

**BEFORE THE  
COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**In the Matter of the First Amended Accusation Against:**

**NORMAN CHADWICK PRAGGASTIS, Respondent**

**Agency Case No. 2-407218995**

**OAH No. 2023080823**

**PROPOSED DECISION**

Matthew S. Block, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), State of California, heard this matter on March 18 and 19, 2024, in Sacramento, California.

Katelyn E. Docherty, Deputy Attorney General, represented Mary Vixie Sandy (complainant), Executive Director of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission).

Matthew Chevedden, Attorney at Langenkamp, Curtis, Price, Lindstrom & Chevedden, represented Norman Chadwick Praggastis (respondent) who was present.

Evidence was received, the record closed, and the matter submitted for decision on March 19, 2024.

## **FACTUAL FINDINGS**

### **Jurisdictional Matters**

1. On September 25, 2017, the Commission issued respondent Education Specialist Instruction Credential No. 220204642 and Single Subject Teaching Credential No. 220205480 (credentials). The credentials will expire on October 1, 2027, unless renewed or revoked.

2. Respondent previously held the following Commission-issued certificate documents: (1) a Preliminary Education Specialist Instruction Credential, which was issued on May 27, 2014, and expired on June 1, 2019; (2) a Preliminary Single Subject Teach Credential, which was issued on May 22, 2010, and expired on June 1, 2015; (3) an Intern Education Specialist Instruction Credential, which was issued on October 1, 2012, and expired on November 1, 2014; (4) a Certificate of Clearance, which was issued on January 14, 2005, and expired on February 1, 2010; and (5) an Emergency 30-Day Substitute Teaching Permit, which was issued on February 10, 2005, and expired on March 1, 2007.

3. On February 6, 2024, the Commission's former Deputy Director signed and thereafter filed the First Amended Accusation in her official capacity. The First Amended Accusation alleges cause to discipline respondent's credentials based on his conduct towards a special needs student in his class during the 2021/2022 school year. Complainant alleges that the conduct constitutes: (1) unprofessional conduct; (2) evident unfitness for service; (3) immoral conduct; and (4) acts of moral turpitude.

4. The First Amended Accusation also alleges that in October 2022, the Commission issued a public reproof against respondent's credentials after a probable

cause finding that respondent frequently discussed inappropriate personal matters with female students while teaching at the Wheatland Union High School District. Finally, as factors in aggravation, the First Amended Accusation alleges that: (1) respondent has a prior disciplinary record with the Commission; (2) respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, or other violation of the law governing educators; and (3) respondent's misconduct significantly harmed a child trusted to his care, the public, or the educational system.

5. Respondent timely filed a Notice of Defense to the First Amended Accusation. The matter was set for evidentiary hearing before an ALJ of the OAH, an independent adjudicative agency of the State of California, pursuant to Government Code section 11500 et seq.

### **Respondent's Conduct During the 2021/2022 School Year**

6. During the 2021/2022 school year, respondent was employed by the Yuba County Office of Education (YCOE) as a moderate-to-severe special education teacher at Anna Bell Karr School (ABKS) in Marysville, California. Approximately halfway through the year, another moderate-to-severe special education teacher left ABKS. The teacher's class was subsequently combined with respondent's class, with respondent assuming responsibility for both.

7. On March 10, 2022, YCOE notified respondent of his non-reelection as a teacher for the 2022/2023 school year. In lieu of non-reelection, respondent submitted a letter of resignation on March 11, 2022, but continued working at ABKS to finish the school year.

## **INCIDENT INVOLVING STUDENT 1**

8. Student 1 was a student enrolled in respondent's class during the 2021/2022 school year. She was either 10 or 11 years old at the time. Student 1 has Down Syndrome. She has difficulty expressing herself, and primarily communicates using short, one-to-two-word phrases. Student 1 was also known to have behavioral problems, though she did not have a reputation for behaving violently.

9. Stacia Isaacson-Sines has worked as a paraeducator at ABKS for two and a half years. Reo Avila worked as a moderate-to-severe special education instructor at ABKS from April through July 2022. She now resides and works in Los Angeles. Ms. Isaacson-Sines and Mr. Avila frequently worked in respondent's classroom at ABKS during the 2021/2022 school year.

10. Ms. Isaacson-Sines and Ms. Avila enjoyed working together. Ms. Avila also enjoyed a good working relationship with respondent. However, Ms. Isaacson-Sines acknowledged her relationship with respondent was "not great." She felt he belittled her as a professional and was verbally rude to students. Despite that, she admitted he was very involved with his students, and she appreciated that he would often incorporate music in the classroom when teaching.

11. Ms. Isaacson-Sines and Ms. Avila both testified at hearing. On May 17, 2022, they were working in respondent's classroom at the same time. As respondent walked past Student 1, who was seated in a chair, they both observed Student 1 kick respondent on his knee. After she did, respondent grabbed Student 1 by the back of the neck, pulled her head backward so that she was looking at him in the face, and shook her. According to Ms. Isaacson-Sines, who was approximately six feet away when the incident occurred, Student 1 appeared "terrified," started crying, and

repeatedly apologized to respondent for what she had done. Ms. Avila explained in her testimony that she was “shocked and dismayed” by what she witnessed. She and Ms. Isaacson-Sines felt that respondent’s physical behavior toward Student 1 was so disturbing that they needed to report the incident to ABKS Principal Joshua Brock.

12. Mr. Brock testified at hearing. He served as YCOE’s Principal of Special Education Programs from 2015 through 2023. He presently serves as the Special Education Director of the Amador County Office of Education. He has a master’s degree in special education. He is also a certified Crisis Prevention Intervention (CPI) trainer with the Crisis Prevention Institute.

13. Mr. Brock described CPI as a non-violent method of de-escalating volatile situations to avoid harm to students and faculty. It emphasizes the use of empathy and verbal intervention as opposed to force. CPI training does include instruction on using physical methods of restraint, but they are only to be used in situations where a student is in danger of imminent harm, and none of them involve grabbing a student by the neck or head.

14. Mr. Brock met separately with Ms. Isaacson-Sines and Ms. Avila after they reported the incident between respondent and Student 1. He described them both as “upset” about what they observed. After speaking with them, Mr. Brock notified law enforcement, Child Protective Services (CPS), Student 1’s parents, the YCOE Assistant Superintendent, and the YCOE Human Resources Department about the incident. He also decided to place respondent on paid administrative leave for the remainder of the 2021/2022 school year.

15. Mr. Brock acknowledged at hearing that respondent is an innovative and knowledgeable teacher, and a talented musician and artist. He agreed to write a letter

of recommendation for respondent following his non-reelection. At the time he wrote the letter, he was not aware that respondent was under investigation for events that occurred while respondent was employed at Wheatland High School. Had he been aware of the investigation, he would not have written the letter, particularly considering the incident with Child 1 which occurred one week later.

16. Parent 1 is Student 1's mother and testified at hearing. She used to send Student 1 to school with a composition book in her backpack for respondent to write notes in regarding Student 1's daily behavior. According to Parent 1, respondent constantly wrote negative comments, which led Parent 1 to begin to question her parenting of Student 1. When Student 1 returned home from school on May 17, 2022, she told Parent 1 that respondent grabbed her arm and neck in class that day. According to Parent 1, Student 1 did not have any visible physical injuries on her body, but she was deeply affected by the incident emotionally. Parent 1 kept Student 1 home from school for several days after the incident, because she did not want to return to school until she realized respondent would no longer be present.

## **PROSECUTION AND DIVERSION**

17. Respondent was criminally charged for the incident with Student 1 in Yuba County Superior Court Case No. CRM22-02767. However, in November 2023, he entered into a two-year pretrial diversion agreement (agreement). Pursuant to the agreement, respondent is to have no contact with Student 1, participate in a 12-hour anger management program, complete 20 hours of community service, and complete a CPI course for teachers. If respondent successfully complies with the terms of the agreement, the criminal case against him will be dismissed at the end of the two-year period.

## **PRIOR CREDENTIAL DISCIPLINE**

18. At its October 2022 meeting, the Commission issued a public reproof against respondent's credentials. The public reproof was based on a finding that respondent frequently discussed inappropriate personal matters and communicated with his female students via text message as late as 11:00 p.m. when he worked at Wheatland High School.

## **Respondent's Evidence**

### **RESPONDENT'S TESTIMONY**

19. Respondent testified at hearing. He has worked in education for approximately 30 years. He describes his youth as "misspent" and enjoys helping children and building lifelong bonds with his students. He presently works as a special education teacher at Woodland High but does not particularly enjoy it. Ideally, respondent would like to teach general education at another school.

20. Respondent first met Mr. Brock when they worked together at Wheatland High School, and Mr. Brock suggested respondent apply at ABKS. Respondent eventually accepted a job offer at ABKS but told Mr. Brock he was only willing to work in the assignment for one year. Another teacher left ABKS after the school year started, and the teacher's students were reassigned to respondent, which doubled the size of his class. Respondent believes Mr. Brock untruthfully testified he was unaware of the Commission investigation into respondent's behavior at Wheatland High School when he wrote the letter of recommendation for him after his non-reelection.

21. Ms. Avila was assigned to shadow respondent in his classroom. They got along well, and respondent enjoyed working with her. Ms. Isaacson-Sines began

working in respondent's classroom in the middle of the 2021/2022 school year. Respondent tried to get along with her, but she quickly overstepped her bounds in his classroom and tried to tell him how to do his job. He believes Ms. Isaacson-Sines has a lot of "disdain" for him and angrily accused her of lying about the incident with Student 1.

22. According to respondent, Student 1 was very "stout" and possessed the "strength of an adult man." She was verbal but could usually only communicate with "garbled language." On May 17, 2022, she was having an episode and refusing to enter the classroom. Ms. Isaacson-Sines and another paraeducator forcefully picked her up and carried her into the room horizontally. Respondent walked over to Student 1 and placed his hand on her shoulder to comfort her. He denies shaking her. However, he recalls that she was shaking because she had just been "manhandled" by Ms. Isaacson Sines and the other paraeducator. After Student 1 kicked his knee, respondent leaned down and told her that kicking was not appropriate, and then walked over to his desk.

23. Approximately 30 minutes after the incident with Student 1, Mr. Brock came to respondent's classroom and told him he was aware of what had occurred. Respondent asked Mr. Brock if he was interested in respondent's perspective on the incident, and Mr. Brock told him, "No. Go home." Respondent was placed on administrative leave and only allowed to return to ABKS to gather his belongings from his classroom.

24. Respondent has taught students with numerous developmental disabilities over the course of his career. He has been physically attacked and spit on in the past, but he has never lost his temper with a student. He does not believe he has an anger problem and only agreed to attend anger management counseling so he



could participate in pretrial diversion for his Yuba County criminal case, because he cannot afford to hire an attorney to contest the case.

## **LETTERS OF SUPPORT**

25. Respondent submitted three letters of support. The first, which is undated, was written by Diana Lichtenberger. Ms. Lichtenberger wrote that respondent is a teacher who is “willing to take on new challenges to impart instruction and create an excellent classroom environment.” The second letter, which is also undated, was written by Annette Tiff, who is one of respondent’s colleagues at Woodland High School. She finds respondent to be a dedicated educator who has great concern for his students and their families. The third letter, which is dated January 24, 2024, was written by Becky Flores, who is also one of respondent’s colleagues at Woodland High School. She described respondent as a talented and empathetic teacher. Notably, respondent admitted at hearing that neither Ms. Tiff nor Ms. Flores are aware of the pending disciplinary proceedings against him, or that their letters would be used as evidence at hearing.

## **Analysis**

26. Complainant seeks to discipline respondent’s credentials based on the incident with Student 1 on May 17, 2022. Complainant alleges that respondent’s behavior on that date constituted: (1) unprofessional conduct; (2) evident unfitness for service; (3) immoral conduct; and (4) acts of moral turpitude.

27. Ms. Isaacson-Sines and Ms. Avila both testified that respondent forcefully grabbed Student 1 by the neck and shook her after she kicked respondent in his knee. Respondent admits placing his hand on Student 1’s shoulder and telling her that kicking was inappropriate but denies forcibly grabbing her neck or shaking her. Rather,

respondent contends Student 1 was shaking from the agitation of being carried into the classroom by Ms. Isaacson-Sines and another paraeducator.

28. Evidence Code section 780 sets forth various factors to consider when determining the credibility of a witness. Relevant factors include: (1) the witness's demeanor while testifying; (2) the character of the witness's testimony; (3) the witness's capacity to perceive and recollect; (4) the existence or nonexistence of bias; (5) prior statements of the witness that are consistent or inconsistent with their testimony at hearing; the existence or nonexistence of a fact testified to by the witness; and (7) the witness's attitude toward the action in which he or she testifies. For the following reasons, Ms. Isaacson-Sines' and Ms. Avila's testimony was more credible than that of respondent.

29. First, Ms. Isaacson-Sines and Ms. Avila have no apparent motive to fabricate or embellish their respective accounts of the incident. Ms. Avila resides in Los Angeles and no longer works in education. She and respondent each testified they enjoyed a very positive working relationship at ABKS. As such, it is unlikely Ms. Avila would testify untruthfully to harm respondent professionally. Ms. Isaacson-Sines admitted her relationship with respondent was "not great." She felt he belittled her in the classroom and spoke rudely to the students. However, she no longer works with respondent, and despite their differences, she was willing to acknowledge several positive traits she appreciated about respondent's teaching.

30. Second, Ms. Avila and Ms. Isaacson-Sines each credibly testified that they were both very disturbed by respondent's behavior, and it was apparent at hearing that the incident still impacts them emotionally. Their testimony was corroborated by Mr. Brock's observations of their demeanor following the incident, when he described

them both as “upset.” It is unlikely that their demeanor at hearing and while discussing the incident with Mr. Brock could have been fabricated if the incident never occurred.

31. Third, while Parent 1 was not present in the classroom when the incident occurred, her testimony regarding Student 1’s reaction to the incident supports the accounts of Ms. Isaacson-Hines and Ms. Avila, and not that of respondent. Parent 1 explained that Student 1 was fearful of returning to school until she realized respondent would not be present, and that she kept Student 1 home from school for several days because she was so upset over the incident.

32. Finally, respondent is presently participating in a two-year criminal pretrial diversion program after being prosecuted for his behavior toward Student 1. He voluntarily agreed to have no contact with Student 1, participate in anger management, and complete a CPI training course. His testimony that he only agreed to acknowledge wrongdoing and participate in the program to avoid the legal expense of contesting the case was unpersuasive.

33. When all the evidence is considered, complainant proved by clear and convincing evidence that on May 17, 2022, respondent forcibly grabbed Student 1 by the back of the head after she kicked him on his knee. The behavior was witnessed by two ABKS employees who were present in the room, and caused Student 1, a middle school student with Down Syndrome, to suffer significant emotional distress.

34. In *Morrison v. State Board of Education* (1969) 1 Cal.3d 214, the California Supreme Court concluded that a teaching credential cannot be disciplined for immoral conduct, unprofessional conduct, or conduct involving moral turpitude “unless that conduct indicates that the [educator] is unfit to teach.” (*Id.* at p. 229.) The Court outlined factors to consider when determining whether an educator’s conduct

demonstrates unfitness to teach, which have been codified in California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 80302, subdivision (a). The factors are:

- (1) the likelihood that the conduct may have adversely affected students or fellow teachers, and the degree of such adversity anticipated;
- (2) the proximity or remoteness in time of the conduct;
- (3) the types of credentials held or sought by the person involved;
- (4) any extenuating or aggravating circumstances surrounding the conduct;
- (5) the praiseworthiness or blameworthiness of the motives resulting in the conduct;
- (6) the likelihood of recurrence of the question conduct;
- (7) the extent to which disciplinary action may have an adverse impact or chilling effect on the constitutional rights of the person involved, or other teachers, and;
- (8) the publicity or notoriety given to the conduct.

#### **LIKELIHOOD OF ADVERSE EFFECTS ON STUDENTS OR OTHER TEACHERS**

35. Respondent's conduct caused Student 1, a special needs student, significant emotional harm. It also troubled his two colleagues who were percipient witnesses to the incident.

## **PROXIMITY OR REMOTENESS IN TIME**

36. The incident occurred less than two years ago. It is more proximate than remote in time.

## **TYPES OF CREDENTIALS HELD OR SOUGHT**

37. Respondent presently holds an Education Specialist Instruction Credential and a Single Subject Teaching Credential.

## **EXTENUATING OR AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES**

38. Neither the Education Code nor the applicable regulations specify what constitutes "extenuating circumstances." However, California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 80300, subdivision (m), defines "mitigating factor" as "an event or circumstance which demonstrates that the public, school children and the profession would be adequately protected by a more lenient degree of adverse action or no adverse action whatsoever." California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 80300, subdivision (b), lists aggravating factors, the presence of which indicate a greater degree of discipline is necessary to protect students and the teaching profession. These factors include, in pertinent part: (1) a prior record of adverse action; (2) that the misconduct significantly harmed a child, the public, or the educational system; and (3) the credential holder demonstrated indifference toward the consequence of the misconduct.

39. Respondent physically accosted a middle school special needs student because she kicked him in his knee. His behavior caused Student 1 to suffer emotional distress, such that she was fearful of returning to school until she realized respondent would not be present. Respondent denies any wrongdoing in the matter. Moreover, he

denies having a problem controlling his temper, and testified that he is only participating in anger management counseling to avoid a criminal conviction.

### **PRAISEWORTHINESS OR BLAMEWORTHINESS OF MOTIVES**

40. There was nothing praiseworthy about respondent's motives. As discussed above, his behavior was motivated by Student 1 kicking him.

### **LIKELIHOOD OF RECURRENCE**

41. Respondent no longer teaches at ABKS. As such, it is unlikely that a similar incident will occur involving Student 1. However, he remains unhappy with his current teaching position, and consequently finds himself in a similar emotional state as he was when he let his emotions get the best of him by reacting as he did to Student 1.

### **CHILLING EFFECT**

42. There is no evidence that discipline would adversely impact or chill respondent or any other teacher in the free exercise of their constitutional rights.

### **PUBLICITY OR NOTORIETY GIVEN TO CONDUCT**

43. No evidence was presented that the conduct at issue was either publicized or notorious.

### **Conclusion**

44. Complainant bears the burden of proving by clear and convincing evidence that respondent engaged in immoral conduct, unprofessional conduct, and conduct involving moral turpitude which indicates he is unfit to teach. When all the

evidence is considered in light of the *Morrison* factors, complainant has met her burden.

## **LEGAL CONCLUSIONS**

### **Burden and Standard of Proof**

1. Complainant bears the burden of proving the allegations in the First Amended Accusation by clear and convincing evidence to a reasonable certainty. (*Gardner v. Commission on Professional Competence* (1985) 164 Cal.App.3d 1035.) Clear and convincing evidence requires proof that is so clear as to leave no substantial doubt and that is sufficiently strong to command the unhesitating assent of every reasonable mind. (*In re Marriage of Brooks* (2008) 169 Cal.App.4th 176, 190.)

### **Applicable Law**

2. Pursuant to the Education Code, commencing with section 44000, and California Code of Regulations, title 5, commencing with section 80000, the Commission is responsible for credentialing teachers in public schools in California, including issuing credentials and taking adverse action against applicants and credential holders.

3. Education Code section 44345 provides in part:

The Commission may deny any application for the issuance of a credential or for the redential of a credential made by an applicant who falls under any of the following categories:

[¶] ... [¶]

(e) Has committed any act involving moral turpitude.

[¶] ... [¶]

Any denial pursuant to subdivisions (a) to (e), inclusive, shall be based upon reasons related to the applicant's fitness to teach or fitness to perform other duties which the credential would authorize the applicant to perform.

4. Moral turpitude has been described as "any crime or misconduct committed without excuse, or 'any dishonest or immoral' act not necessarily a crime." (*Clerici v. Department of Motor Vehicles* (1990) 224 Cal.App.3d 1016, 1017.)

5. Education Code section 44440, subdivision (b), provides:

The suspension or expiration of any credential, its surrender without the written consent of the commission, or a revocation pursuant to Section 44423 does not deprive the commission of its authority to do the following:

- (1) Institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the credential holder upon any ground provided by law.
- (2) Enter an order suspending or revoking the credential.
- (3) Issue a public reproof or private admonition to the credential holder.

6. Education Code section 44421 provides in part:



The Commission on Teacher Credentialing shall privately admonish, publicly reprove, revoke, or suspend for immoral or unprofessional conduct, or for persistent defiance of, and refusal to obey, the laws regulating the duties of persons serving in the public school system, or for any cause that would have warranted the denial of an application for a credential or the renewal thereof, or for evident unfitness for service.

7. California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 803000, states in part:

[¶] ... [¶]

(b) "Aggravating factor" is an event or circumstance which demonstrates that a greater degree of adverse action for an act of professional misconduct is needed to adequately protect the public, schoolchildren or the profession.

Aggravating factors may include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) a prior record of adverse action including the nature and extent of that record;

(2) that the misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct;

(3) that the misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty or other violations of the laws governing educators;

(4) that the misconduct significantly harmed a child entrusted to the care of a credential holder or applicant, significantly harmed the public or the educational system;

(5) that the holder or applicant demonstrated indifference toward the consequences of the misconduct, which includes failure to comply with known court orders; or

(6) that the holder or applicant had prior notice, warnings or reprimands for similar conduct from any reliable source.

8. As set forth in Factual Finding 34, California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 80302, subdivision (a), sets forth the factors to consider “to determine the relationship between the alleged misconduct and the applicant’s or holder’s fitness, competence, or ability to effectively perform the duties authorized by the credential.”

9. The California Supreme Court has recognized that the terms “immoral conduct” and “unprofessional conduct” substantially overlap one another and conduct that constitutes one often includes the other. (*Morrison v. State Bd. of Ed.*, *supra*, 1 Cal.3d 214, 221, fn. 9.) Additionally, in *San Diego Unified School District v. Commission on Professional Competence* (2011) 194 Cal.App.4th 1454, the court explained:

Moreover, the definition of immoral or unprofessional conduct must be considered in conjunction with the unique position of public school teachers, upon whom are imposed “responsibilities and limitations on freedom of action which do not exist in regard to other callings.” [Citation.]

(*Id.*, at p. 1466.)

10. Immoral conduct is sometimes considered as synonymous with "dishonesty" or a high degree of unfairness. (*Board of Education of the San Francisco Unified School District v. Weiland* (1960) 179 Cal.App.3d 8089, 811.) The court explained in *Palo Verde Unified School District of Riverside v. Hensey* (190) 9 Cal.App.3d 967, 972:

The term "immoral" has been defined as that which is hostile to the welfare of the general public and contrary to good morals. Immorality includes conduct inconsistent with rectitude, or indicative of corruption, indecency, depravity, dissoluteness; or as willful, flagrant, or shameless conduct showing moral indifference to the opinions of respectable members of the community, and as an inconsiderate attitude toward good order and the public welfare.

11. "Evident unfitness for service" means a teacher is clearly not fit, not adapted to or unsuitable for teaching, ordinarily by reason of temperamental defects or inadequacies. (*Woodland v. Joint Unified School District v. Commission on Professional Competence* (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 1429, 1444.) "Unlike 'unprofessional conduct,' 'evident unfitness for service' connotes a fixed character trait, presumably not remediable merely on receipt of notice that one's conduct fails to meet the expectations of the employing school district." (*Ibid.*)

## **Cause for Discipline**

12. Based on the Factual Findings and Legal Conclusions as a whole, complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that respondent committed acts constituting unprofessional conduct on May 17, 2022.

13. Based on the Factual Findings and Legal Conclusions as a whole, complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that respondent committed acts demonstrating his evidence unfitness for service on May 17, 2022.

14. Based on the Factual Findings and Legal Conclusions as a whole, complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that respondent committed acts of immoral conduct on May 17, 2022.

15. Based on the Factual Findings and Legal Conclusions as a whole, complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that respondent committed acts of moral turpitude on May 17, 2022.

### **Appropriate Discipline**

16. Pursuant to Education Code section 44421, the Commission shall privately admonish or publicly reprove a credential holder, or revoke or suspend his credential, if the credential holder has engaged in immoral or unprofessional conduct, action that warrants denial of an application for a credential or the renewal thereof, or is evidently unfit for service. Careful consideration has been given to the available disciplinary options. When all the evidence is considered, complainant demonstrated that respondent is unfit to teach, and revocation of his credentials is necessary to protect children, the public, and the teaching profession.

//

//

## ORDER

The credentials issued to respondent Norman Chadwick Praggastis by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing are REVOKED.

DATE: April 10, 2024

*Matthew Block*

MATTHEW S. BLOCK

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings