

**GCEC Regular Meeting
Thursday, September 22, 2016
5:30 p.m., UOG SOE Building**

I. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

GCEC Chair Hendricks called the meeting to order at **5:31 p.m.**, on Thursday, Sept. 22, 2016 at the UOG - SOE, Room 108A, Mangilao.

Commission Members: All Present

Others Present: Katherina Perez (GDOE), Dan Del Priore (Guam Federation of Teachers) and Karl Quitano.

AGENDA AMENDMENTS

Hendricks amended the agenda to allow the guests to speak first and added Future Meeting Time and Day. M Santos added Time Limits for guests.

Motion by M Santos and seconded by Ichihara-Rosario to approve the amended agenda. APPROVED.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Karl Quitano

Quitano relayed how he wanted to apply for an Administrator position at GDOE and needed a valid Initial Admin. Educator Certificate. He stated that he patiently waited but was never called for an interview. Hendricks asked how long was his certificate expired. Quitano admitted that he was “irresponsible” because he failed to make a copy of his certificate when he submitted it to GDOE. He said he did not know his certificate was expired. He declared that he was previously granted one extension already. M Santos asked what he did from Jan 15, 2014 when he signed out for his extension to Aug 18, 2016 (18 months after) when he applied for a new extension. He repeated that he did not make a copy of the extension certificate that he submitted to GDOE. Camacho explained that the commission gave him 4 copies – an original, a colored copy and two (2) black and white copies. Quitano stated that submitted all 4 copies to GDOE. Ichihara-Rosario discussed how the GCEC website had all the information online relating to his certificates, including expiration dates. Quitano again relayed that GDOE never called him and so he was not interviewed. L Santos discussed how GCEC granted extensions to applicants who brought a GDOE document confirming that were interviewed and not hired. Ichihara-Rosario asked Quitano how many days after the expiration date did he apply. His reply was to discuss his medical conditions, then stated that “...he was disabled and his brain was functioning”.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

B. a. GFT

As requested Del Priore submitted copies of PL 33-55 and the CSC Resolution on Adverse Action Appeal Time Standards. He restated GFT’s request. He informed the commission that Fred Horecky was hired as the CSC Administrative Law Judge. Baza-Cruz explained that the commission members had just received the documents and did not have enough time to make a thorough review for a recommendation. As requested by Hendricks, Del Priore will send the language of the amendment to the Executive Director. GFT does not want their members to be faced with several simultaneous investigations and proceedings. He added that GCEC may avail of the information and documents that GDOE and CSC produces. Hendricks is concerned with Del Priore’s statement that they had other amendments. She is worried that making changes to the law might open the doors for

pedophiles to continue working at the schools. He stated that they have been working with Speaker Won Pat and Sen. Underwood's office for other amendments, including judicial review of commission decisions. He added that they are not working to overturn the law. M Santos discussed the DOC case in relation to administrative slip-ups. The commission is concerned with the ethics of faculty, teachers and administrators and that they "... *have a responsibility to our children and not to violate our children's rights.*" If the administrator fails to follow the appropriate procedure or the 60 day rule, the teacher may return to the classroom because the commission could not do anything to the certificate. Ichihara-Rosario added that "... *while others are worried about protecting adults, we are worried about protecting our students.*" GFT stated that "... *while you want to protect the rights of the students, which we all do, nevertheless you do not want to sacrifice the rights of individuals to accomplish that end. The end does not justify the means.*" He emphasized that the 60 day rule is the law. He apologized for not sending the materials earlier.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

M Santos discussed the level of details in the minutes and L Santos will make the appropriate changes.

Motion by M Santos and seconded by Ichihara- Rosario to approve the minutes. APPROVED.

III. REPORTS

A. TREASURER'S REPORT

Ichihara-Rosario reported that the FY16 budget was \$281,822. Total Expenditures and Encumbrances as of Sept. 16, 2016 was \$204,533.65 and the balance was \$77,288.35

FY16 rollover appropriated funds is \$92,636.58. Total FY 2016 Expenditures is \$8,641.98 and a balance of \$7,709.00

Motion by Baza-Cruz and seconded by Cooper-Nurse to approve the Treasurer's Report. APPROVED.

B. CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

A discussion was held on the Chair's draft response to Kin Fernandez.

C. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- Sept. 6 meeting with Sen. Underwood
- Sept. 16 Appeals Committee meeting
- Sept. 18 Educator Misconduct meeting. Letter was sent informing the Acting Superintendent on the Educator Misconduct complaint decision.
- FY17 budget law contained
 - GCEC budget amounting to \$281,822 and is the same as FY16
 - Sec. 25, Chapter 12 Miscellaneous Provisions – Legal Services for GCEC – The GEB "*may enter into a MOU with GCEC ...to provide for legal and investigatory services...*" Hendricks relayed of a possible conflict of interest between GCEC and GDOE. "*What would happen legally? Since GEB hired the lawyer, then we would have to find another legal representative... Number 2. Is there anything in the law that says we would be included in the selection process?*" L Santos replied no. Hendricks said that "...*we would have to take whoever they hired.*"

L Santos stated that originally the section read that "GEB **shall** enter into an MOU with GCEC" but was changed to "**may**" during session so GEB has the option to refuse. Hendricks questioned why GDOE would be paying. L Santos was informed that there was no funding included in the budget bill for the GCEC legal services and because the

GEB lawyer was paid by GDOE. Hendricks wants GCEC to be independent from GDOE. She does not want to give GDOE the ability to dictate to GCEC because they will be paying for the legal services. L Santos will speak with the Speaker regarding Hendricks' concern.

Motion by M Santos and seconded by Baza-Cruz to approve the Executive Directors report. APPROVED.

D. SUB-COMMITTEE
No reports.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Early Childhood certificates
Tabled for next meeting.

C. Middle School Science
M Santos reported that the PRAXIS content test for Middle School Science matches the GDOE content standards. She recommended that the commission adopt the PRAXIS Middle School Science content test (5440).

Motion by M Santos and seconded by Ichihara-Rosario to adopt the PRAXIS II Middle School Science test. APPROVED.

M Santos suggested that the commission examine the cut score in relation to other states based on her analysis of the Middle School Math scores. L Santos will get the recommended PRAXIS cut score for the test and the passing scores of other jurisdictions.

D. Chamorro Language Certification
PL 30-15 states that for an Initial Educator Chamorro Language certificate, the applicant "...presents evidence of completing a Bachelor's degree and fulfilling the requirements for educational credits." Currently, if the BA degree is not in Education, then the applicant needs to complete an educator prep program with a specialty in Chamorro and pass the GDOE Chamorro proficiency test. If the BA degree is in Education, then they need 24 credits in Chamorro and the GDOE test. The law does not specify the Chamorro classes that must be taken. Camacho explained that she uses an old DOE list of Chamorro classes and will email it to the members. Camacho stated that she recommends the 385 classes because Ruth Mendiola mentioned that many need that class.

E. PRAXIS II Special Education
L Santos asked if the commission was going to delete the PRAXIS II Special Education PreK-12 Core Knowledge and Applications test (5354). This will impact those educators who want to take the test for an endorsement. M Santos wants to keep the test but the commission must determine what it will be used for. She explained that SPED majors take the Elementary Ed to show content knowledge. "The law requires them to take the PLT K-6 for Elementary. Where does the SPED test come in? Are you then just going to look at course work or will someone challenge the test?" M Santos asked if SPED majors will be required to take 3 tests. Hendricks stated that this involves a change in the law. M Santos added this situation also exists with Early Childhood. Hendricks added that over the years, she has seen many general education teachers who do not know how to deal with special needs students. Hendricks mentioned that in the future, SPED will be a graduate degree. The issue is if the degree is in SPED, how do you back up the degree with the appropriate test. Baza-Cruz stated that she has no problem with requiring them to take 3 tests. Hendricks has observed that over the years, SPED teachers take a break from teaching special education by returning to the regular classroom. If

they take the Elementary content test, “*how will you certify them for secondary?*” M Santos replied that if they will be certified in secondary, they should major in their content and take 15 credits for endorsement. Camacho has observed that most of her SPED endorsements have 24 credits and they are not in the MA program. Many are Elementary majors who take extra credits but don’t major in SPED. The certificates in SPED are for PreK-12. Hendricks stated that student teaching is split between the Elementary and Secondary level. Camacho added that the educator can choose which PLT test to take. Hendricks discussed that under the new law, you are supposed to major in a content area and then add SPED so you are certified in both areas. Hendricks suggested to schedule a work session with Dr. McManus.

V. NEW BUSINESS

B. Time Limit

M Santos discussed that there should be a time limit for guests. Hendricks provided different options. Cooper-Nurse suggested that like the GEB, they should be given 5 minutes to present with no questions. L Santos recommended that she will inform those requesting to speak at the commission meetings of the 5 minute limit for presentations. If the commission members want to ask questions, then the time is extended. The presenters must also submit their documents a week before the meeting. M Santos asked that the 5 minute limit be placed on the sign-in sheet.

Motion by Baza-Cruz and seconded by Ichihara-Rosario for a 5 minute limit on presentations and documents must be submitted a week in advance. If they wish, the Commission members have an opportunity to ask questions outside of the 5 minute limit. APPROVED.

C. Meeting time and day

Motion by Ichihara-Rosario and seconded by M Santos for meetings to be on the 3rd Thursdays at 4:15 pm. APPROVED.

VI Ex-Officio

VII Announcements

IX Adjournment

Motion by Baza-Cruz and seconded by M Santos to adjourn. APPROVED.

Adjourned at 7:15 p.m.

Next meeting scheduled for Thursday, Oct. 13, 2016, 4:30 pm