

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

Wednesday, October 9, 2002

California Department of Education
1430 N Street, Room 1101
Sacramento, California

Members Present

Reed Hastings, President
Joe Nuñez, Vice President
Donald Fisher
Susan Hammer
Nancy Ichinaga
Carlton J. Jenkins
Marion Joseph
Stephanie H. Lee
Suzanne Tacheny

Members Absent

Robert Abernethy
Vacancy

Principal Staff to the State Board of Education

Delaine Eastin, State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Leslie Fausset, Chief Deputy Superintendent, California Department of Education
Scott Hill, Chief Deputy Superintendent, California Department of Education
Richard Whitmore, Chief Advisor to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Linda A. Cabatic, General Counsel, California Department of Education
Rick Brandsma, Executive Director, State Board of Education
Phil Garcia, Deputy Executive Director, State Board of Education
Greg Geeting, Assistant Executive Director, State Board of Education
Rae Belisle, Chief Counsel, State Board of Education
Deborah Franklin, Education Policy Consultant, State Board of Education
Karen Steentofte, Education Policy Consultant, State Board of Education
Hazel Bailey, Executive Assistant, State Board of Education
Maryanna Bogard, Legal Secretary, State Board of Education
Robin Jackson, Executive Secretary, State Board of Education
Katherine Gales, Office Technician, State Board of Education

Call to Order

President Hastings called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

Salute to the Flag

President Hastings led the Board, staff, and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

Approval of Minutes (September 2002 Meeting)

- ACTION: Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board approve the minutes of the September 2002 meeting with minor corrections. Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Jenkins was not present when the vote was taken.

| | | |
|--------|--|-----------------------|
| ITEM 1 | STATE BOARD PROJECTS AND PRIORITIES. Including, but not limited to, future meeting plans; agenda items; State Board office budget; staffing, appointments, and direction to staff; declaratory and commendatory resolutions; update on litigation; bylaw review and revision; review of the status of State Board-approved charter schools as necessary; and other matters of interest. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|--|-----------------------|

Appointment of Screening Committee Member

President Hastings noted that currently the Screening Committee members are Mrs. Joseph and Mr. Jenkins. Ms. Reynolds had been the third member and her resignation from the Board created a vacancy on the Screening Committee. President Hastings reported that he had asked Mr. Nuñez to serve on the Screening Committee and that Mr. Nuñez had accepted.

President Hastings mentioned that in November the Committee would be interviewing the student Board member candidates and meeting to screen the applications for the Curriculum Commission.

Authorization for Appointments to the AB 312 NCLB Liaison Team

President Hastings informed the Board that under AB 312 an NCLB Liaison Team had been established. The Board has two appointments to the Liaison Team, which will meet for the first time in November.

- ACTION: Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board authorize the Board President to make the two Board appointments to the No Child Left Behind Liaison Team established by Assembly Bill 312 (Chapter 1020, Statutes of 2002), which was recently signed into law by the Governor as an urgency statute. Mrs. Ichinaga seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Jenkins was not present when the vote was taken.

President Hastings announced that he had asked Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Charles Weis and the State Board's Chief Counsel Rae Belisle (who recently announced her acceptance of employment with the Los Angeles Unified School District) to serve on the No Child Left Behind Liaison Team as the State Board's appointees, and that both had graciously accepted.

November Meeting: Wednesday Morning Agenda

President Hastings announced that the agenda for the State Board meeting the morning of Wednesday, November 13, would include the Screening Committee interviews of the student

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

member candidates, the presentation of recommendations by the Student Advisory Board on Education, and the presentation of the Presidential Awards for Excellence in Math and Science Teaching. He mentioned that all of the Board members would be welcome to join the Screening Committee for the interviews of the student member candidates.

Meeting Locations on Wednesday, November 13: Room 4203 at the State Capitol in the Morning/The State Board Meeting Room at 1430 N Street in the Afternoon

President Hastings informed the Board and the audience that to accommodate the large group of students, parents, and special guests expected to attend the meeting on Wednesday, November 13, the Board would meet in the California Room, Room 4203, of the State Capitol for the morning only. At approximately 1:00 p.m., after the lunch break, the Board meeting would reconvene in the usual meeting location in Room 1101 at 1430 N Street.

| | | |
|--------|---|-------------|
| ITEM 2 | PUBLIC COMMENT. Public Comment is invited on any matter <u>not</u> included on the printed agenda. Depending on the number of individuals wishing to address the State Board, the presiding officer may establish specific time limits on presentations. | INFORMATION |
|--------|---|-------------|

The following individuals addressed the Board:
Rosaline Turnbull, California State PTA

In response to Ms. Turnbull’s comment on the needs for medication regulations, President Hastings asked Ms. Fausset about the status of the proposed regulations. Ms. Fausset replied that work is continuing on the proposed regulations and they are currently scheduled to be on the November agenda.

| | | |
|--------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 3 | No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act: Including, but not limited to, Update on NCLB and Reading First Implementation. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|--|--------------------|

Camille Maben, Senior Advisor to the State Superintendent, and Don Kairott, CDE Executive Office, provided an update on NCLB. Ms. Maben noted that Department staff and Board staff are working together to move ahead with NCLB. Ms. Maben discussed Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), adding that Mr. Padia would report further on this issue during the next item. Ms. Maben stated that AB 312 appropriates two percent of funding for implementation of the NCLB Act. Mr. Kairott reported that local action plans were being developed by the local education agencies (LEAs) and the State Board would be asked to approve the plans at a future meeting.

Ms. Maben commented that Ms. Belisle would report on the new information regarding highly qualified teachers later during this meeting. On the issue of parent educators, the federal government will be putting out guidelines for the LEAs. Ms. Maben reported that Governor Davis had signed Senator Polanco’s bill, which codifies in state law the federal laws related to English learners.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

Mr. Kairott commented that the Department is awaiting guidance from the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) on reporting dangerous schools. The USDE has asked for information this year on dangerous schools. He noted that our state definition requires three years of data before a school can be considered a dangerous school.

Ms. Hammer asked when the state plan has to be in place. Ms. Maben noted that the state plan is due in May 2003. Schools are now beginning to implement NCLB, but in many cases we are waiting for additional guidance from the USDE. Mr. Kairott remarked that while some provisions of NCLB went into effect in January 2002, it has become somewhat of a “shifting sand” situation as the federal guidance has changed over time.

Ms. Fausset stated that keeping the LEAs as informed as possible is a challenge because of the urgency of the timeline coupled with the changing guidance from the USDE. Ms. Fausset thanked Ms. Maben and Mr. Kairott for their many hours of hard work.

Mr. Brandsma reported on Reading First, one of the components of NCLB. He reminded the Board that it had approved the state plan in May 2002. He added that Ms. Steentofte is working with the Department to implement Reading First and that the application for the first round of proposals has been posted on the web. The Reading First Leadership Team would be meeting on Friday, October 11, 2002.

President Hastings informed the audience that Item 3 would remain open. (This item was continued on the following day. See minutes for Thursday, October, 10, 2002.)

No action was taken on this item.

| | | |
|--------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 4 | No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Accountability Plan. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|--|--------------------|

President Hastings informed the audience that this item would take up to an hour. He commented that the discussion on this item is the most important work the Board will do today.

Bill Padia, Policy and Evaluation Division, reported that the Academic Performance Index (API) would be released next week. He noted that this is the first time the English-Language Arts California Standards Test would be included in the API. We are moving toward an accountability system based principally on the standards tests.

Incorporating K-Only and K-1 Schools in the Accountability System

Mr. Padia stated that as guidelines and regulations are received from the federal government, the Department hopes to get a plan before the Board at the November meeting for possible action in December. Mr. Padia walked the Board through the information in the agenda materials, beginning with incorporating kindergarten only and K-1 only schools into the accountability system. The proposal is to include those schools by assigning them the API of the schools their students enroll in for second grade. President Hasting commented this would also solve the problem of including those schools in awards and intervention programs. He asked if legislation

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

would be required to do this. Mr. Padia responded that this issue was raised in the agenda materials, but he does not believe legislation would be required to implement this recommendation.

Adequate Yearly Progress and Proficient or Above

Mr. Padia commented that the difference between our state accountability system and the accountability system under NCLB is that the API is a growth model, while that federal AYP is a status model. Under the AYP, schools must meet a bar each year. The difficulty is the integration of the two systems. The USDE has two additional subgroups, which makes it more difficult for schools to achieve the federal AYP. Mr. Padia noted that four options were presented in the agenda materials. Option 1 is the same option presented last month. Under Option 2, we would use the current method of calculating the API to compute indicator scores for English-language arts and mathematics. Under this option, we would set an API number as the AYP target with the target rising each year.

Ms. Hammer asked if both Option 1 and Option 2 would meet the federal requirements. Mr. Padia responded that the options are ordered so Option 1 more closely meets the federal requirements, and Options 2, 3, and 4 less closely meet the requirements. President Hastings noted the options are ordered not by the wisdom of the approach, but by compliance with the federal requirements. Mrs. Joseph commented that under the federal requirements not one single child can be left behind. President Hastings added that the federal philosophy is that 100 percent of the students must be proficient. The API model is that the entire school meets a target, including any subgroups. Ms. Hammer commented that California has higher standards than many states. Other states may have more students at a proficient level because their standards are lower. Ms. Hammer remarked that it is somewhat irrational for the federal government to have a policy that rewards lower standards. President Hastings responded there is no solution to the problem of consistency across the states because the states have different content standards and different definitions of proficient.

Mr. Padia continued his presentation. He stated that Option 3 would be to maintain the current API report, but have a two-sided report. The front part of the report would be the standard API report, and the back part would be a separate AYP report under the NCLB system. In this model, there are two ways of reporting the STAR data. This option could create anomalies where schools would get awards for meeting state targets but would not meet federal targets. Mrs. Joseph commented that a school that previously scored in the 15th percentile and improved to the 25th percentile, thereby making its API target, would be a federal Program Improvement school. She noted that the two additional subgroups would be compounding factors. President Hastings remarked that the additional federal subgroups could be added to the API. He commented that the disadvantage of a growth model is a school can grow and then fall back—be successful every other year. With the federal system, the goal is raised every year so low-performing schools may find their performance gap widening more every year under the federal linear model. Mrs. Joseph added that one problem with the growth model is that some schools still perform poorly even as they meet the API growth targets.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

Mr. Padia noted that under Option 4, the current API system would remain unchanged other than the addition of the two federally required subgroups (students with disabilities and English learners). There would be no separate reporting system for AYP. This option would require a federal waiver. Mr. Padia noted that it is likely that more schools would be identified as in need of program improvement under Option 1 and fewer schools would be so identified under Option 4. President Hastings asked whether the target in Option 4 would be a growth target or a bar target. Mr. Padia responded that a bar target would be set at some level of the API.

Ms. Tacheny remarked that looking at the big picture, she sees two problems: 1) how do we identify schools in need of improvement and 2) what to do to improve them. She stated that she likes Option 3. She likes the separate reporting of the API. She noted that the goal is to keep the API as simple as possible. She added that she thinks that the USDE would not accept Option 4. Ms. Tacheny said that what we do to improve schools part should be at the intersection of the state and federal systems. We should look at the schools that do not meet one of the two targets. Mr. Fisher stated that whatever we end up with, we should not have two different plans. This would be confusing.

Mrs. Joseph stated that the Board ought to be taking a serious look at those schools with lot of English learners and/or economically disadvantaged students that do well to see what is working. These schools could be models for low-performing schools. Mrs. Ichinaga remarked that Mrs. Joseph's suggestions are important.

Mr. Nuñez stated he does not see how changing our growth model to a linear model serves our purposes. Schools that are low performing, that continue to not meet AYP targets, would be overwhelmed by a sense of defeat. We need to refrain from blowing our system up and driving schools crazy. The federal timelines are already causing problems. We need to keep our state accountability system as simple as possible. We should go to the USDE and tell them this is our system. He added that Option 4 is what he prefers.

President Hastings commented that on the Option 3 report, the front side is the state's view of success and the federal view of success is on the back side. Mr. Padia pointed out that under the state system, if a school is decile one but improving that is acceptable; however, that is not acceptable under the federal system. Ms. Tacheny remarked that Option 3 keeps the two points of view separate. It identifies schools that are not improving and are not performing well. We would want to do different things for schools that are improving under the API but have not met the federal AYP target than for schools that are not meeting either the API or the AYP targets. This option highlights the lowest performing schools.

President Hastings noted that Option 4 is just Option 3 without a second page. Mr. Padia stated that Option 4 includes the addition of two subgroups, which is a significant difference. Mr. Nuñez stated that we already know which schools are the lowest performing and that Option 3 would just create more paperwork to tell us what we already know. Mrs. Joseph said that under NCLB, the additional subgroups are required and it is important to add them.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

President Hastings asked for the Board's view on adding the two additional subgroups to the API. He noted that the downside is that it is harder for schools to achieve growth, to meet their growth target when more subgroups are added. The upside is that it seems intuitive to track English learners and disadvantaged students. Mr. Nuñez commented there has to be an appropriate definition of English learners.

Mr. Padia stated that the advantage with the growth model is that even if the English learner cohort is new, it can have growth. President Hastings stated that he thinks there is little philosophical difference between Options 3 and 4. Ms. Tacheny asked Mr. Padia for additional modeling with different assumptions. Mr. Padia explained that under the federal NCLB, the interventions only include school wide Title I schools, approximately 5,000 schools.

High School Test of Core Knowledge

Moving to a different topic, Mr. Padia stated that another problematic issue is how to define what every student in high school ought to know, which is an NCLB requirement. The Department's recommendation is that we use the CAHSEE for this purpose. If the State Board accepts this recommendation, the discussion needs to focus on defining what is proficient for NCLB purposes. He noted that the Department had presented two options. One option is scaffolding, using California Standards Tests (CSTs) performance levels to define proficiency. That is the tough approach. The other approach is vectoring back. The Board would set the proficient cut score at or near the CAHSEE passing score. Mr. Padia also suggested reporting performance levels by numbered performance levels, 1 through 3, for federal NCLB purposes. Ms. Tacheny asked if both options would meet federal requirements. Mr. Padia responded that he thought they would. The NCLB Act is talking about basic knowledge for high school graduation.

President Hastings commented that for the CSTs we have defined proficient. We have not defined proficient for the CAHSEE. The vectoring approach would tell us whether students are on the path to pass the CAHSEE. Mr. Fisher stated that we should do whatever gives us credit for our high academic standards. Mr. Hill noted that the CAHSEE is viewed as one of the hardest of any state's exit exams. President Hastings said that it is not possible to have exact mapping between performance on the CAHSEE and performance on the CST for every student. There would be a risk that a student appears to be on the path to pass the CAHSEE and then fails the exam. Ms. Tacheny expressed her concern about using the CAHSEE as the driver for AYP definitions of proficiency. This is putting too much on CAHSEE.

President Hastings said that one model is mapping back based on the CAHSEE, but there are other models for setting proficiency. He added that he thinks there is no option other than using the CAHSEE for the core knowledge test. The next step is to define proficient on the CAHSEE.

Incorporating Alternative Schools into the Accountability System Under NCLB

Eric Crane, Policy and Evaluation Division, thanked Sue Bennett, Educational Options Office, and the members of the Alternative Accountability Subcommittee for their assistance in preparing the materials for the agenda. Mr. Crane commented that he was seeking the Board's guidance on a policy issue. He explained that the federal government defines alternative accountability schools as schools whose purpose it is to serve students for less than a full

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

academic year. The state's definition of alternative accountability schools includes California Youth Authority (CYA) institutions and continuation schools that serve students for more than a year. He added that Options 1 and 3 seem to be the most viable. Mr. Crane stated that a judgment is needed on how to define CYA and continuation high schools. The real problem is continuation high schools, because the state law does not define the purpose of continuation high schools. Mr. Crane explained that Option 1 is to continue with the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) as it is. Option 3 continues ASAM with the exception that continuation high schools would use the main API approach.

Mrs. Joseph complimented all involved for the excellent presentation of the options. She also thanked Mr. Crane for his assistance with the Reading First eligibility list. Mrs. Joseph stated that because continuation schools are intended to educate students and to graduate students, they should be held accountable for producing the results of high school graduation. President Hastings noted that some continuation high schools are intended to serve students for a short period of time with the students returning to regular high school. Because of this turnover in students, it is hard to accurately assess the schools outside of the ASAM. Mrs. Joseph stated that more ought to be done to assist these schools and meet students' needs.

Mr. Crane stated that what the Department needs is the State Board's guidance on what direction to take. Mrs. Joseph asked if the USDE would accept including continuation high schools in the ASAM and whether students stayed in continuation high schools for several years. Mr. Crane replied that there is a range of practice in continuation high schools. Mrs. Ichinaga commented that a high school is a high school. If students receive a diploma, the requirements for the continuation high schools ought to be the same as for other high schools. Mrs. Joseph declared that the issue is we are holding the students accountable with the CAHSEE, so we also need to hold the continuation high schools accountable. Ms. Bennett responded that students in the ASAM take the same STAR and CAHSEE tests as other students.

Defining Graduation Rates for NCLB

Rachel Perry, Policy and Evaluation Division, commented that it is a challenge for California to define the high school graduation rate. The federal government provides some guidelines and some flexibility, however, the high school graduation calculations are a problem the state has been working on for some time. There is disparity across the states on how graduation rates are defined and reported. Since California does not have a longitudinal tracking system in place, the Department recommendation is to use the CAHSEE as a proxy for graduation rates until the longitudinal tracking system is in place. She noted that she is seeking the Board's guidance on this issue.

Ms. Tacheny asked what other states do to calculate graduation rates. Mr. Padia explained that various methods are utilized, including reporting dropout rates and reporting the raw numbers. President Hastings asked how accurate the cumulative CAHSEE pass rate is and whether it could be used as the proxy for graduation rates since we are already publishing the cumulative passing rate. Mr. Padia said that Department staff could take that under review and report at next month's Board meeting.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

No action was taken on this item.

President Hastings informed the audience that the Board would hear Item 5 at this time and Item 6 after the lunch break. The Board would meet in a Closed Session related to Items 7 and 8 before lunch.

| | | |
|--------|--|-------------|
| ITEM 5 | Board Briefing regarding the California Statewide System of School Support (S4). | INFORMATION |
|--------|--|-------------|

Wendy Harris, School Improvement Division, and Chuck Weis, Ventura County Superintendent, provided background information on the Statewide System of School Support (S4). Ms. Harris advised that the S4 system consists of two comprehensive assistance centers and 11 regional centers. The S4 system's first priority is to provide assistance to schools under a corrective action plan and the second priority under the federal law is to provide assistance to schools in Program Improvement. There is a need to build capacity and assist these schools. AB 312 authorizes the S4 system to provide assistance to low-performing schools, but it is not designed to provide support for low-performing schools alone. Ms. Harris advised that the Department is developing a regional model of support.

President Hastings thanked Mr. Weis for agreeing to serve on the new liaison team established under AB 312. Mr. Weis stated that the new S4 system will build capacity to serve under-performing schools and is based on direct accountability. The approach will be to better coordinate services that are currently often duplicative and to focus on state-adopted standards and how to improve instruction on the standards.

Mrs. Joseph commented that the coordination effort and the work of CCSESA are very timely. She added that we need to focus on the content. Many schools have teams and consultants coming in that do not know the standards. She expressed concern about the recent papers put out by WestEd (one of the comprehensive centers) that express a point of view that is exactly the opposite of where the state is on assessment. Accountability and capacity building must be included in the districts' improvement efforts. Mr. Weis stated that coordinating services would help to ensure that everyone providing assistance gives the same message. Mrs. Joseph stated that the content is the most serious problem and having an in-depth knowledge about the state's adopted curriculum and standards is critical. We need to think about ways to train the trainers. Mr. Weis commented that one of the advantages of the S4 system is its monitoring of the assistance providers.

Mr. Fisher voiced his opinion that better leadership is needed at these schools, as performance cannot be improved with the same principals and teachers. He added that "combat pay" might be the method to secure better principals and teachers. Mr. Weis noted that principals will have AB 75 training and teachers will have AB 466 training. Mrs. Joseph commented that we are getting results where schools have the adopted textbooks and trained their teachers on the adopted materials.

No action was taken on this item.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

Closed Session

President Hastings called for the Closed Session at 12:10 p.m. and announced that the lunch break would occur after the Closed Session.

Lunch Break

President Hastings called for the lunch break at 12: 25 p.m. The meeting was reconvened at 1:25 p.m.

Ms. Tacheny acknowledged the October birthdays of President Hastings, Mrs. Joseph, and Ms. Lee.

Closed Session Report

President Hastings reported that the State Board had met in Closed Session to review and discuss the content of test items in accordance with the authorization for that purpose set forth in the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act. For the record, it was noted that Ms. Hammer did not participate in the Closed Session to the extent that the content of test items pertaining to science were considered for the reason stated at the September 2002 meeting, i.e., to exercise “an abundance of caution” with respect to a potential conflict of interest in regard to her position with the Synopsis Foundation.

| | | |
|--------|---|--------------------|
| ITEM 7 | Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, California Standards Tests (CST): Including, but not limited to, Revision of the Grade 11 English-Language Arts and High School Mathematics Blueprints for Golden State Exam (GSE) Linking, the New Grade 4-5 Science Blueprint, the new 70-item Grade 8 History-Social Science Blueprint, and Final Review of Both Public and Non-Public Blueprints for English-Language Arts, Mathematics, History-Social Science, and Science | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|---|--------------------|

Bob Anderson, Standards and Assessment Division, requested State Board approval of the proposed test blueprints so that Educational Testing Services (ETS) could move forward in developing the CSTs. He reported that there are policy issues related to the Algebra II Test and the High School Summative Mathematics Test that still need to be resolved.

President Hastings reminded the Board of the efforts to work with the California State University (CSU) system to create a test that CSU could use for college placement. President Hastings recognized the remarkable process and the important role played by CSU Vice Chancellor Dave Spence, Mrs. Joseph, and many other individuals. He thanked Mr. Spence for his investment of the time and political capital to make this happen.

Mr. Spence remarked that this test is very important to the CSU. It will help students be ready for college level work when they enter CSU. Mr. Spence also stated there is strong, almost unanimous support, for the use of the 11th grade English-language arts and high school summative math test for placement purposes. This cooperative effort would not have been

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

possible without the very high State Board approved academic content standards.

Mr. Spence thanked the following individuals for their assistance: Bill Tarr, Hung-Hsi Wu, Paul Clopton, Marshall Cates, Carol Jago, Cheryl Cartin, Paul Michaelson, Paul Warren, Ron Fox, Bob Anderson, Bill Vasey, Reed Hastings for his leadership, the State Board Members, John Mockler, and Rick Brandsma. Mr. Spence gave special recognition to Mrs. Joseph and Ms. Tacheny for spearheading this effort.

Mr. Spence commented that there are many benefits to using the tests for placement purposes, the most important of which is students will have an additional year to prepare for college course work. He added that while we have a ways to go, he knows we will be able to resolve the policy issues.

President Hastings commented that the content review panels (CRPs) really are the foundation of the test blueprint review process. He drew the Board's attention to three letters from the STAR Mathematics CRP. The letter from the entire CRP raises a number of policy issues that will be discussed with CSU. In addition, there were letters from individual CRP members that recommend the State Board approve the blueprint for the High School Summative Mathematics Test.

Ms. Tacheny requested that the State Board think about administering the GSE on Saturdays. President Hastings asked that this issue be postponed and placed on the November Board agenda. Mrs. Joseph pointed out that the issues raised by the Mathematics CRP are policy issues and are not related to the blueprints. Although these are serious issues and have merit, they should be addressed by CSU and the testing liaisons. She added that a meeting to discuss these important issues has been scheduled.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the content of the detailed (non-public) blueprints and the public blueprints for the California Standards Tests in English-Language Arts, Grade 11; Mathematics, High School Summative Test and Geometry Test; History-Social Science, Grade 8; and Science, Grade 5; as presented to the State Board. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0-1. Ms. Hammer did not participate in the discussion or vote on this item because the item included test blueprints pertaining to science, and she wished (as stated at the September 2002 meeting) to exercise "an abundance of caution" with respect to any potential conflict of interest in regard to her position with the Synopsis Foundation. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken.

| | | |
|--------|---|--------------------|
| ITEM 8 | Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program, California Standards Tests (CST): Adoption of the Integrated Science Blueprints. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|---|--------------------|

Deputy Superintendent Paul Warren noted that at its last meeting, the State Board requested that the STAR Science CRP review the proposed integrated science tests blueprints. He reminded the Board of the letter it had received from the CRP.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

The following individuals addressed the Board:
Stan Metzenberg, representing the Science CRP
Karen Carroll, member, Integrated Science Panel

Ms. Tacheny inquired whether the four tests were designed to be sequential or not. Ms. Carroll responded that the tests were designed to be sequential. Ms. Tacheny commented that the Board had been told that the integrated science community was all over the map and there were no common curricula or textbooks and that the Integrated Science Panel was charged with developing consensus around an integrated science test. Now she has heard that there are textbooks available for physical science, which is a type of integrated science course. Phil LaFontaine, Professional Development and Instructional Support, responded that physical science may or may not be taught as an integrated course.

Ms. Tacheny stated that what she has been hearing is the integrated tests are not based on any set of instructional materials, any sequential materials. Mr. LaFontaine stated he understood that the integrated science panel was asked to come up with an instructional sequence—which it did. He added that publishers have already been asking for the blueprints to begin to develop materials that match the sequence. President Hastings asked if it was Mr. LaFontaine's opinion that publishers would develop materials within the next few years. Mr. LaFontaine's replied that he believes that they will.

Mr. Metzenberg commented that more students take physical science courses than Integrated/Coordinated Science I. Mrs. Joseph asked if not very many students take Integrated Science IV, what happens to the 110,000 plus students who take physical science. She inquired about what test, if any, those students take.

President Hastings noted that physical science courses are often used like Integrated Science I and II to prepare students for biology, chemistry, and physics. He added that it is not inconsistent to have the four integrated science tests and then later consider a physical science test.

Mr. Warren stated the Department agrees more students need to get into the assessment system. NCLB requires all high school students be tested on core knowledge in science. We will have to solve the problem of how to define core knowledge in science and develop a test for it. He informed the Board that the contract with ETS does not include a physical science test.

President Hastings remarked that the work involved in developing the four integrated science tests is relatively minimal because the same items are used as on the single subject tests. The problem with only having three tests is that then some standards will never be tested. As a separate issue, we might want to look at what areas are not tested. The NCLB test is a totally separate issue that we will have to deal with later.

Mr. Nuñez commented that we did not think we would get this far, but the Integrated Science Panel has developed blueprints on which there is consensus. President Hastings suggested dealing with the integrated science blueprint first.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Christine Bertrand, California Science Teachers Association

Curtis Washington, California Teachers Association

Holly Jacobsen, California School Boards Association

Lisa Ramer, Association of California School Administrators

- ACTION: Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board approve the content of the detailed (non-public) blueprints and the public blueprints for the California Standards Tests for Integrated Science 1, 2, 3, and 4 as presented to the State Board. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0-1. Ms. Hammer did not participate in the discussion or vote on this item because the item included test blueprints pertaining to science, and she wished (as stated at the September 2002 meeting) to exercise “an abundance of caution” with respect to any potential conflict of interest in regard to her position with the Synopsis Foundation. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken.

Ms. Tacheny thanked Mr. Metzberg for all of his efforts. She remarked that he always brings to the Board important data and information that are helpful when the Board is making policy decisions.

Mrs. Joseph asked to be on the record that the State Board should discuss the physical science test. President Hastings asked Mr. Metzberg to explain the differences between the Integrated Science I blueprint and the proposed physical science test. Mr. Metzberg briefly explained the differences.

President Hastings asked if there was any support for developing a physical science test for the next test administration. Mr. Warren noted that the science tests are being drafted now and we are out of time for the 2003 administration. He suggested agendaizing a broader item on what is not tested in science. Mrs. Joseph asked that the CRP be involved in any future work regarding science testing issues. The Board expressed interest in conducting a broader discussion on this issue within the next few months. Mr. Warren said that February 2003 would be good timing.

| | | |
|--------|--|-------------|
| ITEM 6 | Recommended process for assigning sanctions to schools in Cohort I of the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) that failed to make significant growth each of two implementation years. | INFORMATION |
|--------|--|-------------|

Mr. Whitmore reported that SB 1310, signed by Governor Davis, made some changes in the process. He asked the Board for direction on how to sort schools for sanctions, noting that some schools will be assigned a School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) and other schools will be assigned other sanctions. Mr. Whitmore said that Department staff had identified SAITs based on Board-approved criteria. He added that many of the SAIT applicants that were not approved were unable to show evidence of success with low performing schools.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

President Hastings clarified Mr. Whitmore's request for the Board's sense of what the Board wants to do and what sanctions should be assigned. President Hastings said that he thinks at a minimum the Board would want to assign a SAIT to schools facing sanctions. Mr. Whitmore advised that assignment of a SAIT is the minimum action that could be taken under the statute. President Hastings also stated that he does not think requiring a school to hold a public hearing would be productive. He noted that the most severe sanction is state takeover of a school. Mrs. Joseph stated that she thinks the sanction of taking over schools should be put way off.

Mrs. Joseph inquired about role the districts play under II/USP. Mr. Whitmore advised that SB 1310 requires district involvement, even in the case of a takeover. He informed the Board that next month the conversation would be about real schools with real data. He stated that the Department is expecting that approximately 20-25 schools will not meet the criteria for significant growth and would like a sense of the Board's direction. Mrs. Joseph commented that since these are just the II/USP schools, schools that volunteer to be in the program, there must be other schools that are in the same situation but are not in II/USP. She expressed concern about the non-volunteer schools.

Mr. Nuñez asked if the High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP) was voluntary. Ms. Harris responded that it is not, but the schools can opt not to participate and instead hold a local public hearing. She noted that only a few schools have selected that option. President Hastings stated that if a school continues to under perform, something different must be done. Ms. Harris said the SAITs have more power than other intervention teams have had in the past because the local governing board is required by law to adopt the SAIT recommendations.

Ms. Tacheny remarked that the Board must be clear that the districts have a role to play and there must be pressure placed on the districts to improve these schools. Ms. Harris stated that the Board would have the task of assigning the SAITs to schools in December. President Hasting summarized that what the Board is being asked what the criteria would be for assigning a more severe sanction than a SAIT. First, the Board may want to discuss whether the Board would consider sanctions other than a SAIT.

Mr. Nuñez stated that he appreciated the guiding principles that were used to develop the sanction criteria. He commented that every school will have a story to tell and Board needs to find out what the story is for each school. Ms. Tacheny agreed that the Board needs to look at each school. A district may have just adopted the state-adopted textbooks and that might explain the lack of progress.

Mr. Nuñez observed that there are some abysmal external evaluators out there and the Board needs to know what evaluators have advised the schools to do. Ms. Tacheny said there are two critical pieces involved: 1) the status of instructional materials at the school and the school leadership and 2) what kind of training teachers have had. Ms. Hammer stated that the Board needs that kind of information to decide what sanctions to assign. Mrs. Ichinaga commented that she does not believe it is so hard to find out what schools are doing wrong.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

Mr. Jenkins stated that he would like the Board to clarify what information it wants Ms. Harris to provide. He added that the Board needs some kind of objective criteria for reviewing the schools. Ms. Tacheny pointed out that the process pieces that matter are instructional materials, school leadership, and professional development. President Hastings said that he thinks what the Board is saying is that it needs information about each school to determine what sanctions to assign. To assist the liaisons in their work with the Department between now and November, the Board needs to think about under what, if any circumstances, it wants to assign a sanction other than a SAIT. Mr. Whitmore noted that the Board needs to make sorting decisions in November. Ms. Hammer commented that the six criteria suggested by the Department staff for determining which schools should be assigned a SAIT are good. She stated that the Board will have to be very aggressive. Ms. Tacheny mentioned that some of this information might be available on the school accountability report cards (SARC). Department staff agreed to do a survey of schools that did not meet the requirement for significant growth in order to assess the stability of the school leadership, access to State Board-adopted instructional materials, and access to AB 466 and AB 75 training.

| | | |
|--------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 9 | Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: 2003 STAR Proposed Report Package and Preliminary Plan for Reporting California Standards Test Results to Teachers. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|--|--------------------|

Mr. Anderson reported on the teacher report, which is new this year. He noted that ETS has committed to convening teacher focus group reviews prior to the November meeting. He asked for the Board's comments on the reports. President Hastings clarified that the teacher report is a grade level report, not a classroom level report. Mr. Anderson explained that the teacher report it is not an accountability document for individual teachers; it is a grade level report at a school. Ms. Hammer commented that the report is nicely laid out. President Hastings stated that overall the report looks good and is going in the right direction. He asked the members to submit any comments to staff by the end of the Thursday meeting.

Mr. Anderson pointed out that the other reports under this item are the parent reports and the summary reports that go to the schools. He noted that last year the Board made a number of changes on the parent report and that this year's report is the same with a few technical modifications. The ETS contract calls for a review and redesign of parent reports next year. President Hastings asked if any flexibility exists to make changes this year and if there was any money in the budget to make those changes. Mr. Anderson suggested that the Board could direct the staff to begin developing concepts for a parent report for next year.

Mrs. Joseph commented that there is a lot of good information on the parent reports and she thinks teachers should have access to the information about the grade level standards that is available on the parent report. Ms. Tacheny stated that she wanted to be clear that whatever needs to be done with software and printing to improve the parent report must be done. Mr. Anderson said that the Department staff could certainly find a method to advise the districts and schools to distribute this information to the teachers. Ms. Tacheny commented that districts need parent information in several languages. Mr. Anderson replied that materials in languages other than English were required under the ETS contract.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

Mr. Nuñez remarked that the Board could work with education groups to get this information out to the teachers. Ms. Tacheny pointed out that the teacher report asks questions that the report is supposed to help answer. She would like the school reports to do the same thing. Before a report is developed, the developer should know what questions the report is supposed to answer. Mr. Warren noted that the school reports are intended to be supplemental data for schools and districts.

No action was taken on this item.

| | | |
|---------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 10 | Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Receive 2003 Accommodations and Modifications for Testing Students with Disabilities. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|---------|--|--------------------|

Mr. Anderson referred to the new version of accommodations/modifications chart. The chart and out-of-level testing are the two key issues under this item. The Department staff would like input from the Board on the chart. He noted that the chart is missing the GSE, which will be included in the next draft of the chart. The chart indicates what are accommodations and what are modifications and provides information and assistance for the districts. Ms. Hammer stated that she hopes this information is widely distributed to the field. Mr. Anderson replied that wide distribution is the Department's intention. Ms. Hammer asked if these accommodations/modifications would be acceptable under NCLB. Mr. Anderson responded that the short answer is yes, but there will be additional conversations as the USDE provides more information and guidance. He informed the Board that approximately 12 percent of special education students are tested out of their grade level. The majority of those students took a test that is one grade level lower.

President Hastings noted that this item is information only. He commented that Option 1 looks reasonable. Mr. Anderson stated that it is important to remember that NCLB does not accept out-of-level testing under state assessment requirements. Ms. Tacheny stated that the Expert Panel suggested that when the Individual Education Plans (IEPs) are developed, it should be made clear that out-of-level testing is not appropriate if a student has high school graduation as a goal. Mrs. Ichinaga suggested that fourth grade be the lowest grade for which out-of-level testing is allowed. President Hastings observed that there appeared to be a general consensus that Option 1 as presented in the agenda item was preferred (over Option 2).

No action was taken on this item.

| | | |
|---------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 11 | Testing Policies for English Learners. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|---------|--|--------------------|

Mr. Warren reported on the English learners' accommodations discussed during the Expert Panel meeting. The conclusion from that discussion is that testing in primary languages is not a viable option for California. He noted that there are not many accommodations for English learners. Primarily, the accommodations are related to testing time and setting and a glossary.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

President Hastings asked if the test administration directions are clear that the CSTs are not timed. Mr. Warren said that he believes that they are. He added that the Department is looking at what impact additional time testing will have on the CAT/6 and a proposal would be brought to the Board next month. President Hastings commented that since the CSTs are not timed, the glossary is the main accommodation for the CSTs. He inquired if the test setting accommodations would be specific to English learners. Mr. Anderson responded that potentially any student could be tested in a different setting.

Ms. Tacheny asked about the glossary and what tests it could be used on. Mr. Anderson advised it would not be used on the English-language arts test. He noted that the glossary is just a synonym dictionary. Ms. Hammer commented that flexible setting options would be helpful for the students. President Hastings emphasized that schools have always had setting flexibility and that the CSTs are untimed tests. Mr. Warren commented that he thinks districts will decide what accommodation is appropriate for students. Ms. Tacheny remarked that it is important to keep in front of us that we believe English learners can learn the standards. These students are not inhibited from learning.

No action was taken on this item.

| | | |
|---------|---|--------------------|
| ITEM 12 | Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Approval of 2003 Eligibility Criteria for Governor’s Scholars Program. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|---------|---|--------------------|

Mr. Warren reported that scholarships would be awarded based on performance on any of seven CSTs in mathematics. The Department recommendation is Option 2, which requires that students have scores on four tests—CAT/6 Reading, CAT/6 Mathematics, CST in English Language Arts, and CST in Mathematics. It is important to know that those ninth grade students who take the general mathematics test will not be awards eligible. High-achieving students can continue to take the summative math test each year to qualify for awards.

- ACTION: Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board approve Option 2 for the 2003 eligibility criteria for the Governor’s Scholars Program as presented in the agenda item. Mrs. Ichinaga seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken.

| | | |
|---------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 13 | California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Including, but not limited to, Information on the Spring Test Results. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|---------|--|--------------------|

Jan Chladek, Standards and Assessment Division, reported that the estimated cumulative passing rate for both portions of the test is 48 percent of the class of 2004. An estimated cumulative percentage of 73 percent passed the English-language arts portion of the exam and an estimated 53 percent passed the mathematics portion. First-time test takers did approximately the same this year as last year. President Hastings reported that by next July the Board would need to decide whether to keep the CAHSEE passage requirement for the 2004 cohort. He added that

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

this kind of background information will be important to have when the Board makes that decision.

No action was taken on this item.

| | | |
|---------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 14 | California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Adoption of Revised Regulations. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|---------|--|--------------------|

Ms. Chladek reported on the comments received during the public review period.

- ACTION: Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board adopt the regulations as presented in the agenda item. Ms. Lee seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken.

| | | |
|---------|---|--------------------|
| ITEM 15 | Report of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|---------|---|--------------------|

Sherry Griffith, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division, reported that the Curriculum Commission recommended that the State Board approve the adoption timeline for the next ten years to ensure all adoption statutory requirements are met. Ms. Griffith also explained the reasons for updating the frameworks, including specific statutory curriculum requirements. The primary adoption for history-social science has been scheduled for 2005. The timeline notes that all follow-up adoptions have been delayed until funding becomes available.

President Hastings noted that the problem with approving the ten-year model is that any revision would need to be approved by the Board. He suggested that the Board express general agreement with the timeline. He stated that he was concerned that many changes could occur over the next ten years and it is unfair to publishers to make it appear as if there was “a guarantee” to such a timetable. Ms. Griffith commented that the Commission would continue to bring to the State Board the 30-month adoption timelines.

Mrs. Joseph stated the monthly report has other information that is important, such as not changing the frameworks for mathematics and reading language arts except for very specific reasons, such as a statutory change.

Ms. Griffith invited the State Board to attend the dinner in November honoring outgoing Commissioners Sue Stickel, Catherine Banker, and Leslie Schwarze.

The following individual addressed the Board:
Bob Lucas, Delta Education

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
October 9-10, 2002

| | | |
|---------|---|--------|
| ITEM 16 | Implementation of the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program (AB 466, Strom-Martin), Including, but not Limited to, Approval of Training Providers and Training Curriculum. | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|

Ms. Franklin informed the Board that Board staff recommends approval of the Reading Implementation Centers as AB 466 providers.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the staff recommendations for approval of AB 466 professional development providers and training curricula. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Hammer, and Mr. Jenkins were not present when the vote was taken.

| | | |
|---------|---|--------|
| ITEM 17 | Permanent Regulations Defining “Instructional Materials...Otherwise Authorized by the State Board of Education” for purposes of the Mathematics and Reading professional Development Program, AB 466 (Chapter 737, Statutes of 2001). | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|

Ms. Franklin noted that these proposed regulations had been before the Board several times and that no comments were received during the public review period.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board adopt the proposed permanent regulations defining instructional materials otherwise authorized by the State Board of Education for purposes of AB 466. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Hammer, and Mr. Jenkins were not present when the vote was taken.

Adjournment of Day’s Session

President Hastings informed the audience that the Board would meet in Closed Session on Thursday morning at 8:00 a.m. for approximately 30 minutes. President Hastings adjourned the day’s session at 5:01 p.m.