

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

**In the Matter of the Accusation and Statement of Issues
Against:**

RENEE GUSTAVO VILLA, Respondent

Case No. 1-673922970

OAH No. 2021030910

PROPOSED DECISION

Marcie Larson, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH), State of California, heard this matter telephonically and by video conference on August 9, 2021, from Sacramento, California.

Malissa Siemantel, Deputy Attorney General, represented complainant Mary Vixie Sandy, Ed.D., Executive Director of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission), State of California.

Mathew Martinez, Attorney at Law, represented respondent Renee Gustavo Villa who appeared at the hearing.

Evidence was received, the record closed, and the matter submitted for decision on August 9, 2021.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

Jurisdictional Matters

1. On December 10, 2012, the Commission issued respondent a Clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential (Pupil Personnel Credential), which expired on January 1, 2018.

2. On or about December 10, 2012, the Commission issued respondent a One-Year Non-Renewable Personnel Services Credential, which expired on January 1, 2018.

3. On January 15, 2015, the Commission issued respondent a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (Administrative Credential), which expired on January 1, 2018.

4. On December 24, 2018, the Commission received an application from respondent for a renewal of his Administrative Credential (Administrative Credential Application). The same day, the Commission received an application from respondent for a renewal of his Pupil Personnel Credential (Pupil Personnel Credential Application).

5. By letter dated August 27, 2020, Gilberto Gonzales, Staff Services Manager III for the Commission's Division of Professional Practices, informed respondent that the Commission found probable cause to revoke his teaching credentials and all other certification documents and to deny his applications. The Commission determined that in 2000 respondent was convicted of theft and in 2018, he was convicted of battery. Respondent failed to disclose these convictions on his applications. Respondent was informed of his right to challenge the Commission's decision and request a hearing. Respondent timely requested a hearing.

6. On February 18, 2021, complainant, acting in her official capacity, signed and thereafter filed the Accusation and Statement of Issues. Complainant seeks to deny respondent's applications, and revoke all credentials, certificates, and authorizations issued to respondent, based on allegations that he has been convicted of crimes and his failure to disclose his convictions on his applications.

7. The matter was set for an evidentiary hearing before an Administrative Law Judge of the OAH, an independent adjudicative agency of the State of California, pursuant to Government Code section 11500 et seq.

Criminal Convictions

8. On or about February 25, 2000, in the Superior Court of California, County of Santa Barbara, respondent was convicted of petty theft, a violation of Penal Code section 484, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor. Imposition of sentence was suspended. Respondent was placed on unsupervised probation for two years. He was ordered to serve five days in jail. Respondent was also ordered to pay restitution, fines, and fees. On February 5, 2003, respondent's conviction was dismissed pursuant to Penal Code section 1203.4.

9. The circumstances underlying the conviction occurred on January 26, 2000, at a Kmart in Santa Barbara County. Respondent was observed by a Kmart Loss Control Officer leaving the store with merchandise without paying. The employee stopped respondent while he was in the parking lot and requested that he return to the store. Respondent had \$211.41 worth of unpaid merchandise. The employee contacted the Sheriff's Department to report the theft.

A Deputy arrived and questioned respondent about his conduct. Respondent informed the Deputy that he had "dyslexia" and "forgot to pay for it." He also told the

Deputy that he wanted to get caught "because [he was a] Criminal Justice student and [he] wanted to see how the system works." Respondent also stated that he was "willing to pay for the merchandise that he had taken, but then changed his mind because the loss control officer was rude to him." Respondent asserted that he had the money to pay for the items. However, when searched, the Deputy found that respondent only had \$8 in his wallet.

10. On or about September 6, 2018, in the Superior Court of California, County of Monterey, respondent was convicted, on his plea of no contest, of battery, a violation of Penal Code section 242, a misdemeanor. Imposition of sentence was suspended. Respondent was placed on three years of informal probation. Respondent was ordered to attend weekly Alcoholic Anonymous (AA) or Narcotic Anonymous (NA) meetings for one year. Upon completion of the requirement, respondent's plea would be withdrawn, and his charge would be dismissed. Respondent was also ordered to pay the victim \$13,727 in restitution and pay the court fines and fees. No evidence was submitted demonstrating respondent's plea was dismissed.

11. The circumstances underlying the conviction occurred on October 31, 2017. Officers from the City of Salinas Police Department were dispatched to BJ's Restaurant in Salinas, California, to investigate an alleged battery of a waitress by a customer. Upon arriving an officer spoke to a waitress who alleged respondent assaulted her in the restaurant. She provided a description of respondent. The officer observed respondent in the driver side of a vehicle that was backing out of the parking lot. The officer conducted a traffic stop of the vehicle to prevent respondent from leaving. The officer then waited for another officer to arrive.

When the second officer arrived, both approached respondent, who was seated in the driver seat of the vehicle. An officer informed respondent that they were

investigating a crime that may have occurred inside the restaurant and that the officer was informed respondent was involved. The officer asked for respondent's identification. Respondent stated that he did not have his driver's license with him, but he provided the officer with a name and date of birth.

One of the officers went back into the restaurant and obtained further information from the alleged victim. She informed the officer that respondent grabbed her breast and attempted to kiss her when she was serving customers at another table. She requested respondent be charged for his conduct. The officer returned outside to speak with respondent. The officer also conducted a Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) record check and found that the name given by respondent required the person to have an interlock device on his vehicle. The officer did not observe an interlock device on respondent's vehicle. The DMV photo for the name of the person and date of birth respondent provided the officers also did not match respondent's appearance. As a result, the officers asked respondent to exit his vehicle.

While seated on a curb, respondent stated that he "may have hugged her but she was flirting with [him]," referring to the waitress. The officer searched respondent for valid identification. The officer found an expired driver's license in respondent's pocket with his name, photo, and date of birth. The officer also found a photo identification card depicting respondent as the Vice Principal of Gonzales High School. The officer conducted another DMV search and found that respondent's driver's license had been suspended. The officer placed respondent under arrest.

The officer conducted a further search of respondent and found a "small plastic bindle of a white powdery substance" in respondent's "right coin jeans pocket." Respondent told the officer it was baking soda. However, later testing confirmed the substance was cocaine. Respondent also again stated that he hugged the victim "but

felt that she was flirting with him so she wanted to be hugged.” Respondent admitted to the officer that he originally gave the name and birth date of his twin brother to “hopefully get himself out of trouble.” Respondent was transported to jail.

Applications

12. On December 24, 2018, the Commission received an application from respondent for a renewal of his Administrative Credential. On or about December 15, 2018, respondent certified under penalty of perjury to the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and representations contained in the Administrative Credential Application.

13. On December 24, 2018, the Commission received an application from respondent for a renewal of his Pupil Personnel Credential. On or about December 18, 2018, respondent certified under penalty of perjury to the truthfulness of all statements, answers, and representations contained in the Pupil Personnel Credential Application.

14. Both applications’ section 4b required respondent to answer yes or no to the following question:

Have you ever been convicted of any felony or misdemeanor in California or any other place?

You must disclose:

- all criminal convictions
- misdemeanors and felonies convictions based on a plea of no contest or nolo contendere

- convictions dismissed pursuant to Penal Code Section 1203.4
- driving under the influence (DUI) or reckless driving convictions
- no matter how much time has passed

15. Respondent checked the "No" box in response to this question on both the Administrative Credential Application and Pupil Personnel Credential Application.

Respondent's Evidence

16. Respondent explained that his 2000 conviction for petty theft served as a turning point in his life. After his conviction, respondent returned to school. He joined the seminary and completed a master's program. He worked as an Army chaplain. Respondent thought the difficult parts of his life were over. However, he began using alcohol in 2016 and drugs in 2017, to cope with marital issues. At the time of his arrest in 2017, he was going through the most difficult time of his life. He and his wife of ten years separated. Respondent was abusing drugs and alcohol. After respondent's arrest, respondent's wife divorced him and he thought he would lose custody of his two children. Respondent explained that he was self-destructive and was not motivated.

17. In August 2018, as part of respondent's criminal plea agreement, he began attending Celebrate Recovery classes one day per week. However, he continued to use drugs and alcohol. Respondent explained he stopped using drugs 392 days ago. He stopped using alcohol 133 days ago. On April 28, 2021, respondent completed 30 sessions of an Intensive Outpatient Program through Celebrate Recovery. He also attended therapy.

18. Respondent maintains his sobriety by attending AA meetings and church, communicating with his sponsor, and through the support of his family. In November 2020, respondent married Xochitl Perez. He explained that his wife, whom he has known since he was a child, is an important part of his support system. Respondent is also actively involved in raising his children.

19. Respondent was fired from his job with Gonzales High School in 2017, after his arrest. Prior to his position at Gonzales High School, respondent had worked in various positions as an educator and administrator. At the start of his career, respondent worked as an after-school mentor while obtaining his Bachelor of Arts degree. Respondent then worked as a history and Spanish teacher. In 2009, he completed his Master's degree in School Counseling. He then worked as a Program Coordinator at Le Grand High School. In 2011, respondent earned his Education Specialist degree and began working as an academic counselor. He then moved into administrative positions at several schools.

20. Respondent is currently working for his family dairy. Respondent explained that teaching and working with students is his passion. He would like to return to the profession. Respondent has completed continuing education to stay current on student issues. Respondent admitted that he lied on his applications. He did so because he was "ashamed and did not know how to handle the situation." Respondent did not want to "face the facts" of what was going on in his life.

CHARACTER EVIDENCE

21. Respondent submitted several character letters and four family members testified on respondent's behalf:

22. Respondent's wife Xochitl Perez Villa testified and wrote a letter in support of respondent. Mrs. Villa has known respondent since they were children. They lost touch and then re-connected in 2017. Mrs. Villa explained that when respondent was going through his divorce, he was depressed. Respondent attended therapy and eventually began to put his life back together. Mrs. Villa explained that respondent is a different person now. He attends church and is very involved with his family and children.

Respondent told Mrs. Villa about his petty theft and battery convictions. Respondent explained to Mrs. Villa that he had only "tapped" the waitress on her shoulder. Respondent did not tell Mrs. Villa that he provided false information on his applications.

23. Richard Perez testified at hearing and wrote a letter supporting respondent. Mr. Perez is respondent's uncle. Mr. Perez is a retired educator and principal. Respondent worked for Mr. Perez at Harmony Elementary School when Mr. Perez was the principal of the school. Mr. Perez described respondent as a person with a kind heart and good character. Mr. Perez was also impressed with the level of commitment respondent showed to his students.

Mr. Perez is aware of the difficulties respondent had with drugs and alcohol during his divorce. He counseled respondent and advised him to get help. Mr. Perez noticed an improvement in respondent's personality after he received treatment. Mr. Perez also explained that respondent is very remorseful for his past alcohol and drug use. Respondent is working hard to overcome his past challenges. Mr. Perez did not know about respondent's convictions or that he provided false information on his applications to the Commission.

24. Jorge Perez testified at hearing and wrote a letter supporting respondent. Mr. Perez is also respondent's uncle. Mr. Perez owns Merced Dairy Distribution, Inc. He has employed respondent for the past three years. Mr. Perez described respondent as a hardworking person who is kind and thoughtful. Mr. Perez observed that respondent had a difficult time coping with his divorce. He is aware respondent began using drugs and alcohol. However, respondent got help and is now a "very responsible worker and father."

Mr. Perez is aware of respondent's convictions. Respondent told Mr. Perez that he had "accidentally hugged a waitress." Within the last year, respondent also told Mr. Perez that he was not truthful on the applications he submitted to the Commission.

25. Stacey Hughes testified at hearing and wrote a letter supporting respondent. Ms. Hughes is respondent's sister. She works for Merced Union School District. Ms. Hughes explained that respondent was the first person in their family of six children to graduate from college and went on to be a successful chaplain, start his own ministry, and volunteer for various community organizations. She explained that respondent went through a difficult period during his divorce. Ms. Hughes advised respondent to get help with his substance abuse issues. Since respondent attended a recovery program, he is more positive and involved with his family.

Ms. Hughes is aware that respondent had "legal troubles." He did not share the details with Ms. Hughes. Respondent did not tell Ms. Hughes he was convicted of battery. He also did not tell Ms. Hughes he provided false information on his applications to the Commission.

26. Respondent submitted an employee evaluation from Patterson Unified School District and letters of recommendation from previous employers all dated in

2018. The letters describe respondent as a hard-working and dedicated educator. The letters appear to be written in support of respondent finding new employment.

Analysis

27. 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 questioned conduct;

(7) the extent to which disciplinary action may have an adverse impact or chilling effect upon 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 FELLOW TEACHERS

28. Respondent's convictions and the underlying acts of petty theft and battery, along with providing the Commission false information about those convictions, demonstrates poor judgment, dishonesty, and is a negative example for students and fellow teachers. As an educator, respondent is expected to set a good example and be a positive role model who abides by the law. He is expected to exercise good judgment. Respondent failed to do so and the potential for adverse effects on students and his fellow teachers was significant.

PROXIMITY OR REMOTENESS IN TIME

29. Respondent's most recent conviction and conduct providing false information to the Commission occurred in 2018. Respondent contends his conduct was a result of his alcohol and drug abuse. He has been sober for just over one year. His criminal probation is not scheduled to end until September 2021. Respondent's misconduct is more proximate than remote in time.

TYPES OF CREDENTIALS HELD AND SOUGHT

30. Respondent held a Pupil Personnel Credential and Administrative Credential, both of which he is seeking to have renewed. The credentials respondent held and is seeking to renew require both teaching competence and administration of school functions.

EXTENUATING OR AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES

31. 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." Respondent presented mitigating evidence of the emotional struggles he was experiencing as a result of his marriage difficulties and subsequent efforts to address his substance abuse.

32. 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) the misconduct in question involved multiple wrongful acts; and (2) the misconduct significantly harmed the educational system. Respondent's misconduct involved multiple wrongful acts including two criminal convictions and knowingly providing false information on two applications he submitted to the Commission. Respondent also minimized his criminal conduct and has not been forthcoming with those who support him about his conduct. Weighing the evidence, the aggravating circumstances outweigh the extenuating or mitigating circumstances.

PRAISEWORTHINESS OR BLAMEWORTHINESS OF MOTIVES RESULTING IN THE MISCONDUCT

33. Respondent's motives for the conduct underlying his convictions is unclear. Respondent failed to provide any insight into why he stole from Kmart. Additionally, although respondent pled no contest to battery, he has consistently tried

to minimize his conduct. Additionally, respondent lied on his applications because he did not want to address his behavior. There is nothing praiseworthy about respondent's conduct.

LIKELIHOOD OF RECURRENCE

34. Respondent is still early in his recovery from drug and alcohol abuse. He has not developed significant insight into or taken responsibility for his conduct. Respondent has not been honest with his family about his convictions or his dishonesty to the Commission. While respondent had engaged in some treatment, respondent did not present sufficient evidence to demonstrate that he is unlikely to engage in future misconduct.

ADVERSE IMPACT OR CHILLING EFFECT

35. 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 OF MISCONDUCT

36. No evidence was presented that respondent's conduct was either publicized or notorious.

CONCLUSION

37. For the reasons stated above, and considering all the *Morrison* factors, complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that cause exists to discipline respondent. Based on the evidence, it would not be consistent with the public interest to allow respondent to retain his existing credentials or to renew his credentials at this time.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

Burden of Proof

1. Complainant has the burden of proving the allegations in the 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.)

2. Concerning the Statement of Issues, respondent has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that he is entitled to the credentials he seeks. (*Breakzone Billiards v. City of Torrance* (2000) 81 Cal.App.4th 1205; *Coffin v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Appeals Bd.* (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 471, 476.) Preponderance of the evidence means "more likely than not." (*Sandoval v. Bank of Am.* (2002) 94 Cal.App.4th 1378, 1388.)

Applicable Law

3. 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.

4. Education Code section 44345 provides in part:

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

[1] ... [1]

(e) Has committed any act involving moral turpitude.

[1] ... [1]

(g) Has intentionally practiced or attempted to practice any material deception or fraud in his or her application.

[1] ... [1]

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 for which that applicant is certificated, or competence to perform the duties which the credential would authorize the applicant to perform.

5. Education Code section 44440 provides:

(a) No applicant who is under review by the commission shall be allowed to withdraw his or her application for a credential without the written consent of the commission.

The commission shall retain its authority over those

applicants to proceed with the denial of the credential upon any ground provided by law, or to enter an order denying the credential upon any ground provided by law.

(b) 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 any of 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 that:

(a) "Adverse action" is a denial, a private admonition, public reproof, suspension or a revocation of one or more credentials.

(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:

[¶] ... [¶]

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

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

[¶] ... [¶]

(c) "Applicant" is an individual applying for a credential, permit, waiver or other certification document issued by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

8. As set forth in Factual Finding 27, California Code of Regulations, title 5, 80302, subdivision (a), provides 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.) "Unprofessional conduct" includes "'that which violates the rules of ethical code of a profession or such conduct which is unbecoming a member of a profession in good standing.'" (*Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles v. Swan* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 546, 553; quoting, 66 Corpus Juris, p. 55.) 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 808, 811.) The court explained in *Palo Verde Unified School District of Riverside v. Hensey* (1970) 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 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." (*Id.*)

Cause for Discipline

12. As set forth in the Factual Findings as a whole, complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that respondent committed acts of unprofessional conduct. Cause exists to discipline respondent's credentials pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

13. As set forth in the Factual Findings as a whole, complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that respondent committed acts demonstrating evident unfitness for service. Cause exists to discipline respondent's credentials pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

14. As set forth in the Factual Findings as a whole, complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that respondent committed acts that consist of

immoral conduct. Cause exists to discipline respondent's credentials pursuant to Education Code section 44421.

15. As set forth in the Factual Findings as a whole, complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that respondent committed acts of moral turpitude. Cause exists to discipline respondent's credentials pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44435, subdivision (e).

16. As set forth in Factual Findings 12 through 15, complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that respondent practiced material deception or fraud in his applications. Cause exists to discipline respondent's credentials pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345, subdivision (g).

Cause for Denial

17. As set forth in the Factual Findings as a whole, respondent committed acts of moral turpitude. Cause exists to deny respondent's applications for renewal of his Clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential and Administrative Credential pursuant to Education Code section 44345, subdivision (e).

18. As set forth in Factual Findings 12 through 15, respondent practiced material deception or fraud in his Clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential and Administrative Credential applications. Cause exists to deny respondent's applications for renewal of his Clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential and Administrative Credential pursuant to Education Code sections 44421 and 44345, subdivision (g).

ORDER

1. All credentials, certificates, and authorizations issued to respondent Renee Gustavo Villa, including his Administrative Credential and Clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential, are REVOKED.

2. Respondent Renee Gustavo Villa's application for renewal of his Administrative Credential is DENIED.

3. Respondent Renee Gustavo Villa's application for renewal of his Clear Pupil Personnel Services Credential is DENIED.

DATE: September 7, 2021

Marcie Larson
Marcie Larson (Sep 7, 2021 11:20 PDT)

MARCIE LARSON

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings