dr. Jacobson said also access to the student data on these other examinations was an issue.

Commissioner Young said she wanted to know whether the recommendation would be for the staff to write up the report, and the report does need to include what the Commission thinks about alternatives to CBEST in the way of streamlining.

Commissioner Schwarze said it would be costly for the Superintendent of Public Instruction to set the cut scores as required by SB 1209 because of the short time line, but she thought there is a way to do that.

Commissioner Gaston said she understands there is a time limit that CDE is facing, but is it possible to through the clean up route to make modifications to that? Dr. Jacobson said possibly the author of the legislation could be contacted by the CDE.

David Pearson suggested that the proxy route required by SB 1209 could be done, but with some considerations. Dr. Jacobson also pointed out another consideration raised by Superintendent O'Connell's letter was some statements by the owners of the examinations regarding the appropriate and inappropriate uses of their test and that area needed to be addressed also.

Commissioner Littman said it would not be the Commission's responsibility to address the improper use of the test. She further said whether the subtest option is provided we need to look at more opportunities to take all of the subtests.

Dr. Jacobson then asked for clarification as to whether the Commission advocated the idea of taking the CBEST examination in the morning and taking the subject matter examination in the afternoon as an option on all of the testing dates. Commissioner Littman replied yes, and she also said we should not give up the idea of dropping the CBEST test. Dr. Jacobson asked whether Commissioner Littman endorsed the idea of incorporating the CBEST subtests within the CSET array. Commissioner Littman said that could be one of the option, but she still suggested throwing out the CBEST exam.

Commissioner McGrath asked for data about if it made a difference when in the preparation sequence the CBEST is taken, and how and if that affects the pass rate. Dr. Jacobson said she is not aware of any studies of that question and that people chose to take CBEST at many points in time and for many different purposes.

Chair Pearson suggested that another way to solve this problem is put the burden on the teacher preparation institutions to demonstrate the basic competency of their candidates to enter the teaching profession as one of the standards, and he questioned if other states have the same type of basic skills exam. Dr. Jacobson said most states have a basic skills examination.

Commissioner Stordahl said the CBEST is an entrance exam and it is another indicator of a statement of quality to the public and should not be given up.

Commissioner Perry agreed with Commissioner Stordahl and thought the Commission should take more consideration on giving up the CBEST.

Dr. Jacobson said staff would craft some language representing the tenor of the Commission's discussion for the draft report and bring back this item at next meeting.

2I: Strategic Plan Development

Margaret Olebe, Strategic Planning Consultant, provided an update on the activities to collect information from external and stakeholder groups. She summarized some of the feedback she received from both employee focus groups and stakeholder opinion leaders.

Commissioner Young asked who from each of the stakeholders groups had been interviewed. Dr. Olebe provided the list of organizations that were interviewed. Commissioner Young asked why the institutions of higher education and teacher unions had not been interviewed. Ms. Olebe responded that the public forums that were held previously had successful attendance that included representation from institutions of higher education and teachers unions and that the interviews were an attempt to discuss the strategic plan with those who had not had the opportunity to do so thus far.

Director Janssen added that the institutions of higher education all have representation on the Commission and therefore have significant input on the strategic plan. In addition, he agreed that higher education and teachers unions have had the opportunity and will continue to have the opportunity to collaborate with the Commission on the strategic plan.

Commissioner Young noted her disagreement saying that an hour long interview with the Chancellor of the California State University system is a much different level of input and that the leaders of the higher education systems should be provided the same opportunity as the other opinion leaders.

Commissioner Perry asked how other opinion leaders are involved in the process. Dr. Olebe noted that there has been opportunity to contribute by completing a survey that was placed on the Commission's website, and that Commission staff have encouraged individuals to submit letters and statements, as well as to come to a public meeting to contribute to the discussion.

Chair Pearson said that there needs to be a fix in the perception of the imbalance in interviews. He said the Commission should reach out to those who have not been interviewed thus far to offer an opportunity to have a one on one interview. He agreed with Commissioner Young that this is a different type of interview collection process.

Dr. Olebe asked whether the Commissioners could submit a list of potential interviewees. Commissioner Perry asked for the specific names of those interviewed. Dr. Olebe noted that there was a promise of confidentiality to the respondents and said it may not be appropriate to share the names of those interviewed, although their organizational representation could be released.

Dr. Olebe noted that the agenda item includes two possible vision statements for Commission consideration. She noted that these were developed as a result of the Commission's discussion at the last meeting.

Commissioner Cordeiro noted that a key responsibility of this agency is to develop policy and that is not noted in each of these proposed vision statements.

Commissioner Young said she remembered that the Commission sought to include three particular responsibilities – accreditation, credentialing and discipline - in the vision statement and these are not mentioned in the proposed vision statements. She expressed concern about including research in the vision statement, saying that although important, the Commission is not specifically a research agency nor is it funded as such.

Chair Pearson noted that an important distinction is whether the Commission is to “do” the research or to “utilize” the research.

Director Janssen noted that the Vision Statement could drive the funding model. He noted that including this in the vision statement would help us begin to search for funding including drafting Budget Change Proposals to support research around teaching issues.

Commissioner Perry noted that she has no problem with the term “research.” She suggested that alternative language should read “through research-based and effective professional practices” so as to be consistent with the No Child Left Behind Act.

Commissioner Littman noted that she liked the first part of the first option. “Ensuring high quality educators for California’s diverse students...” She said the remainder of the sentence is not as important, but that this clause is a key.

Chair Pearson voiced support for including just the clause mentioned by Commissioner Littman. He said that the second part of that sentence could be in the mission or goals statements.

Commissioner Gomez agreed with Chair Pearson and Commissioner Littman.

Chair Pearson suggested “Ensuring high quality educators for California’s diverse students, communities and schools.”

Commissioner Cordeiro moved that the vision statement for the Commission be as follows: “Ensuring high quality educators for California’s diverse students, school and communities.” Commissioner Gaston seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Chair Pearson suggested whether one to one mapping could be done for the mission and goal statements.

Commissioner Gaston suggested that the first sentence under the Draft Mission now reflect the adopted new Vision Statement.

Commissioner Littman noted that the order needs to be changed of the draft missions. She voiced support for the second bullet as the first bullet. In addition, she noted that “conduct periodic review of the efficiency” under Goal 1 should be part of Goal 5, and the “implement technologies to support agency activities” should be under Goal 3. She also discussed that what is missing is that “promotion” of the Commission’s goals isn’t as apparent as it should be. She noted that the use of the term “inform” doesn’t imply collaboration and that the term “develop” is probably more appropriate.

Commissioner Schwarze suggested “framework” should be added to the second bullet under the Draft Mission.

Commissioner Gomez said Goal 6 does not appear to fit within the piece.

Commissioner Perry suggested add the word “utilize” to research.

Commissioner McGrath suggested “responsive” contacts under Goal 4, and she also noted to change the mission statement which reflected that every California student deserves and our communities aspire to have effective teachers.

Commissioner Young suggested combining Goal 6 into Goal 3 because customer service requires attention to staff training.

Commissioner Stordahl suggested that the second bullet on Goal 4 should read “collaborate with stakeholders in the development and implementation of commission policies.”

Chair Pearson voiced concern about the term “conduct” as not appropriate for the Commission and suggested using “promote” such as in Goal 5.

2K: Perspectives on Implementation of Teaching Performance Assessment

Caryl Hodges, from the University of San Francisco, Vicki Costa, from California State University Fullerton, and Randall Souviney of the University of California, San Diego shared their experiences with the implementation of the Teaching Performance Assessment.

Vicki Costa gave a brief presentation on the purposes, the benefits and some of the concerns using the Teaching Performance Assessment for the CSU system.

Caryl Hodges shared some information regarding the cost of the Teaching Performance Assessment, how it was funded, who coordinated the effort, how the results were used, what was learned and what the Commission should know based on input provided from the nine different institutions.

Randy Souviney talked about the importance of candidate assessments and the difficulty of doing so; however, it is precisely the goal that the TPA is moving towards.

Commissioner Schwarze asked whether the tasks fit into the district needs, such as a pacing schedule. She asked about operational matters given the needs of the district.

Carol Hodges responded that there is an assumption that the student teachers will be teaching the curriculum of the classroom. She noted that the videotaping component is a challenge.

Vicki Costa noted that Task 3 requires analysis of completed student work which is critical, and that they require a verification that the classroom includes English Learners and special populations to ensure that there will be that opportunity for student teachers.

Commissioner Littman noted that it was very refreshing to hear that requirements were being changed as necessary, but not merely adding on to requirements.

Chair Pearson asked Dr. Costa how they handle the implementation of Task one for the Single Subject Credential Program. Dr. Costa replied the draft was provided by Amy Jackson and it seemed to work pretty well.

Randy Souviney noted the need to notify districts about the implementation of the TPA and the necessity of videotaping. Dr. Jacobson noted there is a plan that would send a joint letter from the Commission and the CDE to the districts to notify them of the implementation of the TPA.

Dr. Souviney asked for a copy of that letter when it is sent.

Vicki Costa noted the discrepancy with the situation of special education teachers who do not have to take the TPA. She said there is a lot of thinking that needs to be done with respect to how this will work for special education credential candidates.

Chair Pearson thanked Dr. Hodges, Dr. Souviney, and Dr. Costa for sharing the progresses and challenges on the TPA issue.

Fiscal Policy and Planning Committee

Committee Chair Gomez convened the Fiscal Policy and Planning Committee.

3A: Approval of Agreements Over \$100,000 for Fiscal Year 2007-08

Crista Hill noted that item 2 of the item has been pulled from action since there were no bids to the RFP and that staff is in the process of reviewing options with respect to this particular item. She said that a plan for addressing this topic will be brought back at the August Commission meeting.

Ms. Hill said that this item seeks action for approval by the Executive Director for two agreements. The first is a proposal to approve the purchase of time and services for the development of reports for the Division of Professional Practices. In addition, it is requested that the Commission approve two competitively bid agreements for Fiscal Year 2006-07 to purchase new hardware to upgrade the CASE system. She explained the second type of agreement for which staff seeks approval is the Local Assistance pass-through funding for the Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program and Intern Programs, listed on page FPPC 3A-2.

Commissioner Littman moved approval of the staff recommendation to approve the agreements. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Stordahl. The motion passed without dissent.

3B: Update on the Proposed 2007-08 Governor's Budget

Ms. Hill provided an update on the proposed 2007-08 Governor's Budget. She explained that the Commission has three items related to its budget under consideration in the Conference committee. These items are listed on pages FPPC 3B-1. She explained that no action has been taken on item 2, related to a \$12 million appropriation for the Governor's proposed EnCorps program, and item 3, related to the Science and Mathematics incentives \$7.5 million appropriation. She explained that these items are part of the Proposition 98 discussions taking place in an attempt to resolve Proposition 98 funding due to an error in the calculation by the Department of Finance.

Ms. Hill noted that overall the budget for 2007-08 for the Commission is positive. It is expected that the Professional Services Division will receive new positions for the TPA, accreditation, and credential reform workload. The Certification Assignments and Waivers division will retain the 7 positions that stemmed from the 4 positions in the Professional Services Division for another year. The 2.5 positions for the CALTIDES project will be continuing along with the second year costs for the project. She said morale is improving. She cautioned that she is optimistic; however, there is currently no signature on the budget from the Governor at this time.

She noted that staff will update the Commission as appropriate as the budget conference committee concludes its work.

Chair Pearson noted the positive direction of the Commission's budget to undertake some very important issues such as the TPA and accreditation. He thanked staff for their efforts to reposition the Commission and with their positive interactions with the members of the Legislature and the Administration.

Director Janssen said that during Budget hearings Senator Scott commented on the positive treatment received by the Commission by the Department of Finance. Director Janssen thanked the Administration and the Department of Finance for their cooperation on the Commission's budget this year.

3C: Proposed Budget Change Proposal for Fiscal Year 2008-09

Ms. Hill reviewed the two budget change proposal concepts for the Commission's consideration. She said that if approved, staff would prepare Budget Change Proposals for submission to the Department of Finance by the deadline this fall.

Ms. Hill explained that the first concept would address staffing issues in the Certification, Assignments and Waivers Division (CAW). She said it would propose to maintain, and make permanent within CAW, the seven positions that were converted from the four Consultant positions in the Professional Services Division in order to address the certification workload. She noted that provisional language within the budget extends this request until June 30, 2008. Ms. Hill noted that the Commission staff engaged in the preparation of a zero based budget analysis of workload in 2006-07 which demonstrated that these seven positions met the needs of the division. She explained that maintaining the reduction in processing time is dependent upon the maintenance of current staffing levels. By appointing these as permanent positions within the CAW division, the Commission will be able to meet the future 50 day processing time mandate proposed in legislation, improve response time on telephone and e-mail inquiries, and convert the 60,000 documents currently on microfilm to an electronic media to ensure the success of the CALTIDES project. She noted that this is primarily a technical change because the positions are permanently appropriated to the Commission, but not to the CAW division.

Ms. Hill noted that the second concept relates to the third year costs related to the CALTIDES projects. She discussed the various objectives of the CALTIDES program and noted its importance to the state policymakers and to data collection activities of the Commission and the state with respect to the teaching workforce.

Ms. Hill explained that although this item is an information item, staff would appreciate direction on these two concepts and that the staff will bring this item back at the August meeting for action.

Commissioner Littman noted that she has no issue with the funding request for the CALTIDES project. She asked whether data within CALTIDES and CALPADS are separate. Executive Director Janssen noted that the data will reside together within a common architecture, but it is not proposed that the data be linked at this time.

Chair Pearson cautioned that there is a lot of discussion at the policy level of linking the two with the intent of tying student achievement with teachers and that the members of the Commission ought to be cognizant of these discussions.

Commissioner Perry asked whether the tracking includes student tracking. The response was no.

2J: Early Assessment Program Administered by the California State University System

Commissioner Young presented this item, noting that the Early Assessment Program (EAP) is a major project that began as an attempt to meet the goal of reducing the need for remediation in college. She explained that this program provides a way for high school students to better understand whether they are ready for college level work and whether they will need to take additional coursework.

Commissioner Young explained that EAP is built on the California Standards Test and that CSU worked with CDE to add 15 additional questions in mathematics and in English where CSU felt there needed to be additional coverage of these subjects. She noted that these tests are voluntary and that there is an essay component to the test. She explained that these items and the essay are scored and then there is a determination made as to whether a student is “ready” for college. If it is determined a student is ready, then he or she is exempt from taking the placement exams and exempt from remediation. She noted that the EAP score is provided on the same form as the CST reports.

Commissioner Young explained that if a student is deemed not to be college ready in mathematics, it is recommended that he or she take math in 12th grade. If a student is deemed not to be college ready in English, it is recommended that he or she take additional coursework in English. She informed the Commission that the CSU has developed an alternative course that is neither remedial nor advanced, but is tightly aligned with the standards, and is accepted as an alternative to traditional 12th grade English. This course is commonly referred to as ERWC, the Expository Reading and Writing Course. She discussed the numerous parent and community awareness campaigns and trainings for high school teachers and counselors developed and implemented by CSU and available in many languages.

Commissioner Young discussed the results of EAP from the Spring 2006, noting that, in English, half of high school juniors took the exam, and 23 percent of those were college ready. In mathematics, 72 percent of eligible juniors took mathematics, and 55 percent were judged college ready. She explained that far fewer students are “eligible” to take the exam in

mathematics than English, largely because they have not completed all the required coursework in mathematics.

Commissioner Young then discussed the efforts by CSU to provide assistance and advice to students on how to become college ready. She discussed the numerous resources and websites available to students. She noted that the coursework has recently been adopted district-wide by Los Angeles Unified School District and is now accepted by the University of California. She said that the CSU has a federal grant which is supporting a 6-district adoption in its first year.

Commissioner Young explained the professional development component of this program. She explained that a 4-day training at county offices is offered to 12th grade English teachers preparing them to teach the ERWC course. The second professional development effort is the Reading Institute for Academic Preparation which is an 80- hour program offered to all 9-12 teachers.

She discussed the evaluation and progress of the scores of students in school that participated in the professional development activities and noted that they are significantly higher than students from schools with teachers who did not participate in the professional development.

She discussed the professional development efforts in mathematics and noted that the CSU has found that Algebra II is the primary point of difficulty for most students, and therefore, the focus of the professional development in mathematics.

Commissioner Young discussed a study completed by Just for the Kids of schools with higher than expected gains in order to determine ways to replicate this success. She discussed access to the scores by schools, counties, districts, and students.

She summarized the numerous benefits of the EAP program.

Commissioner Schwarze commended the CSU for making its remediation information available on line. She requested a copy of the PowerPoint presentation and asked about the 12th grade coursework and how districts could sign up. Commissioner Young said that she would provide that information but that the teachers need to go through the professional development program.

Commissioner Schwarze discussed the end of course test for mathematics. Commissioners discussed the various pathways by grade level for mathematics. Commissioner Schwarze noted that the effort is commendable.

Commissioner Gaston asked about the professional development and whether the CSU is keeping track of the numbers of teachers going through and who developed the coursework. Commissioner Young responded that CSU was indeed keeping information on the teachers completing the professional development and that the coursework and the professional development programs were developed by CSU faculty with K-12 experts.

Chair Pearson commended the CSU and noted the benefits of having the scores online so teachers and parents can have access to the information.

Commissioner Perry asked about the nexus with the high school exit examination. Commissioner Young responded that the exit test is at a much lower level than the CSU placement exams. She said that the CSU's passing standard for exemption from remediation is among the highest in the nation.

Chair Pearson adjourned the General Session until 8:30 a.m.

Reconvene General Session

Chair Pearson reconvened the general session of the Commission.

5A: Public Hearing: Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations, Title 5 Section 80001 Pertaining to Definitions and Terms

Chair Pearson declared the public hearing open. He said the purpose of the hearing is to consider proposed amendments to Title 5, Section 80001, pertaining to definitions and terms.

Terri Fesperman, explained the proposed regulations appear on pages 4 and 5 of the agenda item. She said that the proposed amendments are intended to update some outdated subsections of the Title 5 regulations but that the main purpose is to amend subsection (e) to clarify that the Commission's website is a one of the official records of an individual's credential along with the official hard copy document. She explained that the status of applications and credentials held have been available on the website since 2001. In 2005, the Commission replaced our database system to store credential and credential history in one database and may be viewed on the on-line secure look-up page. In the future, the Commission will no longer print credentials issued, but will continue to post the official documents on the online site. The Commission provides a download to the County Offices of Education which includes information on the credentials issued. Education Code requires employing agencies to keep records on all credentials for its employees. She said that some employers have been reluctant to use the online credential information as an official record; therefore, staff recommends that Title 5 regulations specifically define that the web-based information is an additional official record of credentials.

She explained the other c, d, f, h, j update terms and delete or update Education Code references. She explained that four responses in support of the regulations have been received and no additional responses have been received since the agenda item was printed.

Chair Pearson asked whether there were any members of the public who wished to speak on this topic. There were no public comments.

Commissioner Gaston moved to adopt the proposed amendments to the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 80001, pertaining to definitions and terms. Commissioner Cordeiro seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

Legislative Committee

Commissioner Gaston convened the Legislative Committee.

4A: Status of Legislation

Mary Armstrong, Director, Office of Governmental Relations, said that all of the Commission's sponsored bills are moving quickly through the legislature. She said there has been a lot of good staff work to make this happen. She said that there are no changes or amendments on the Commission's sponsored bills.

Sue Westbrook, representing the California Federation of Teachers, noted that she had concerns with the Commission's support of AB 1415 (Brownley). She said the bill attempts to evaluate administrator preparation programs and she said that these individuals are quite far removed from the classroom and so are the programs. She said she feared that this is a "slippery slope" where the teacher preparation programs are next and that teachers will then be evaluated using student test scores. She said CFT has an oppose position on this bill.

She said she also has a problem with SB 859 (Scott) noting she was not sure what amendments the Commission was seeking. She said this seems like full employment for part time community college faculty, the pedagogy is not specific enough, and no induction is required. She said the 6 years with good evaluations seems to have been reduced to 3 years and that these people would not be well-prepared to teach in California K-12 classrooms.

Committee Chair Gaston noted that although this item is noticed for action, no action is required at this time.

4B: Analysis of Bills

Chair Gaston noted that this item is an action item. Ms. Armstrong explained that this agenda item includes a legislative proposal. She said that as a result of discussion from the bilingual panel, there was a need to modify Education Code language. The current law lists a coursework route for the CLAD certificate but the language in the statute is not explicit that a coursework option can lead to a BCLAD authorization. 4B-4 clarifies that one can do a coursework option. She said that at this time, there is no legislative vehicle available for this legislative concept, but that approval by the Commission would allow the staff to act quickly should one become available or to introduce it at the next legislative session.

Chair Pearson said that this proposed language would bring this authorization in line with the other types of credentials, bringing consistency. Ms. Armstrong agreed.

Commissioner Gomez noted that waiting until the next legislative session may prevent the possibility that this language gets attached and that it might be slowed by any other unrelated language in a bill it might be included in this session. Ms. Armstrong noted that the more likely situation is that the language of this proposal would replace the language in a bill that was not going to go through, and therefore the author might drop that previous language entirely, leaving the Commission's proposal to stand alone.

Commissioner Whitson moved the approval of the proposed legislative concept and direction to staff to seek an author. Commissioner Schwarze seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

4C: Other Legislative and Policy Items

Committee Chair Gaston explained that there needed to be no discussion of this item since there are no other legislative and policy items.

Reconvene

Chair Pearson reconvened the June 27-28 General Session

2L: Welcome by Chancellor Reed

CSU Chancellor Charles Reed welcomed the Commission to the Office of the Chancellor in Long Beach. Chancellor Reed discussed his professional background in educator preparation and the CSU's priorities with respect to educator preparation. He discussed the CSU's efforts to recruit and train additional educational leaders, including the system's new authority to award doctorate degrees in education. Chancellor Reed asked the Commission to join with the CSU on ensuring major educational needs are met in California, such as in the area of recruitment and retention of teachers of mathematics and science and teachers from historically underrepresented backgrounds and language diversity. He discussed the importance of training teachers from all cultural and ethnic backgrounds to be more representative of the K-12 student population so that they can serve as good role models for young students. Chancellor Reed discussed the need for greater flexibility and the importance of experimenting with different ways to prepare teachers and school leaders. He spoke of the importance of letting teacher candidates "practice" their skills early on in their academic career. He discussed the CalStateTEACH effort and the difficulty he had to begin this type of new program. Chancellor Reed commented on the important role that the community colleges play in preparing new teachers, noting that many of the new teachers they prepare are community college transfer students. He suggested that the state and educational institutions must find new and different ways to tap this pipeline of potential teachers. Chancellor Reed discussed his past opinion of the Commission and noted that he no longer wants to eliminate the Commission.

Commissioner Gomez and Commissioner Gaston thanked Chancellor Reed and expressed their agreement with many of his comments. Commissioner Gomez talked about the shortage of educational leaders, particularly in challenging schools and the need to find new ways of preparing them. Commissioner Gaston agreed with Chancellor Reed about the need to prepare educational leaders and noted that data shows the educational leaders are aging, are older than the teachers, and will need replacement at even higher rates than teachers in the future.

Commissioner McGrath thanked Chancellor Reed for recognizing the important role played by community colleges in preparing teachers. She noted that she agreed strongly with his comments.

Commissioner Cordeiro agreed with Chancellor Reed about the importance of educational leaders noting that when she came to California, she was appalled that the State University system was not allowed to offer the doctoral degree in education. She discussed the partnership of San Diego State with University of San Diego and said she is happy to see them offer their first cohort. She said that there is a crisis in community college leadership as well and urged the Chancellor to continue his efforts in this area.

Chancellor Reed noted that the Commission was welcome at the Chancellor's office at any time.

Professional Services Committee

Committee Chair Cordeiro convened the Professional Services Committee.

6A: Program Approval and Initial Accreditation

Teri Clark, Administrator of Accreditation, explained that there was a printing error and the April agenda item was reprinted instead of the June agenda item. Commission staff provided a copy of the revised agenda item 6A and Ms. Clark stated this is the document which contains the information for the current meeting. She said that there were three subject matter programs that have completed the program review process: Pepperdine University, English; CSU Los Angeles, English; and CSU Dominguez Hills, Social Science.

Commissioner Gaston noted that there appears to be a typo in the program outcomes for the Pepperdine program as one is listed twice. Ms. Clark noted the error and would look into it.

Commissioner Littman moved staff recommendation to approve the three subject matter programs. Commissioner Perry seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

6B: Implementation of the Accreditation System

Teri Clark, Cheryl Hickey, and Jo Birdsell presented this item. Ms. Clark noted that this item is the regular update on the implementation of the revised accreditation system and it is divided into three sections.

Ms. Hickey explained that the staff was working hard to begin the implementation of the new accreditation system. She described the current efforts including the pilot biennial reporting process. She noted that to date, eighteen programs have agreed to participate in the pilot and that the Commission staff would attempt to get a few more institutions to volunteer to pilot test the in some credential areas where there are few volunteers. She explained that the purpose of the pilot was to determine whether the instrument needed refining and to see whether the data that is provided is useful to the accreditation process. She noted that in the fall, Commission staff would review with members of the workgroup and the Committee on Accreditation the submissions received during the pilot test and determine if any changes needed to take place. She noted that the Orange County Office of Education had submitted the very first biennial report.

Ms. Hickey discussed the program assessment efforts planned for 2007-08. She reminded Commissioners that this is the aspect of the accreditation process that has been decoupled from the site visit and that this will be the first group of institutions to undergo this process in this form. She said there was some uncertainty in the field about this aspect of accreditation and that staff will be working to ensure good communication and understanding about what is expected at for this component of the process. In addition, Ms. Hickey noted that a full schedule of site visits will be undertaken next year. She noted that three of the visits are NCATE visits, but the majority (11) are state visits alone. She commented that this is the first year that non-NCATE visits are resuming after a long hiatus.

Ms. Hickey also informed the Commission that the Committee on Accreditation had asked staff for a Commission liaison to the Committee. She noted that the Commission had discussed this issue at a previous meeting, but that it remained unresolved. At the last Committee meeting, the members of the Committee discussed this issue and determined that there are significant benefits to having a member of the Commission serve as the liaison to the Committee and that having one would serve to facilitate a better understanding of accreditation issues and general communication between the two bodies.

Dr. Birdsell then discussed the development of the new proposed *Accreditation Framework*. She said that the Framework is the policy document that establishes the revised accreditation system. She commented that the staff is asking the Commission for direction to gather stakeholder feedback on the revised *Accreditation Framework* beginning in June, to consider if any revisions are necessary to the draft Framework. She said that a revised draft *Framework* would be brought back to the Commission at a future Commission meeting for adoption.

Teri Clark then discussed the proposed Revised Common Standards. She noted that this item was presented to the Commission at its March 2007 meeting, and that the Standards then were made available for stakeholder feedback. She said that the stakeholders had several very good comments that were discussed with the Committee on Accreditation and the members of the Accreditation Study Workgroup. As a result, some modifications to the proposed standards were made and are reflected in the version before the Commission in the agenda item.

She noted that in Standard 2, a revision was made to include “and program effectiveness” to the language. In addition, Standard 4 was revised to include “field experiences” in the first sentence. And finally, she reminded Commissioners that the CCAC had proposed additional language to help ensure that the Commission monitors credential recommendations now that the online recommend system was implemented at universities and district offices. She said that the COA had reviewed the CCAC proposed language, and incorporated the concept within Standard 1 with the addition of the sentence that reads “The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.”

Mel Hunt, representing St. Mary’s College and CCAC, Carol Riley, representing CSU Long Beach and CCAC, Nancy Proclivo, representing CSU San Marcos, and Franell Prather, representing San Diego State, Calexico Campus and CCAC all thanked the Commission, the Committee on Accreditation and the staff for incorporating their suggestion into the Common Standards. They each voiced support for the language and the importance of oversight for this new online process. In addition, they thanked staff for the consideration of a new and separate process for oversight of the online recommend process.

Commissioner Gaston moved staff recommendation to adopt the revised Common Standards. Commissioner Whitson seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

Staff asked for direction on the appointment of a liaison to the Committee on Accreditation. Committee Chair Cordeiro asked for volunteers from the Commission to serve in this capacity. Commissioner Schwarze volunteered for the role.

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

Teri Clark, Administrator of Accreditation, noted that this agenda item addresses induction and the work that leads to the clear credential. She referred to the chart on page PSC 6C-2. She explained that SB 2042 changed the nature of the credential to a two-tiered system where teacher candidates are educated and practice some skills and abilities in their teacher preparation program, and then that development is continued and advanced during a two-year induction and mentoring process that includes formative assessment and guidance.

Ms. Clark discussed the comparability of the two routes to the clear credential – induction and the fifth year of study, noting there is a disparity in the two routes. She said Table 2 beginning on page 3 illustrates the induction program standards and the fifth year program standards. She discussed the role of the Common Standards and how some of the induction standards are covered by the Common Standards. She discussed the standards that are not included in the fifth year of study but are required under induction. She said that there is concern in the field that these two routes to the clear credential ought to be as equivalent as possible.

She said that a group of stakeholders has been meeting since 2004 to discuss this issue. She said they have a proposal which recommends that Standard 15 and 17 should be required in the fifth year of study. In addition, they are reviewing the earlier standards to see if there is something that a university induction program could do to meet those and that the fifth year of study programs would be held to the Common Standards and six of the induction standards.

She said the group meets again in July and that after that meeting, staff would bring a recommendation back for consideration and action by the Commission.

Dr. Birch, Director of the Professional Services Division, said that the second policy issue is related to preparation routes for those who have a preliminary credential but are not employed by the K-12 public schools. He noted that induction is a standards-based, job-embedded process of applying and demonstrating theory and knowledge with the support of a mentor and that state funding is available for those employed in the public schools. He said that the SB 2042 clear credential required completion of an induction program. He also said that if induction is not available, then a fifth year of study was allowable. He further said that private school teachers or those in other school settings may participate in induction programs, but they are not supported by public funding. He noted that if induction is not available, the employer verifies that the teacher is eligible for a fifth year program.

Dr. Birch discussed the chart on page 34 indicating different categories of individuals and their eligibility for induction. He noted that the preliminary credential is available for five years and it was the expectation that the majority of teachers would be able to complete the induction requirement within the five years. He noted that it is clear now that there are individuals whose credentials will begin expiring in 2009 who are not eligible for induction. He said that there remains a question that if SB 2042 intended a job-embedded professional development, whether these individuals should be allowed to earn a clear credential independent of their teaching experience.

Dr. Birch said that there is general agreement among stakeholders that individuals earning the clear credential should have demonstrated skills and abilities identified by the clear credential standards. However, they have expressed concern for the individuals who have not been able to find a teaching position and therefore have not been able to complete induction.

Dr. Birch said that staff recommends that the work to ensure that the two currently available routes (Induction and the Fifth Year of Study) to the clear multiple and single subject teaching credentials are as equivalent as possible be continued and brought back to the Commission for action at future meeting.

Chair Pearson asked why it is not possible to match all the standards. Ms. Clark said some of the concerns were raised by the universities such as the formative assessment system, and the roles and the responsibilities of K-12 schools and support providers.

Commissioner Gaston asked what the interface was between the intern program with the master teacher component and this stream of induction and fifth year. Ms. Clark said the intern program fits in the preliminary preparation level and although some of the Education Code implies that interns could be served in BTSA it does not fit in with the credential structure under SB 2042 because the induction experience expects that a candidate has completed the preliminary credential. Ms. Clark also said the intern is a second level of preparation (the first being subject matter preparation) similar to student teaching candidates. When individuals complete an intern program and enter induction the induction program should be modified based on their prior experiences. Commissioner Gaston further asked whether the modification was explicit. Ms. Clark replied the modification was not as explicit as it should be and staff would bring back a report from the University of California, Riverside study regarding duplication between internship and induction in the near future.

Commissioner Littman raised her concern regarding renewal of the preliminary credential whether the ten year period makes any difference for the induction program, and whether the funding is still available for the induction program if the candidates must renew the credential. Ms. Clark said there is a possibility for a two-year renewal instead of five-year and the funding from the state is only available for the first and second year of teaching on the preliminary credential. She also said that a group of stakeholders is working on coming up with an clear statement about the SB 2042 credential with respect to earning a clear credential and clearly laying out the state funding option.

Chari Pearson asked who would be the constituencies interested in the fifth year program. Ms. Clark said it depended on who would be eligible for that option.

Chair Pearson moved staff recommendation to continue on the topic of ensuring that the routes to the clear multiple and single subject credential are as equivalent as possible. Commissioner Gaston seconded the motion. The motion passed without dissent.

6D: Update on the Activities of the Special Education Advisory Panel

Michael McKibbin, Administrator, Professional Services Division, gave an update on implementation procedures to add an English learner authorization to the Special Education credential and to eliminate redundancy of credential requirements. He also gave an update on the

work on the Special Education Work Group that reviews the structure and requirements for the Special Education credential.

Commissioner Gomez applauded staff's effort to work with the work group on this issue. Commissioner Schwarze asked what outreach that staff using to get the good rate of participants. Mr. McKibbin said that staff are using all of the professional organizations to make sure to reach all the people. Commissioner Schwarze asked when the meeting would be start. Mr. McKibbin said staff is discussing the ways to get the information to the public.

Committee Chair Cordeiro asked about the possibility expanding the credential authorization of the Special Education credential. Mr. McKibbin said in the case of autism for which the authorization is only in Moderate/Severe, staff would recommend changing the limitation of the authorization. Committee Chair Cordeiro further asked how we notify the candidate who holds a Mild/Moderate credential could teach kids that have autism. Mr. Janssen said normally authorization follows what is provided in the program.

Sue Westbrook, representing the California Federation of Teachers, noted her concerns about evaluating the Special Education teachers on their students' score, and that she thought the term "highly effective teacher" should not be used for the special education group.

Commissioner Gomez suggested looking at the progress instead the test score as evidence.

Sherrye Smith, representing California Baptist University, said she like to pose the Mild/Moderate perspective because of the huge differential between severe Autism and Asperger Syndrome, which could be assisted by a Mild/Moderate educator.

6E: Update on the Activities of the Bilingual Certification

Jo Birdsell, Consultant, Professional Services Division, presented an update on the activities of the Bilingual Certification Design Team, including elements and timelines for the development of routes for bilingual certification.

6F: Induction Program Review

Teri Clark and Dr. Sarah Solari, representing the California Department of Education, provided an overview of the BTSA Program Review that was begun in the 06-07 year.

She explained that BTSA is administered by both the Commission and the CDE. She explained the role of the BTSA Interagency Task Force. She also discussed the BTSA Induction State Leadership Team that includes the Task Force as well as the 12 Cluster Regional Directors (CRDs). These CRDs are charged with working directly with the programs.

Ms. Clark discussed the history of program evaluation of the BTSA program. She talked about the annual activities to evaluate the programs, including the Peer Program Review and Induction Program Review process. She explained that the Peer Program Review is done annually while the IPR process happens about once every five years. In both processes, individuals key to the program are interviewed and key evidence is reviewed.

Dr. Solari discussed the Induction program Review Process in detail and noted that programs are held to all standards. Ms. Clark noted that the Task Force said that the programs are held to ten standards at the standard level and to the other standards at the element level. She explained that if any part of the standard is not met, the entire standard is not met. She then explained those standards for which the programs are held to the element level and explained why those standards were chosen as important to ensure programs meet them at the element level. She said that in the Program Review Process, if one element is not met, then the entire standard is not met.

Dr. Solari explained the follow up process to the IPR process, including the drafting of action plans, scheduling of future meetings, and monitoring and implementing the action plans.

Dr. Solari summarized the results of IPR process on a standard by standard basis. She reviewed those standards met by most of the programs that were reviewed this year and those that were not. Dr. Solari noted that the difficult challenge seems to be with those standards that require demonstration of evidence that candidates know the expected knowledge, skills and abilities and the collection of that data to show they have demonstrated their competence. This seems to be a challenge for many programs.

Ms. Clark explained the Plan to Remedy process and the work that will be done with all programs this year as a result of the findings of the 28 IPR reviews that took place.

Part II.

Ms. Clark explained the rationale for the review of the Fresno Unified School District. Ms. Clark noted that the induction programs are not yet in the accreditation system and the program review was the closest and best way to review the program. She noted that it was a modified program review.

Ms. Clark explained the process for reviewing the Fresno Unified School District BTSA Program. She explained that in the process of reviewing the Fresno Unified BTSA program, three themes emerged. She described the three themes:

- 1) lack of demonstrated knowledge and leadership in administering the FUSD BTSA Induction Program;
- 2) an inadequate or inappropriate process of selection, training, and matching of support providers (consulting teachers); and
- 3) lack of a process to monitor and document program activities and individual participations progress toward meeting all requirements contained in the induction standards.

Ms. Clark explained that the team borrowed from the accreditation process in issuing stipulations. She summarized the proposed stipulations listed on page PSC 6F-14 and 15 of the agenda item.

Ms. Clark noted that Fresno program is the first program to be placed in the Plan to Remedy process and that this entire process is new for the Commission and the CDE.

Ms. Clark explained why the team did not recommend the program be closed. She explained that this program is in a large urban district and if closed, the County Office induction program would have to take over the new teachers – thereby doubling that program. She noted that there are very dedicated and well trained support providers, that there is quality support provided for the academic content standards at school sites, and that the local program can integrate the work of induction rather than have it be in addition to site and district work.

Dr. Solari noted that the agenda insert showed the actions the CDE is taking with respect to the fiscal and program issues under the jurisdiction of CDE.

Commissioner Stordahl asked about stipulation 6 and what the term “majority” means. Ms. Clark explained that would be 11 standards but that there would be a continuous effort on the part of the program to work toward and be monitored toward meeting all standards. She said there would be a plan to follow up but that the Task Force and both agencies would follow up to ensure that the program is making progress towards meeting all standards.

Commissioner Littman asked about the chart on Page 6 and why the Commission isn’t following up on the other districts that have met only 8-9 standards. Ms Clark said the task force does not believe that a review is warranted at this time. Commissioner Littman asked about requiring that all elements are met in some standards, and she thought that the bar seems to be set very high and she is concerned about that.

Ms. Clark noted that the current system is an attempt to be more objective. Dr. Solari emphasized that there is a need to support a growth model and to be very clear about whether a standard was met or not met.

Commissioner Littman noted concern about the August 15th deadline listed in the stipulation. She suggested that there be some additional time at the beginning of the school year to address this.

Commissioner Littman also expressed concern about the dates listed in the second proposed stipulation. She addressed the proposed modification of the second stipulation, that not all programs need to be under the direct supervision of the superintendent and that the current leadership be given an opportunity.

Chair Pearson asked for clarification about the jurisdictions with respect to the CDE versus the CTC. Ms. Clark said the responsibility of the superintendent as co-administrator is fiscal, the funding is done through the CDE and the Commission has the approval processes.

Chair Pearson asked why the district Superintendent is listed in the proposed modification. Dr. Solari noted that during the interviews, different individuals were identified as the program leader and that it was not as clear as it should be.

Commissioner Schwarze noted that she did not have issue with the August 15 date. She asked what would happen if the district did not meet the date. Ms. Clark noted that the team’s recommendation would be to have the COA monitor. Commissioner Schwarze asked whether

the Commission could be the monitor since this is a new process. Ms Clark responded that this is certainly possible should that be desired.

Commissioner Schwarze said that the letter of action taken by the Commission should be copied to the president of the Fresno Unified School District Board.

Commissioner Young commented that she is happy to hear that the BTSA program review process is moving to an accreditation-like model. She commented that this program is severely out of compliance and that she would like to see a tighter stipulation for meeting more than the majority of standards. She agreed that there needs to be a way to better reflect good programs versus ineffective programs when the number of standards met or not met is simply listed. She noted that Fresno County met all standards and perhaps they could be of greater assistance.

Commissioner Gaston asked whether as the IPR process matures, if we might keep in mind modifying the approval process because the Commission members only meet periodically and are not specifically trained, so perhaps the initial approval process should be kept with a review team and Commission staff, and only send issues to the Commission on occasions that warrant further consideration.

Chair Pearson thought we have a problem with the two types of standards, which created an apples and oranges situation. He said it creates two systems, and portrays an inaccurate picture of the situation.

Chair Pearson noted that two issues have been raised. One is that August 15 may not be a reasonable time, and the other is that a majority of the standards must be met. He suggested changing the date to September 15 for the notification and that fifteen standards should be met.

Commissioner Littman voiced concern for this process going through the COA. She said that this issue should stay with the Commission and that she wants to see the follow up.

Commissioner Perry asked why the district is not being held to the same standard as the one that we are discussing today.

Michael Hanson, Superintendent of the Fresno Unified School District, said that the district Board does know of the issues. He introduced the administrators from the district and the reorganization within the district to address the issues. He is supporting the stipulations. He said it is very fair, noting that the students deserve high quality teaching. He explained that the Fresno Unified district currently has 260 teachers in the program and could have 700-1000 new teachers in the coming years. Of the 100 schools, 60 are in program improvement. He described the urgency in the district to address the issues. He noted that the timelines are aggressive, but that the stakes are high and he supports the stipulations given the 76,000 students in the district. He said that he is supportive of whatever stipulations the commission decides. He also spoke in support of the process going through the Committee on Accreditation. He thanked staff for their assistance.

Susan Westbrook, representing the California Federation of Teachers, noted that this BTSA program is a merged PAR BTSA program.

Ken Burt, California Teachers Association, said he generally supports the recommendations and he is also appearing on behalf of the Fresno Teachers Association. He thought that CDE has PAR intertwined with the BTSA program which is very confusing and some of that is negotiable in contract negotiations. He said that these issues are separate and the CTC is to address the accreditation and approval of the program. He voiced concern about whether the timelines are realistic and he is also concerned about "strict adherence." He voiced support for flexibility. He said it is a reasonable time that teachers are notified. He voiced support to report to the Professional Services Division, and he does not think the Committee on Accreditation is appropriate.

He was reminded that these were adopted as standards, not under the administrative procedures act. He thought there is some question about the legality of the standards, and how the Commission determined whether a standard is met, during which he did not think the Commission voted and debated it, and he has not see it in the Code of Administrative Regulations. He thought it is worthy to get a program to help out Fresno, but within the overall area there are some legal difficulties that need to be addressed.

Nina Wynn, Orange County Office of Education, noted that the Peer Review process needs to be consistent and that there needs to be consistency in the number of elements that need to be met. She shared an experience at Orange County and said that although this is not pleasant can be a catalyst to moving a program towards excellence.

David Simmons, Ventura County Office of Education, said that they have one of the larger BTSA programs in the state and shared many of the same concerns raised by the CTA. He hoped in the future that a new Induction Program Review process would be established that would be conducted with the same degree of professionalism transparency, respectful due processes and its equitable application that has been the hallmark of the Commission and the Committee on Accreditation.

Commissioner Gaston moved that the Commission accept the program approval recommendation from the Induction Program Review team of Approval with Probationary Stipulations with the modification on Stipulation 2 and additional stipulation 7. Commissioner Whitson seconded the motion.

Chair Pearson proposed an amendment to change the August 15 to September 15 to notify the teachers and another to raise the bar in terms of the number of program standards to fifteen rather than eleven.

Commissioner Stordahl seconded the amendment, and move the target date to October 1 in the second stipulation.

Commissioner Schwarze said there seems to be a disconnecting resolution for the situation.

Mr. Hanson said that more time is helpful, but will live with whatever the Commission proposed.

Chair Pearson repeated the motion to accept the program approval recommendations with the following amendments: 1) to change Stipulation 1 from August 15, 2007 to September 15, 2007 ; 2) to change Stipulation 2 from September 1,2007 to October 1, 2007 and to include “effective program leadership under the direct supervision of the superintendent of the LEA pursuant to Induction Standards 1, 2, 5 and 10 of the BTSA Induction Program”; and 3) to change Stipulation 6 so that the Fresno Unified program must meet fifteen of the induction program standards, and also meet additional Stipulation #7. Commissioner Stordahl seconded the motion. The motion carried without dissent.

Ken Burt asked for clarification about the motion as it relates to the Committee on Accreditation. Chair Pearson noted that this was not included in the motion.

Report of Closed Session Items

Chair Pearson provided the report of the Closed Session items. He reported that the Commission granted the following Petitions for Reinstatement:

1. Patricia Ashe
2. Theodore Okasinski

The Commission adopted the Proposed Decision of the Administrative Law Judge in the matter of David Sepe.

The Commission delegated authority for approval of the Consent Determinations to the Committee of Credentials and the Executive Director.

Report of the Executive Committee

Chair Pearson provided the report of the Executive Committee.

He noted that the Executive Committee approved its April 2007 Meeting Minutes.

The Executive Committee recommended and he moved the addition of a new Section 231 which sets forth the rule for establishing a quorum as the majority of the total number of members. The Committee also directed staff to bring back proposed revisions to Section 610 relating to the Executive Director’s contract authority.

The motion carried without dissent.

Chair Pearson noted that the Executive Committee adopted Schedule B as the 2008 Commission calendar and directed staff to return in August with more information on conflicts and costs related to off-site meetings.

New Business

Chair Pearson noted that the Quarterly Agenda is presented for information.

Chair Pearson asked whether there were any public comments. There were no public comments.

Adjournment

There being no further business Chair Pearson adjourned the meeting.

APPENDIX

June 2007

CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent Calendar

Division of Professional Practices

For your approval, the following items have been placed on the Consent Calendar for the June 27-28, 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. **ANTOS, Barbara J.** San Diego, 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.
2. **AVILA, Zoilo A.** Marina, 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.
3. **BALDUC, Chris M.** Port Hueneme, 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.
4. **BENTLEY, Kathleen A.** Carlsbad, 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.
5. **BISKIE, Kenneth J.** Chula Vista, 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.
6. **CAROZZA, Jarrod A.** Lafayette, CA
All pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
7. **CASE, Audrey N.** South Lake Tahoe, 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.

8. **CHAN, Nadia** Montgomery Park, 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. **CHANEY, Timothy E.** Visalia, CA
Mr. Chaney is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
10. **CHEVES, Susanne J.** San Luis Obispo, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of one hundred eighty (180) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
11. **CHRISTENSON, Tanya S.** Antioch, 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.
12. **CUEVAS, Delia** Los Angeles, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **revoked** and any pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
13. **FIEN, Nicole E.** Kerman, 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, effective immediately.
14. **FLORES-CARDENAS, Fernando** San Francisco, 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, effective immediately.
15. **GALLEGLY, Lori A.** Buena Park, 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.
16. **GARCIA, Jorge V.** Pomona, 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.
17. **GARZA, Mariah B.** Visalia, 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.

18. **HAMILTON, Debra M.** Bakersfield, CA
All pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
19. **HAUNSCHILD, Raquel B.** San Diego, CA
Ms. Haunschild is the subject of **public reproval** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
20. **HEATON, William B.** Whittier, 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. **HENDERSHOTT, Francis J.** San Jose, CA
Mr. Hendershott is the subject of **public reproval** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
22. **HERRERA, Joe** Garden Grove, 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, effective immediately.
23. **HILAS, Stephen E.** San Francisco, CA
Mr. Hilas is the subject of **public reproval** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
24. **HUDDLESTON, Brady E.** 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.
25. **IP, Timothy J.** Belmont, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of sixty (60) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44420.
26. **JEFFRIES, Raymond V.** Fairfield, 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.
27. **JONES, Manvella R.** Lawndale, CA
All pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
28. **JONES, Michael R.** Oakland, 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.

29. **KAMPER, Lowell F, Jr.** Campo, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of thirty (30) days** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, effective immediately.
30. **KOOP, Patrick D.** 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.
31. **MANSON, Joanne** Albany, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **revoked** and any pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
32. **McCORMICK, Christine M.** Huntington Beach, CA
Ms. McCormick is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
33. **MOATS, Edward I.** Santa Maria, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **revoked** and any pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
34. **MONTGOMERY, Robert C.** Yucca Valley, 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. **MOORE, Thomas** Davis, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of one hundred eighty (180) days** and any pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
36. **MURRAY, Kirk T.** El Cajon, CA
Mr. Murray is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
37. **NEILSON, Christine A.** South 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.
38. **NOBLE, Cynthia M.** Fairfield, 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.

39. **PERETTO, Karen B.** Visalia, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **suspended for a period of sixty (60) days** and any pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
40. **PEREZ, Abraham M. Jr.** La Quinta, CA
Mr. Perez is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
41. **PINHEIRO, Frank B.** 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.
42. **RAYA, Carmen** Yuba City, 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.
43. **ROBINSON, Selwyn H.** 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.
44. **ROGERS, Margaret A.** 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.
45. **ROGERS, Sandra A.** Mobile, AL
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.
46. **SAPPENFIELD, Mynette C.** Redding, 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.
47. **SCOTT, Linda F.** 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.
48. **SERRANO, Kristopher R.** Cypress, CA
All pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.

49. **SILBERSTEIN, Diane M.** Los Angeles, CA
Ms. Silberstein is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
50. **STEVENSON, Michael C.** Anaheim, CA
All pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44345.
51. **STOCK, Ashlee B.** Oceanside, CA
Ms. Stock is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
52. **TAVASOLIAN, Laurie C.** Moorpark, 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, effective immediately.
53. **UPHAUS, Elizabeth** Evanston, IL
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **revoked** and any pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
54. **WADHWANI, Neelam** Sacramento, CA
Ms. Wadhvani is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44420.
55. **WALSH, Daniel P.** San Jose, CA
All certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **revoked** and any pending applications are **denied** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345.
56. **WEBB, Gregory V.** Murrieta, 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.
57. **WHEATON, Nancy A.** La Quinta, 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.
58. **WHIPPLE, Mark W.** Fresno, CA
Mr. Whipple is the subject of **public reproof** for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421.
59. **YBARRA-BAKER, Stella** Squaw Valley, 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.

CONSENT DETERMINATIONS

60. **ARREDONDO, Omar** Huntington, 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.
61. **BARLETTO, Philip** Chico, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are **suspended for a period of forty-five (45) days**, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
62. **ELENES, Rigoberto** Paso Robles, CA
The 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 he is placed on **probation for a period of three (3) years**, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
63. **ERVIN, James R.** Madera, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are **suspended for a period of forty-five (45) days**, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
64. **FULLER, George S.** West Covina, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are **suspended for a period of seventy (70) days**, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
65. **HARMON, Gary J.** Victorville, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are **suspended for a period of forty-five (45) days**, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
66. **HENNINGER, Martha J.** Fair Oaks, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are **revoked**; however, **the revocation is stayed**, and she is placed on **probation for a period of two (2) years**, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
67. **KEENER, Shelley L.** Chico, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that all certification documents are **suspended for a period of ninety (90) days**; however, **eighty (80) days are stayed**, she will serve a **ten (10) day suspension**, and she is placed on **probation for a period of three (3) years**, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
68. **KUJAWSKY, Paul** Studio City, 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.

69. **LATTKA, Marjorie O.** Susanville, 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.
70. **LEE, Karen G.** Bethel Island, 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.
71. **MADDOX, Karen D.** Los Angeles, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which allows Ms. Maddox to **withdraw** her application, and stipulates that any submission of an application prior to the date the felony conviction is reduced pursuant to California Penal Code section 17(b) and/or dismissed pursuant to California Penal Code section 1203.4 will result in the immediate denial of the application, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
72. **METCALFE, Robert D.** Inglewood, 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.
73. **NENORTAS, Viktor E.** Yuba City, CA
The Attorney General's Proposed Consent Determination, which stipulates that Mr. Nenortas is the subject of **public reproof for a period of two (2) years**, and at the end of the two-year period, the public reproof will be deemed null and void, for misconduct pursuant to Education Code section 44421, is adopted.
74. **WEBER, Justin M.** Santa Barbara, CA
The Proposed Consent Determination, which allows Mr. Weber to **withdraw** his application is adopted. It also stipulates that any submission of an application prior to him obtaining dismissal pursuant to California Penal Code section 1203.4 , shall result in the immediate denial of the application.

RECONSIDERATION CONSENT
(Deny--no new information)

75. **KACHAENCHAI, Thomas F.** Rancho Cucamonga, CA
At its April 25-26, 2007 meeting, the Commission denied Mr. Kachaenchai's Petition for Reinstatement of his previously revoked certification documents. Mr. Kachaenchai submitted a letter received on May 24, 2007, requesting reconsideration. No new information was provided.
76. **AZARBAYDJANI, Farhod** Upland, CA
At its April 25-26, 2007 meeting, the Commission adopted the Committee of Credentials' recommendation to revoke all credentials, life diplomas or other certification documents under the jurisdiction of the Commission and deny any pending applications. Mr. Azarbaydjani submitted a letter received on May 24, 2007, requesting reconsideration. No new information was provided.

PRIVATE ADMONITIONS

Pursuant to Education Code section 44438, the Committee of Credentials recommends four (4) private admonitions for the Commission's approval.

DECISION AND ORDER

77. **BAKHDOUD, Sahar J.** Fresno, CA
In accordance with the default provisions of Government Code section 11520, all certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **revoked**.
78. **Item pulled**

REINSTATEMENT OF SELF REVOKED CREDENTIAL

79. **ALBARRAN, Maggie** Hayward, CA
Pursuant to Government code section 11522, Ms. Albarran's application for reinstatement of her Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language & Academic Development emphasis Spanish on her Multiple Subject Teaching Credential is granted after she previously self-revoked the authorization pursuant to Education Code section 44423, with no known misconduct.
80. **COURTNEY, Cheryl A.**
Pursuant to Government code section 11522, Ms. Courtney's applications for reinstatement of her Specialist Instruction Credential in Special Education and Resource Specialist Certificate of Competence are granted after she previously self-revoked the credentials pursuant to Education Code section 44423, with no known misconduct.

RESCISSION

81. **DEVON, Heather H.** Huntington Beach, CA
The Commission's action reported on the September/October 2004, FY 04-05 (#2) All Points Bulletin to **revoke** all certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and **deny** any pending applications, is hereby rescinded.

REQUESTS FOR REVOCATION

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

82. **AKZIN, Hilary H.** Irvine, CA
Upon her written request, pursuant to Education Code section 44423, her authorizations of math on her Professional Clear Single Subject and Multiple Subject Teaching Credentials are **revoked**.

83. **CARDELLO, James A.** Alta Dena, CA
Upon his written request, pursuant to Education Code sections 44423, all certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **revoked** and any pending applications are **withdrawn**.
84. **FORD, Annette M.** Auburn, CA
Upon her written request, pursuant to Education Code section 44423, her Clear Resource Specialist Certificate of Competence and Life Specialist Instruction Credential in Special Education are **revoked**.
85. **HARLEY, Jason S.** Los Angeles, CA
Upon his written request, pursuant to Education Code sections 44423, all certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are **revoked**.
86. **PETERS, Michael L.** Applegate, 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. He also agrees that any application or petition for reinstatement he submits to the Commission will be rejected without further processing.
87. **VANN, Donna J.** Sacramento, CA
Upon her written request, pursuant to Education Code section 44423, her Clear Resource Specialist Certificate of Competence and Life Specialist Instruction Credential in Special Education are **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.

88. **ANDERSEN, Eric P.** Stockton, CA
89. **AUSTGEN, Susan R.** Lakeside, CA
90. **BABST, Walter E.** Corona, CA
91. **BIEVENUE, Eugene P.** Hemet, CA
92. **CALIP, Celena M.** El Centro, CA
93. **CARLSON, Kathleen M.** Ukiah, CA
94. **DEITZ, James L.** Lancaster, CA

- | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| 95. DEVERA, Shirley N. | Huntington Beach, CA |
| 96. GOLEMAN, Jody L. | Lemoore, CA |
| 97. ORTIZ, Efrain I. | Gilroy, CA |
| 98. SCOTT, Jae | Playa Del Rey, CA |
| 99. SEYMOUR, James S., II | Cloverdale, CA |
| 100. SMERDON, Michael J. | San Diego, CA |
| 101. SILVA, Paul T. | San Leandro, CA |
| 102. WILSON, Hugh S. | Fullerton, 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).

- | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|
| 103. BARNES, Andrew J. | Chino, CA |
| 104. CARDOZA, Julio A. | Pasadena, CA |
| 105. CORDERO, Oscar | Baldwin Park, CA |
| 106. DE LUCA, James A. | Torrance, CA |
| 107. EATON, Pamela L. | Elk Grove, CA |
| 108. GOMEZ, Antonio | Downey, CA |
| 109. HARBERTS, William W. | Garden Grove, CA |
| 110. HAWTHORNE, John W. | Soquel, CA |
| 111. LEE, John K. | San Diego, CA |
| 112. LIPARI, Tom A. | Corona, CA |
| 113. MARTINEZ, Juan M. | Avenal, CA |
| 114. PINE, Joseph S. | Redlands, CA |
| 115. ROSSI, Michelle A. | Aliso Viejo, CA |

116. **SPAICH, Kelly C.**

Lincoln, CA

INDEFINITE SUSPENSION

117. **NAAS, Charleen E.**

Chino, CA

Pursuant to Ms. Naas's violation of the terms of the Consent Determination and Order that became effective December 8, 2006, all certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing shall remain **suspended** until final disposition has been made by the Commission.

118. **WINFIELD, Nicole N.**

Encinatas, CA

Pursuant to Ms. Winfield's violation of the terms of the Consent Determination and Order that became effective April 12, 2006, all certification documents under the jurisdiction of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing shall remain **suspended** until final disposition has been made by the Commission.

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.

119. **CEPICAN, Matthew J.**

San Bernardino, CA

120. **MACKEY, Eugene A.**

Compton, CA

121. **McKINLEY, James W.**

Apple Valley, CA

122. **RODRIGUEZ, Elsie C.**

San Clemente, CA

TERMINATION OF PROBATION

123. **BERRY, Teresa**

Upland, 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 9, 2003, **the stay order has been made permanent and her credentials are restored.**

124. **BRAVO, Joshua**

Fresno, 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 March 10, 2005, **the stay order has been made permanent and his credential is restored.**

125. **GIUDICE, Patricia**

Pacific Grove, 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 May 6, 2004, **the stay order has been made permanent and her credentials are restored.**

126. **MOSS, Whitney**

King City, CA

Having violated the conditions of probation set forth in the Consent Determination and Order adopted by the Commission on February 5, 2004, her **probation is terminated, the stay is lifted, and her credential is revoked.**

127. **SALICHS, Deborah**

Huntington Beach, 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 April 14, 2005, **the stay order has been made permanent and her credential is restored.**

CERTIFICATION, ASSIGNMENT AND WAIVERS DIVISION

VALIDATION OF SERVICE RENDERED WITHOUT A CREDENTIAL

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
Betty Credit	Paradise Unified School District	Butte	01.02.07-01.04.07
Betty Ponting	Lassen County Office of Education	Lassen	04.01.07.-04.23.07
Brian Craig Snow	Rim of the World Unified	San Bernardino	01.01.07-03.26.07
Bruce A. Rubio	Rim of the World Unified	San Bernardino	03.01.07-03.13.07
Bruce Rubio	Rim of the World Unified	San Bernardino	03.01.07-03.13.07
Diane Marie Eastman	Visalia Unified School District	Tulare	03.01.07-03.03.07
Frederick Simes	Fresno Unified School District	Fresno	01.01.07-02.27.07
James S. Williamson	Redding School District	Shasta	03.01.07-03.08.07
Jean Marie Campbell	Victor Elementary	San Bernardino	04.01.07-04.10.07
John Christie	Paradise Unified School District	Butte	01.01.07-01.04.07
Julie M. Berg	Lake Elsinore Unified School District	Riverside	01.01.07-01.08.07
Katayoun Kathy Khalehpari	Culver City Unified School District	Los Angeles	01.01.07-01.09.07
Katherine Barg	San Carlos School District	San Mateo	02.01.07-03.05.07
Kathyleen R. Thayer	Chico Unified School District	Butte	01.08.07-01.23.07
Kennie Ott	Chaffey Joint Union High School District	San Bernardino	04.01.07-04.25.07
Kevin Dempsey	Chaffey Joint Union High School District	San Bernardino	03.01.07-03.06.07
Kristy L. Harne	Lake Elsinore Unified School District	Riverside	01.01.07-01.08.07
Leslie Fredrick	Fresno Unified School District	Fresno	10.01.06-04.02.07
Lon Hannah	Visalia Unified School District	Tulare	01.01.07-01.20.07
Lynn M. Klopfer	Rim of the World Unified	San Bernardino	03.01.07-03.21.07

Lynn M. Klopfer	Rim of the World Unified	San Bernardino	03.01.07-03.21.07
Mary Wingett	Fresno Unified School District	Fresno	01.01.07-03.06.07
Melanie Y. Ruiz	Fontana Unified School District	San Bernardino	03.01.07-03.13.07
*Michael Valine	Fresno Unified School District	Fresno	03.01.07-04.10.07
*Michael Valine	Fresno Unified School District	Fresno	03.01.07-04.10.07
Nancy M. DeFelice	Culver City Unified School District	Los Angeles	01.01.07-01.08.07
Noriko Nagumo	Culver City Unified School District	Los Angeles	01.01.07-01.16.07
Priscilla Aganon	New Haven Unified	Alameda	12.01.06-02.13.07
Rebecca J. Baker	Cottonwood School District	Shasta	02.01.07-02.27.07
Sandra Guzman	Fresno Unified School District	Fresno	04.01.07-04.19.07
Sharon P. Dixon	Hayward Unified School District	Alameda	12.02.06-02.22.07
Suzanne Gradjeda	Oxnard School District	Ventura	01.01.07-01.12.07
Veronica Pena	Tulare Joint Union High School	Tulare	03.02.07-03.05.07
Yvonne Ruane Cardinale	Chino Valley Unified	San Bernardino	04.01.07-04.10.07

***Two Credentials: Single and Education Specialist Teaching Credentials**