



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for January 16, 2013**

## **AGENDA ITEM UPDATES**



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for January 16, 2013**

## **ITEM 1 ATTACHMENT 2**

### **ADDENDUM**

## ITEM ADDENDUM

**DATE:** January 15, 2013

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** Ilene Straus, Chair, State Board of Education (SBE) Screening Committee and Members

**SUBJECT:** Item 1 – SBE Priorities Item: SBE Screening Committee Recommendations for appointing members to the Advisory Commission on Special Education (ACSE).

### Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations for Committee Appointments

In compliance with *Education Code* Section 33590 (a)(1), the SBE is responsible for appointing five of the seventeen members of the ACSE. Three of the five SBE appointments must be parents of students with disabilities in either a public or private school who have received or are currently receiving special education services due to a disabling condition. One of the parents must be a representative of the charter school community.

At its July 2011 meeting, the SBE appointed two new members to the ACSE. On October 23, 2012, one member of the ACSE appointed by the SBE resigned, and on December 31, 2012, the terms of three SBE appointees to the ACSE expired.

On October 23, 2012, SBE staff posted an announcement to recruit for applicants to fill the four vacancies on the commission, including three parent representatives and one other person who may be any member of the public who is interested in state-level policy development in the area of special education.

On December 21, 2012, the Ad-Hoc SBE Screening Committee reviewed forty-eight applications and recommended thirteen for interviews and consideration by the SBE Screening Committee for appointment to the Commission. Today, the SBE Screening Committee interviewed thirteen candidates and is recommending three parents and one member of the public who is interested in state-level policy development in the area of special education for appointment to the ACSE.

**Attachment(s)**

---

Attachment 1: SBE Screening Committee Recommendations for Advisory Commission  
on Special Education (1 Page)

## **SBE Screening Committee Recommendations for Advisory Commission on Special Education**

The SBE Screening Committee recommends that the following individuals be appointed to the Advisory Commission on Special Education:

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Term</b>
1	Sara Jocham	Parent	January 16, 2013 to December 31, 2016
2	Amy Brenneman	Parent – Charter Schools	January 16, 2013 to December 31, 2015
3	Nancy Portillo	Parent – Charter School	January 16, 2013 to December 31, 2015
4	Kristi Hagans	Other - Higher Education	January 16, 2013 to December 31, 2015



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for January 16, 2013**

## **ITEM 1 ATTACHMENT 3**

### **ADDENDUM**

## ITEM ADDENDUM

**DATE:** January 15, 2013

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** Ilene Straus, Chair, State Board of Education (SBE) Screening Committee and Members

**SUBJECT:** Item 1 – SBE Priorities Item: SBE Screening Committee Recommendations for appointing members to the Title I Committee of Practitioners.

### Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations for Committee Appointments

Title I of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL107-110, Section 1903; 20 USC 6573) requires each State educational agency that receives Title I funds to create a State Committee of Practitioners to advise the State in carrying out its responsibilities under Title I. The purpose of this committee is to review any State rules and regulations relating to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in order to ensure that they conform to the purposes of Title I.

At its July 2012 meeting, the SBE approved CDE staff recommendations to change the number of members appointed to the Title I Committee of Practitioners to 13, and appointed 10 representatives, leaving three vacancies to fill, including two teacher representatives and a representative of private schools.

On October 8, 2012, SBE staff posted an announcement to recruit applicants to fill the remaining three vacancies on the Committee, and the recruitment was open through November 30, 2012. On December 20, 2012, the Ad-Hoc SBE Screening Committee reviewed applications for consideration by the SBE Screening Committee. Today, the SBE Screening Committee interviewed five candidates for appointment to the Committee and the recommendations are provided in Attachment 1.

### Attachment(s)

SBE Screening Committee Recommendations for Title I Committee of Practitioners  
(1 Page)

**SBE Screening Committee Recommendations for Title I Committee of Practitioners**

The SBE Screening Committee recommends that the following individuals be appointed to the Title I Committee of Practitioners with the following terms:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Term</b>
John Banis	Private Schools	3-Year Term
Teresa Burke	Teachers	2-Year Term
Harry Obiako	Teachers	2-Year Term



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for January 16, 2013**

**UPDATED**

**ITEM 3 ADDENDUM**

## REVISED ITEM ADDENDUM

**DATE:** January 14, 2013

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Item 3–Adoption of Modifications to the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics with California Additions.

### Summary of Key Issues

Summary report on the public hearings for the January State Board of Education item regarding the modifications to the mathematics standards.

### Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: Summary of Comments from Public Hearings on Recommended Modifications to the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics with California Additions and Model Courses for Higher Mathematics (1 page)

Attachment 2: Recommended Modifications to the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics with California Additions and Model Courses for Higher Mathematics (2 pages)

Attachment 3: Memorandum from the SBE Providing Additional Context for the Recommendations Before the SBE Regarding Implementation of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (2 pages)



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for January 16, 2013**

## **ITEM 3 ADDENDUM**

### **ATTACHMENT 1**

# SBE Agenda Item 3 Addendum Attachment 1

---

## **Summary of Comments from Public Hearings on Recommended Modifications to the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics with California Additions and Model Courses for Higher Mathematics**

Pursuant to Senate Bill 1200 (Chapter 654, Statutes of 2012) the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) and the State Board of Education (SBE) held two public hearings on the SSPI's "Recommended Modifications to the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics with California Additions and the Model Courses for Higher Mathematics."

The public hearings were held at the California Department of Education (CDE) in Sacramento on Thursday, January 3, 2013, and at the Orange County Department of Education (OCDE) in Costa Mesa on Friday, January 4, 2013. Both public hearings were recorded, and a copy of the recordings is available at the SBE office.

SBE Member Patricia Rucker represented the SBE and Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division (CFIRD) Director Tom Adams represented the SSPI at the public hearing in Sacramento. Eight individuals attended the public hearing at the CDE, and seven provided public comment. Of the seven speakers, one speaker spoke in opposition to the recommendations. The other six speakers spoke in support of the recommendations.

SBE Member Ilene Straus represented the SBE and CFIRD Director Tom Adams represented the SSPI at the public hearing at the OCDE. Instructional Quality Commission Member Ed D'Souza, Chair of the Mathematics Subject Matter Committee, also attended the hearing. Twenty-two individuals attended the public hearing at the OCDE, and six individuals provided public comment. Of the six speakers, two spoke in opposition to the recommendations. The other four speakers spoke in support of the recommendations.

In addition to oral comments made at the two public hearings, a number of written comments were received as of January 7, 2013. Copies of the written comments are available for viewing at the SBE office.

**Questions: State Board of Education | 916-319-0827**

California State Board of Education  
1430 N Street, Suite #5111  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Last Modified: Thursday, January 10, 2013



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for January 16, 2013**

## **ITEM 3 ADDENDUM**

### **ATTACHMENT 2**



**Instructional Quality Commission**  
An advisory body to the California State Board of Education

January 9, 2013

Michael Kirst, President  
California State Board of Education  
1430 N Street, Suite 5111  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear President Kirst:

**Subject:** Recommended Modifications to the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics with California Additions and Model Courses for Higher Mathematics

At its December 10, 2012, meeting, the Instructional Quality Commission (IQC) voted unanimously to support modifications to the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics with California additions and the model course outlines for higher mathematics that will simplify and consolidate the California additions, provide for both a traditional and an integrated pathway for higher mathematics, and eliminate duplicate standards. The IQC supports modifications that are consistent with the design and focus of the *Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM)*, meet the requirements of Senate Bill 1200 (Chapter 654, Statutes of 2012), and bring California closer to alignment with other Common Core states. In addition, the IQC supports higher mathematics model courses that are rigorous and will prepare our students for college, careers, and citizenship.

The IQC suggests one additional modification to a California addition in grade two: the deletion of the words "combinations of" in standard 2.MD.8. The standard is currently written as follows: "Solve word problems involving **combinations of** dollar bills, quarters, dimes, nickels, and pennies, using \$ and ¢ symbols appropriately. *Example: If you have 2 dimes and 3 pennies, how many cents do you have?*" As currently written, standard 2.MD.8. would require second-grade students to use decimal notation to which they are not formally introduced until grade four. This California addition is not consistent with the focus and coherence of the *CCSSM*.

The IQC recommends that the State Board of Education (SBE) adopt the modifications to the California additions and the outlines for the model courses in higher mathematics as posted on December 19, 2012, for the public hearings as required by SB 1200. These modifications and course outlines will be presented for action at the SBE's January 16, 2013, meeting.

Sincerely,

Bill Honig, Chair  
Instructional Quality Commission

BH:df

cc: State Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson  
Patricia Rucker, Member, State Board of Education  
Members, Instructional Quality Commission

California State Board of Education  
1430 N Street, Suite #5111  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Last Modified: Thursday, January 10, 2013



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for January 16, 2013**

## **ITEM 3 ADDENDUM**

### **ATTACHMENT 3**

**CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION**

1430 N Street, Suite 5111  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Phone: 916-319-0827  
Fax: 916-319-0175



January 11, 2012

**To:** Members of the State Board of Education (SBE)

**From:** Judy Cias, Acting Executive Director

**Re:** January 2013 SBE Agenda, Item 03

The purpose of this memo is to provide additional context for the recommendations before the SBE regarding implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for mathematics as they relate to Item 03 on the January, 2013 agenda. Specifically, this memo speaks to the requirement for the SBE to adopt a single set of standards and the need for this action to occur at the January 2013 meeting.

**Background on Adoption of Common Core Standards for Mathematics**

Senate Bill (SB) X5 1 (Steinberg, Ch. 2, Statutes of 2009) authorized the SBE to adopt academic content standards in English language arts and mathematics as proposed by the California Academic Content Standards Commission (ACSC). This law required the SBE to accept or reject the ACSC's recommendations without the ability to make any modifications to the standards as presented by the ACSC. The ACSC presented the SBE with two sets of standards for grade 8 mathematics: 1) the CCSS for grade 8 and 2) standards called "Algebra 1 at Grade 8," which are an amalgamation of 51 standards unique to California. The SBE adopted the dual set of standards as recommended.

SB 1200 (Hancock, Ch. 654, Statutes of 2012) became law on January 1, 2013, and requires the State Superintendent of Public Instruction (SSPI) to recommend to the SBE modifications of the CCSS for mathematics by March 30, 2013. This law specifies that there be only one set of standards adopted for each grade level and that the content standards for Algebra I be based on the CCSS. (The Common Core State Standards as promulgated by the Council of Chief State School Officers establish grade level standards for grades 1-8 and flexibility in course design based on mathematic subject areas for grades 9-12.)

**Adopting a Single Set of Mathematics Standards for Grade 8**

In order to meet the requirements of SB 1200, the SBE must adopt a single set of standards for each grade level in grade 1 through 8, which are aligned to the CCSS. The Instructional Quality Commission's (IQC) recommendation for an 8<sup>th</sup> grade CCSS course includes approximately one-third of the material that was previously covered in California's Algebra I standards as well as content previously covered in California's Geometry standards. The CDE will, as a part of its presentation on this item, offer a PowerPoint that identifies some of the advancement and sequencing options available under the CCSS.

There is nothing in SB 1200 or the IQC's recommended revisions to the CCSS in mathematics that prevents students from completing Algebra I in grade 8 or earlier. The proposed revisions to the standards offer a number of placement options for students, and the SBE continues to believe that student placement decisions are best made at the local level. The state has no role in this local decision process.

**Next Steps in Implementing Revisions to the CCSS in Mathematics**

Also scheduled for action at the January meeting is the evaluation criteria for instructional materials for mathematics. In order to adopt these criteria, the SBE must first adopt a single set of standards for mathematics in grade 8.

In November 2013, the SBE will hear a recommendation from the IQC for a framework that will provide guidance to schools and districts on how to implement the CCSS in mathematics. The adoption of the mathematics frameworks will serve as a blueprint for instruction and will provide suggestions for multiple pathways for students to become college and career ready. The Math Curriculum Frameworks and Evaluation Criteria Committee (CFCC) is currently discussing issues related to acceleration and remediation of mathematics instruction in grades kindergarten through 8 and will recommend to the IQC options for pathways within the framework. To date, the CFCC has discussed a number of pathways that promote long term success in mathematics and college and career readiness.



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for January 16, 2013**

## **ITEM 11 ADDENDUM**

## ITEM ADDENDUM

**DATE:** January 11, 2013

**TO:** MEMBERS, State Board of Education

**FROM:** TOM TORLAKSON, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

**SUBJECT:** Item 11 – Update on Issues Related to California’s Implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and other Federal Programs.

### Summary of Key Issues

Attached is the January 4, 2013, letter of denial of California’s June 15, 2012, waiver request to exempt California local educational agencies from certain provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

### Attachment(s)

Attachment 1: Denial of June 15, 2012, Waiver Request to Exempt California Local Educational agencies from Certain Provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (2 pages)

THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

January 4, 2013

Dr. Michael W. Kirst  
President  
California State Board of Education  
1430 N Street, Suite 5111  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Dr. Kirst:

Thank you for your June 15, 2012, letter requesting a waiver to exempt local educational agencies within California from certain provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. Specifically, you sought waivers of sections 1116(b) and (c) for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school years.

Section 9401 of the ESEA permits me to waive, with certain enumerated exceptions, any statutory or regulatory requirement of the ESEA. In deciding whether to grant such a waiver, I must determine if a State's waiver will increase academic achievement and improve the quality of instruction for students. It was with these twin goals in mind that I offered each State the opportunity to request a package of waivers of certain ESEA requirements, including most of sections 1116(b) and (c), in exchange for a rigorous and comprehensive State-developed plan designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction. To receive this flexibility, a State must have college- and career-ready expectations in reading/language arts and mathematics for all students and develop aligned assessments; develop and implement a system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support; support effective instruction and leadership through teacher and leader evaluation and support systems that include, as a significant factor, data on student growth; and reduce duplication and unnecessary burden. These principles are described in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility* (updated June 7, 2012), which is available at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility>.

For a waiver of nearly all of the requirements of ESEA sections 1116(b) and (c) to result in meeting the goals of increased academic achievement and improved quality of instruction set forth in ESEA section 9401, I believe that a State must agree and be prepared to take on the rigorous reforms required by all of the principles of ESEA flexibility in exchange for that waiver. Because California's request did not indicate that

Page 2 – Dr. Michael W. Kirst

California intended to meet that high bar, I am declining to exercise my authority to approve your waiver request.

Thank you for all that you do to support improving educational outcomes for the children of California. We look forward to continuing our partnership to meet this shared goal.

Sincerely,

/s/

Arne Duncan

cc: Honorable Tom Torlakson, Superintendent of Public Instruction



# **California State Board of Education**

**Meeting Agenda Items for January 16, 2013**

## **UPDATED ITEM W-05**



## CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

### JANUARY 2013 AGENDA

#### General Waiver

<p><b>SUBJECT</b></p> <p>Request by <b>Jamestown Elementary School District</b> to waive California <i>Education Code</i> Section 48352(a) and <i>California Code of Regulations</i> Title 5, Section 4701, to remove its school from the Open Enrollment List of “low-achieving schools” for the 2013–14 school year.</p> <p>Waiver Number: 28-10-2012</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Action</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Consent</b></p>
---	---

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval  Approval with conditions  Denial

The California Department of Education (CDE) recommends approval of one waiver request for a school on the 2013-14 Open Enrollment list (Attachment 2). This waiver is recommended for approval on the condition that the local educational agency (LEA) granted this waiver must honor any transfer requests pursuant to the Open Enrollment Act. Granting this waiver would allow the school to have their name removed from the 2013–14 Open Enrollment List as requested. This waiver does not affect the standing of any other school, as this waiver is specific to the individual school named in the attached waiver.

#### **SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

This is the first time the SBE has heard a request from an LEA to be removed from the 2013-14 Open Enrollment list.

#### **SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

The methodology used in creating the list of 1,000 lowest achieving schools, per the statute, resulted in some higher achieving schools being placed on the list while at the same time some schools with lower APIs were not included on the list. This was primarily due to the statutory provision that an LEA can have no more than 10 percent of its schools on the list.

Identification as a “low-achieving” school can have a significant educational, economic, and political impact on the school community. The label of “low-achieving” does not take into account the API scores for schools whose scores have risen or are maintained closer to the higher levels of achievement. The perception that the school is “low-achieving” may cause unwarranted flight from the school community and may

negatively impact fiscal issues.

**Because this is a general waiver, if the SBE decides to deny the waiver, it must cite one of the seven reasons in EC Section 33051(a), available at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=edc&group=33001-34000&file=33050-33053>.**

**Demographic Information:** Tuolumne County

**Authority for Waiver:** EC Section 33050

**Period of request:** July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2014

**Period of recommendation:** July 1, 2013 to June 30, 2014

**Local board approval date(s):** October 10, 2012

**Public hearing held on date(s):** October 10, 2012

**Bargaining unit(s) consulted on date(s):** Jamestown Teacher Association  
Representative: Maqueda Williams,  
consulted on September 12, 2012

**Public hearing advertised by (choose one or more):** Posted at the Tuolumne County Office of Education, Family Resource Center, post office and each school

**Advisory committee(s) consulted:** Jamestown School Site Council

### **FISCAL ANALYSIS (AS APPROPRIATE)**

---

There is no statewide fiscal impact of waiver approval or denial.

### **ATTACHMENT(S)**

---

Attachment 1: Schools Requesting a General Waiver from the 2013-14 Open Enrollment List (1 page)

Attachment 2: Jamestown Elementary School District General Waiver Request 28-10-2012 (2 pages) (Original waiver request is signed and on file in the Waiver Office)

**Schools Requesting a General Waiver from the 2013-14 Open Enrollment List**

Waiver #	County District School	2012 District Growth API	2012 School API Growth*	2012 API Target Met?	Met API Growth Targets (3 of last 5 yrs)	Meets SBE Waiver Policy (Yes/No)	Decile, Similar Schools Rank	Current PI Status	Position of Bargaining Unit/Date Consulted	Period of Request	Recommend for Approval (Yes/No)	
28-10-2012	Tuolumne Jamestown Elementary Jamestown Elementary	765	Schoolwide White SED	777 783 751	Yes Yes Yes	No	No	3, 5	Year 1	Support 09/12/2012	<b>Requested:</b> 07/1/2012 to 06/30/2014  <b>Recommended:</b> 07/01/2013 to 06/30/2014	Yes

\*Only student groups that are numerically significant are included in this column.  
SED – Socioeconomically Disadvantaged

Prepared by the California Department of Education  
Revised: 11/09/2012 02:42 PM

**California Department of Education  
WAIVER SUBMISSION**

CD Code: 5572363

Waiver Number: 28-10-2012

Active Year: 2012

Date In: 10/17/2012 4:01:58 PM

LEA Name: Jamestown Elementary School District

Address: 18299 Fifth Ave.

Jamestown, CA 95327

Fax: 209-984-0434

Start: 7/1/2012

End: 6/30/2014

Waiver Renewal: Y

Previous Waiver Number: 07-12-2010

Previous SBE Approval Date: 5/1/2011

Waiver Topic: Open Enrollment

Ed Code Title: Removal From the List of LEAs

Ed Code Section: 48352(a) and CCR Title 5 Section 4701

Ed Code Authority: 33050

Ed Code or CCR to Waive: *Education Code* 48352. For purposes of this article, the following definitions apply:

[(a) "Low-achieving school" means any school identified by the Superintendent pursuant to the following:

(1) Excluding the schools, and taking into account the impact of the criteria in paragraph (2), the Superintendent annually shall create a list of 1,000 schools ranked by increasing API with the same ratio of elementary, middle, and high schools as existed in decile 1 in the 2008-09 school year.

(2) In constructing the list of 1,000 schools each year, the Superintendent shall ensure each of the following:

(A) A local educational agency shall not have more than 10 percent of its schools on the list. However, if the number of schools in a local educational agency is not evenly divisible by 10, the Superintendent shall round up to the next whole number of schools. (B) Court, community, or community day schools shall not be included on the list.

(C) Charter schools shall not be included on t

Outcome Rationale: The desired outcome is the removal of Jamestown from the Open Enrollment List of 1,000 "Low-achieving" Schools. Jamestown has an API of 780.

Jamestown School District has successfully implemented a variety of strategies to address student achievement. Jamestown Elementary is in "Safe harbor" status and actively supports all students to meet grade level standard.

Student Population: 336

City Type: Rural

Public Hearing Date: 10/10/2012

Public Hearing Advertised: The Notice was posted at the Tuolumne County Office of Education, Family Resource Center, Post Office and each school.

Local Board Approval Date: 10/10/2012

Community Council Reviewed By: Jamestown School Site Council

Community Council Reviewed Date: 10/10/2012

Community Council Objection: N

Community Council Objection Explanation:

Audit Penalty YN: N

Categorical Program Monitoring: N

Submitted by: Ms. Diane Dotson

Position: Superintendent

E-mail: [ddotson@jamestown.k12.ca.us](mailto:ddotson@jamestown.k12.ca.us)

Telephone: 209-984-4058 x154

Bargaining Unit: Date: 09/12/2012 Name: Jamestown Teacher Association

Representative: Maqueda Williams Title: President Position: Support

Comments: