

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

Wednesday, May 29, 2002

California Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall, Room 166
Sacramento, California

Members Present

Reed Hastings, President
Joe Nuñez, Vice President
Robert J. Abernethy
Erika Goncalves
Nancy Ichinaga
Carlton J. Jenkins
Marion Joseph
Suzanne Tacheny

Members Absent

Donald Fisher
Susan Hammer
Vicki Reynolds

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 9:14 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
May 29-30, 2002

Approval of Minutes (April 2002 Meeting)

- ACTION: Mr. Abernethy moved that the State Board approve the Minutes of the April 2002 Meeting with minor corrections. Ms. Goncalves seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Jenkins was not present when the vote was taken.

Announcements

President Hastings informed the audience that the seminar presentation would begin at 3:00 p.m. to accommodate the presenters' schedules.

President Hastings announced the following items had been withdrawn:

- Item 27 was withdrawn.
- Item 39 was withdrawn at the petitioner's request.
- Waiver W-1 was withdrawn by the requesting district.
- Waiver W-6 was withdrawn because the passage of SB 508 eliminated the need for the waiver.

President Hastings announced the following items would be heard out of order:

- Item 19, Reading First, would be heard at approximately 10:00 a.m. so the federal deadline for submission could be met.
- Item 20, the State Consolidated Application under the No Child Left Behind Act, would be heard after Items 21 and 22.

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; establishment of direction regarding contracts and requests for proposals as necessary for the state assessment and accountability system; and other matters of interest.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	-----------------------

State Budget

Mr. Abernethy requested that the State Board President explore ways in which the State Board might use its authority to help contribute to the realization of savings to the state in recognition of the severe budget crisis now confronting us. He suggested looking at programs in light of our goals and purposes.

NCS Scoring Center

Ms. Tacheny reported she had visited the NCS Scoring Center and found it fascinating. She was impressed by the magnitude of scoring they undertake. She added that the information she gained by seeing the center would be useful in making decisions related to the contract and scope of work.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

New Board Staff Member

President Hastings welcomed Karen Steentofte, the new education policy consultant to the Board. She joined the Board staff at the beginning of May and immediately began working on the Reading First application. She has already done great work. Prior to joining the Board staff, Ms. Steentofte worked for the Department's Education Technology Office.

June Seminar

President Hastings informed that Board that the seminar in June would be on charter school accountability, including national trends and thinking.

California Distinguished Schools Awards

President Hastings thanked Ms. Goncalves for representing the Board at the California Distinguished School Awards ceremony. Superintendent Eastin added that Ms. Goncalves stayed through the entire awards ceremony and smiled throughout.

New Building

President Hastings announced that the Board office would be moving to the new Department of Education building in August. The new building is located at 15th and N Streets. The September Board meeting will be the first in the new location.

No action was taken on this item.

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 individual addressed the Board:
Alan Bonsteel

ITEM 3	Recommendations for grant awards under the High-Tech High Schools Grant Program, AB 620 (Wayne).	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	-----------------------

Nancy Sullivan, Education Technology Office, explained the competitive grant process. A panel of reviewers was appointed by the Superintendent and the Office of the Secretary for Education. The panel recommended approval of five grants for \$1.2 million. The Superintendent's recommendation is the same as the panel's.

Mrs. Joseph requested that the postponed education technology seminar be rescheduled. The seminar will focus on what currently exists in technology, what it is, and how it serves the students. President Hastings replied that it was scheduled for September.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the State Superintendent’s recommendation for the funding of five one-time grants for the purpose of establishing high-tech high schools. Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Jenkins was not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 4	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, 2003 Scope of Work for Educational Testing Service (ETS).	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Deputy Superintendent Warren discussed the options in the Scope of Work for the Board to consider. [Attachment 1, 2003 Scope of Work for Educational Testing Service.] He noted that the CAT-6 comes in parts in English-language arts (ELA) with approximately 20 questions per subtest. What will need to be determined for purposes of contract negotiations is what subtests will be used in STAR. Mr. Warren suggested that for contract negotiations purposes, we should assume that all subtests would be used. This will allow time for a Content Review Panel (CRP) review and give us more information. Mrs. Joseph stated that Mr. Warren’s suggestion on the ELA CRP review was a good one. President Hastings asked if a motion was needed. Mr. Warren replied that he needed to know there was agreement with this approach. President Hastings indicated that there was such agreement.

Mr. Warren recommended using the abbreviated survey science tests because 25 questions are enough for school level data. President Hastings asked if a science CRP review of this issue was planned for June. Phil Spears, Standards and Assessment Division, responded that timing in science is not as critical as it is for English-language arts. Mr. Hastings commented that he thought decision needed to be made in June. Mr. Spears suggested a review by the science CRP similar to the one planned for English-language arts. He added that a decision in September would be timely. President Hastings stated that the question is whether we want the CRP to meet earlier than July. He added that we sometimes think we can decide policy questions later, but then issues arise and we have to make an earlier decision without the benefit of a full discussion.

Mr. Warren agreed to try to schedule a science CRP review before June. For English-language arts, the CRP really needs a week to review the tests. Mrs. Joseph inquired whether the State Board’s decision could be held off until September. If not, then the CRP has to meet before June.

Ms. Belisle commented that for purposes of augmenting of the English-language arts test it is critical to know what is on the NRT. She added that she understands it is difficult to get the CRP together quickly, but we need to have this information to make a decision in June. Mr. Spears responded that for contracting purposes, we are assuming the use of the full test in English-language arts. The CRP will meet in July to review items and blueprints and to consider whether all subtests should be used.

Mrs. Joseph asked Ms. Belisle to comment. Ms. Belisle responded that the only augmented test in the system is the English-language arts tests, and we would need to know what the NRT looks like to form the CST. This information is needed before September. Mr. Warren stated that he thinks we can move forward. There are many policy decisions to be made.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

President Hastings recommended that having promised a seamless transition, the Department work with the CRPs to get as much information as possible to the Board in June. Mr. Spears noted that ETS does not have a contract, so we will need to find another way to pay for CRP to meet. Superintendent Eastin stated that the CAT-6 will not be longer than the SAT-9. She added that we are working to reduce testing time and redundancy.

Mr. Warren referred to the groups of options. The options are grouped as no cost, top priority; second priority; and not recommended. He drew the Board's attention to two options that were developed in response to requests from the field. Option 17.2 is for answer documents for grades 9 through 11 that can be separated. Option 21.5 is for electronic return of student scores to schools.

Ms. Tacheny reported that the Department had met with the testing liaisons and re-ordered the priority of the options. In general, she and Mrs. Joseph are in agreement with the options as proposed.

Mr. Warren pointed out that 11th grade English-language arts writing test is on the “not recommended” list and requested the Board’s guidance. Ms. Tacheny responded that after much discussion, it appears that the Golden State Exam (GSE) is the place for this test writing test, which is intended to provide placement information to the California State University (CSU) system. Superintendent Eastin commented that the Department has been working with CSU, which is moving toward accepting the GSE for placement. It would be much more cost effective that way.

President Hastings stated his support for the release of items, but noted that releasing the CST items is very costly. He asked for an explanation of front-loading of costs for releasing items. Mr. Warren commented that the cost is for more than releasing items; it is also for district item analyses and includes developing teacher and parent materials.

President Hastings asked why there was no estimate of work related to Scholarshare awards. Mr. Warren responded that the Department has no estimate from the contractor yet. The Department expects to have a price estimate shortly.

Ms. Tacheny remarked that the staff work on this item was “awesome.” The write-up and options are very clearly presented for policy decisions. Ms. Tacheny asked for the addition of milestones. As to the improvements to parent and teacher reporting, the State Board wants this done. She added that she understands that the focus is on teacher reports this year and then parent reports. She stated that this was a deal breaker issue for her and that she needs clearer delineation on the budget worksheet when it comes back in June. Mr. Warren stated that he would appreciate input from Ms. Tacheny. Mr. Spears noted that the contractor is acutely aware that parent reports are important to the State Board.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 19	California’s Reading First Application.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

President Hastings welcomed Education Secretary Kerry Mazzoni. He noted that Secretary Mazzoni had taken a leadership role in the development of the Reading First plan. [Attachment 2, California's Reading First Application, and Attachment 3, Errata Sheet for California's Reading First Application.] If the State Board approves California's Reading First application today, we will meet the federal deadline of this afternoon to start the process so that \$133 million can flow into California.

Secretary Mazzoni acknowledged the monumental efforts of Alice Furry, Karen Steentofte, and the State Board staff and their dedication in meeting this deadline. Ms. Mazzoni explained that the Reading First program is the implementation of research-based reading instruction. Our State's work, from adopting English-language arts standards in 1997 to adopting reading-language arts/English language development instructional materials in 2002, is impressive and is the basis for the Reading First plan. The Governor, the State Board, and the Superintendent developed the plan. She urged the State Board to move this plan forward with necessary technical corrections. Secretary Mazzoni expressed special appreciation for the Reading First Leadership Committee.

Superintendent Eastin suggested amendments to the plan. [Attachment 4, Superintendent's Letter to the State Board.] She stated that she wants to allow districts to continue down the path they are on, especially II/USP schools, by including state adopted programs from the previous adoptions. She expressed concerns about the number of application dates in the timeline because of a lack of Department staff to administer the reviews. She suggested that November 1 be the first application date to provide time for teacher input in the development of school applications. She also recommended expanding the professional development for this program beyond AB 75 and AB 466 and to involve the county offices more.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Rosalyn Turnbull, California PTA

Jacki Fox Ruby, California Federation of Teachers

Susan Liberati, Association of California School Administrators

Patricia Rucker, California Teachers Association

Holly Jacobson, California School Board Association

Glen Thomas, California County Superintendents Educational Services Association

President Hastings noted that Board approval at this meeting sets up a timeline to have \$133 million available by July 1. He noted that the dollars can only begin to come into districts when the districts submit their applications. The plan calls for six rolling application deadlines from September to June. Districts that are ready to go can apply now to make the September 1 deadline. The reason for the six application dates is to give flexibility to districts and get the money flowing into districts. President Hastings suggested that given the Superintendent's concerns about workload, we have fewer than six dates for submission over the September through June interval. Superintendent Eastin suggested September 30 as the first date and then the fourth and sixth dates on the timeline.

Mrs. Joseph informed the Board that Reading First is a competitive grant, not an entitlement, with very specific requirements that must be met. The Department of Finance letter asked that we not go astray and implement new programs but build on the programs currently in place. Mrs. Joseph further noted

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

that not all districts qualify for this funding, which is for schools with the greatest percentage of children scoring below basic and far below basic.

President Hastings asked if fewer deadlines would be acceptable to the Board Members. Mrs. Joseph stated that the September 1st date must be kept because some schools are ready to apply now. She added that fewer rounds of submissions are acceptable if Department staffing is an issue. Mr. Nuñez concurred, stating that many schools are ready to apply now and, therefore, the September 1st date should be maintained. President Hastings stated that there was consensus to keep the first, fourth, and sixth application dates. He noted that the next issue to discuss is the AB 2519 adoption.

Mrs. Joseph noted that she is the only Board member present who was serving at the time of the AB 2519 adoption. She informed the Board of the history of the AB 2519 adoption, which was an unusual kind of adoption of materials to fill in the gap. Some of the AB 2519 materials are not that great. This adoption was before the framework and not all the materials would meet the Reading First criteria. Since that adoption, we have had the framework and a research-based adoption. Generally, the 2002 adoption had better instructional materials. Governor Davis put \$150 million in the budget for purchasing of new materials. Reading First would also help with the purchase of newly adopted materials. If our application does not meet the federal requirements, we will not get the \$133 million. Superintendent Eastin stated it was not fair and not good fiscal or educational policy to require districts that are using AB 2519 materials to buy new materials. The AB 2519 materials are standards-based.

Mr. Nuñez commented that all schools and districts must comply with the law. For AB 75 and AB 466, districts must have the newly adopted instructional materials. If Reading First is a catalyst for districts to purchase those materials, that is a positive effect. He also noted the II/USP external evaluators have not brought the results we expected. This is a competitive grant. Not all schools will qualify. The Reading First program will reach the lowest performing schools. He stated that he thinks the plan is on the right track. Ms. Tacheny expressed concern that districts do not have the funding to purchase new materials. Mrs. Joseph responded that there is \$150 million in the budget for instructional materials and Reading First funding could be used to purchase materials. This is a six-year program and districts do not need to purchase the materials right now. It is not just about whether the instructional materials are standards-based; we have the framework now and the 2002 adoption criteria, which are outstanding and go beyond requiring materials to be standards based.

- **ACTION:** Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board of Education, as the designated State Education Agency for the Reading First Program, authorize the submittal of the California Reading First Application, as amended by the Errata Sheet presented by staff and including an additional amendment agreed to at the meeting under which there would be three (instead of six) rounds of consideration of local applications, specifically the first, fourth, and sixth rounds as indicated in the document as presented to the State Board, immediately to the United States Department of Education to obtain approval and funding for California's Reading First Program by July 1, 2002. Mrs. Ichinaga seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0-2. Ms. Goncalves and Mr. Jenkins did not vote on the motion.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

Mr. Jenkins stated that he wants to be certain that schools have the time to transition from AB 2519 to the newly adopted materials and that those schools with AB 2519 materials would not be precluded from participating in Reading First in future years. President Hastings commented that schools that do not apply this year could do so in future years when they have the instructional materials.

Mrs. Joseph remarked that Reading First does not establish any new policy for California. Adoption of researched-based instructional materials is already in place. AB 466 and AB 75 already exist. Having these things in place allows us to apply for Reading First. She added that it is important to note that the districts decide which schools participate.

Superintendent Eastin made two points. First, AB 2519 is a state adopted list that goes to the year 2005. Second, the II/USP program happens to be the Governor's most important reform and it does not advance the cause of improving the lowest performing schools if Reading First undermines II/USP.

ITEM 5	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Amending 2002 Contract with Harcourt Education Measurement.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Mr. Spears discussed the revision of the Harcourt 2002 scope of work. He stated that Board staff has requested additional information on the \$100,000 part of this proposed change in the scope of work. He said that he will bring more detailed information for the Board's decision in June.

Ms. Belisle suggested that the Department of Finance staff be included in all conversations regarding this amendment to the scope of work. Mr. Spears agreed that Finance would be included at the onset.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 6	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Blueprints for School District, Teachers, and the Public.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Mr. Spears explained that the issue regarding the blueprints is what type of information should be provided to the public on the blueprints.

Bob Anderson, Standards and Assessment Division, reported that the timing is such that the Board can make this decision in June. The Department is still seeking information from ETS and the testing experts panel. Mr. Anderson presented three potential blueprint options. The current blueprint provides the number of items in a strand and checkmarks to indicate if the standard is tested. The second option identifies standards assessed every year and those that are rotated. The third option identifies the cognitive level of the items. Mr. Anderson noted that the Department has already received comments from the field. The blueprints will be brought back to the Board in June.

Ms. Tacheny expressed her excitement about developing a plan for item rotation. She commented that she has concerns about communicating too much information to the field. She does not want to create

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

an incentive for teaching to the test items and is in favor of giving more general information. President Hastings clarified that for those standards that are marked as rotation items, the year for rotation is not reported.

Mrs. Joseph stated that she has serious concerns similar to Ms. Tacheny's and asked for more information as well as input from the CRPs. She noted that the essential standards were not identified in English-language arts, although they were identified in the frameworks for math and science. Superintendent Eastin responded that as a practical matter, the Department is trying to level the playing field for all schools and all districts. She added that she wants to make sure that every district understands what is going to be tested every year.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 7	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Approval of Revised STAR Integrated Science Blueprints.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Mr. Spears reported that when performance standards (levels) for the science tests were established for API purposes, the Board made a decision not to set performance standards (levels) for integrated science tests. The Department's efforts to address the integrated science issue have been on behalf of integrated science programs and to bring information to the Board. Those efforts resulted in this proposed blueprint for integrated science. Teachers who work in integrated science were invited to review three options: 1) the current format of four integrated tests; 2) two-integrated science tests using as a base the two most commonly administered integrated tests, and 3) altering the format to include a first year test that assesses fundamental concepts and skills and three subsequent year tests with focuses in chemistry, physics and biology. [Attachment 5, Revised STAR Integrated Science Blueprints.] Mr. Spears noted that there has been an increase in number of students taking science tests this year.

President Hastings noted that under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act the state is required to have a science test that all students must take. The test cannot be an end-of-course test, which is what we currently have.

Mrs. Joseph expressed concern that the CRP has not reviewed these blueprints.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

- Karen M. Carroll, integrated science teacher, Huntington Beach UHSD
- Dean Gilbert, science consultant, Los Angeles USD
- Ken Walkins, science teacher, Travis USD
- Marian Murphy Shaw, science consultant, Siskiyou COE
- Susan Liberati, Association of California School Administrators
- Geno Flores, Long Beach USD

No action was taken on this item.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

Lunch Break: President Hastings called for the lunch break at 12:23 p.m. He informed the audience that discussion on the integrated science tests would continue after lunch. He reconvened the meeting at 1:16 p.m.

To frame the discussion, President Hastings reported that approximately 20-25 percent of students are taking integrated science courses. There are as many approaches to integrated science as there are high schools. The core tension is that unlike integrated math, where there are two curricula, integrated science courses have many programs. We have coming up a decision on the scope of work for ETS. It would be helpful, but not essential, for the Board to give direction on the integrated science tests for the scope of work.

Mr. Nuñez stated that it was frustrating that more speakers did not comment on the options presented by the Department, as opposed to the importance of integrated science. He inquired if there was a deadline for a Board decision on this issue. Mr. Spears responded there is not an immediate need for a decision; what the Department has presented is a starting point. President Hastings noted the deeper issue is how do we develop an end-of-course test for a subject that has no common program.

Mr. Abernethy remarked that there were five things he wanted to address:

- 1) Integrated science as a field of study: There is no field of integrated science. There are no college programs in integrated science and no professors with degrees in integrated science.
- 2) Curriculum: There is no generally accepted curriculum. Nor is there a framework to align textbooks or a test to. Integrated science is a survey course; and in many cases, it is watered down.
- 3) Test results: The percentage of correct answers is higher for students taking traditional science courses than for students taking integrated science courses.
- 4) Opportunity: Given the way the University of California and the California State University operate, an integrated science course often denies the student an opportunity to take a course to prepare for college.
- 5) Budget: These are austere times and we should not be funding the development and administration of this test.

Ms. Tacheny thanked the speakers. She commented that she is unsure of her position on the options. Testing is an essential ingredient for accountability and evaluation. If we stop testing it, people will still teach it; therefore, it should be tested for the data. Ms. Tacheny stated she is not comfortable with bringing the group together to create a blueprint that will change curriculum. She added that she appreciates having time to discuss the issue and hear comments.

Superintendent Eastin stated it is not true that the lowest-performing schools and lowest-performing students have integrated science. We have a tradition of local control. Many leading high schools offer, and many high-performing students take, integrated science.

Mr. Abernethy stated that to have integrated science tests, we need to develop a framework to guide publishers and to create the tests. To the extent we want to continue integrated science, we should pull

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

together a team to develop a framework, which is quite an undertaking. Mrs. Joseph clarified that the items on integrated science test are the same items used on the other science tests. In many cases, integrated science is used for students that have a harder time. That is a problem. She agreed with Mr. Abernethy that we need something to which to anchor the test items.

President Hastings stated that as a parallel, in integrated math community, there was a kind of consensus on curriculum. That has not happened in integrated science. He suggested not testing until the integrated science community comes to a consensus on what the alternative course would be. We do not want to have the Department staff spend time trying to develop blueprints. If we do not test integrated science, it would be leverage on the integrated science community to come together. Mr. Nuñez noted that he heard speakers say that integrated science is a way to generate excitement about science and to bring more students into science.

Superintendent Easting stated that, as a practical matter, unless the Department or someone brings people together, the work would not get done. Mr. Spears commented that the concept President Hastings presented is what the Department tried to do on a smaller scale. He agreed with the Superintendent that the Department must have a leadership role. We need to be careful to be clear about what we want done.

Christine Bertrand said that the California Science Teachers Association stands ready to assist with this effort but would need assistance from Department staff. She stated that she prefers to continue with the current test while refining the blueprint.

Mr. Abernethy stated that a number of students who take integrated science decreases from the first year to the third year. He is concerned about students who get one or two years of integrated science and do not receive an in-depth science education. Mrs. Joseph pointed out that when integrated mathematics was agreed to, the math CRP and framework developers worked together. If we do this work for integrated science, we need the CRPs and people who worked on the science frameworks to be involved. President Hastings observed that in June, the Board will have at least three choices: continue the same test, stop testing, or develop a different test. Ms. Tacheny said that she likes the direction of having the integrated science community take responsibility.

Superintendent Eastin stated she will try to come back with an option like Option 3 that will include the CRP and Curriculum Commission.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 8	California English Language Development Test (CELDT): Including, but not limited to, Results of the 2001 Administration.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Mr. Spears provided information on the preliminary results of the CELDT test 2001 administration.

President Hasting stated that the results indicate that we are making progress with English learner students. He noted that approximately 25 percent to test takers scored at the advanced or early advanced

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

levels. At these levels, students should be considered for reclassification. The current reclassification rate is around nine percent. He added that most students at advanced or early advanced levels are in English-language classrooms.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 9	California English Language Development Test (CELDT): Request for Proposals (RFP) Document for the Selection of a Contractor.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Mr. Spears remarked that most often the State Board staff's input on an RFP does improve the RFP. Today there are two RFPs before the Board. In the CELDT RFP, there is a proposal for a computer-based testing pilot, an external auditor, and changes in the storytelling and essay components.

Ms. Belisle requested a couple of technical changes, some related to alternate assessment and the two-day session they have planned. Another issue is the computer-based testing pilot. Any pilot should be on the new version of the test.

President Hastings asked why the CELDT was selected for the pilot and why it would be the right vehicle for a computer-based testing pilot. Mr. Spears responded that this just a way to look at other options. President Hastings commented that it seems like the High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) is a more likely place to do this pilot. Young children who may not be comfortable with computers generally take the CELDT. The CAHSEE is administered to 10th graders who have generally had more experience with computers. Ms. Tacheny stated that if the computer-based test would not help with the oral part of the test, she does not think the CELDT is the test on which to do this pilot. Superintendent Eastin commented that the computer-based testing could save the districts money.

President Hastings noted that it is probably better to begin with older students, perhaps on the Golden State Exam (GSE). Mr. Warren advised that this pilot would not be a requirement for districts. Ms. Tacheny stated that she strongly agrees with President Hastings. She remarked that she wants the computer-based testing pilot to be effective, so we need to look at where it makes the most sense. Mr. Nuñez stated that it seems to be a distracting issue in this program.

- ACTION: Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board approve the draft Request for Proposals for the selection of a California English Language Development Test contractor with (1) inclusion of the changes recommended by the State Board's Chief Counsel and (2) exclusion of the proposed provisions pertaining to computer based assessment. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Ms. Goncalves and Mrs. Joseph were not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 10	California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Including, but not limited to, an Update and Status Report.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Jan Chladek, Standards and Assessment Division, presented an update on the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE). She reported the preliminary results of the March administration. The districts

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

have not reviewed the data, some of which we already know is incorrect. The May test administration is currently being scored. Ms. Chladek stated the number of students who took the test for the second time and passed could not be estimated. Not having individual student data and mobility are the main problems in obtaining that information. She said that she will provide additional data at the September Board meeting.

President Hastings commented that the results are encouraging.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 11	Golden State Examination (GSE): Including, but not limited to, Request for Proposals (RFP) Document for the Selection of a Contractor.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	-----------------------

Mr. Spears informed the Board that the RFP had been developed with input from Board staff, assessment staff, and the contract's office.

Ms. Belisle commented she was fine with the RFP, noting that the Department had incorporated her suggestions. She added that a few technical changes may still be needed.

President Hastings thanked all staff who worked hard to develop the document.

- ACTION: Mr. Abernethy moved that the State Board approve the draft Request for Proposals for the selection of a Golden State Examination contractor with the inclusion of any technical amendments as may be necessary following final review of the document by the State Board Chief Counsel. Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Ms. Goncalves was not present when the vote was taken.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

ITEM 12	Establishment of an advisory body to the State Board of Education to provide guidance and advice on the State Board’s responsibilities with respect to the state assessment system.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Ms. Belisle noted that at the staff level there had been discussion about ways to help Mr. Brandsma get "up to speed" on assessment issues and also to address Ms. Tacheny’s interest that districts have a way to give input. Ms. Belisle said that staff would continue to work on the concept.

The following individual addressed the Board:
Tony Wold, teacher, Rowland High School

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 13	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.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Ms. Franklin stated that State Board staff recommended three actions. The first two recommended actions, approving AB 466 training providers and training curriculum and directing staff to implement a conditional approval process, are included in the memorandum. [Attachment 6, Memo from D. Franklin.] The third recommended action is approval of local education agencies' funding applications, which are assurance forms from the LEAs, as recommended by Department staff [Attachment 7, AB 466 Past Training Reimbursement.].

Bill Vasey, Professional Development and Curriculum Support Division, reported that the University of California's Professional Development Institutes had not provided information about which trainings were materials-based trainings. To remedy this lack of information, local educational agencies will need to sign another district assurance stating that the training their teachers received was materials-based.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve (1) reimbursement of local education agencies for past training under the provisions of AB 466 in accordance with the recommendation of CDE staff; (2) the list of training providers and training curricula for the purposes of providing mathematics and reading professional development under applicable provisions of AB 466 in accordance with the recommendation of State Board staff; and (3) a process to be implemented by staff for bringing to the State Board at the June 2002 meeting those AB 466 training providers and training curricula recommended for conditional approval as well as for unconditional approval. Conditional approval shall include the subsequent review of modifications by a subcommittee of reviewers who shall make a recommendation to the Executive Director of the State Board. Upon certification by the Executive Director that the specified conditions have been satisfied, any affected training provider and training curriculum will be listed as approved to provide AB 466 professional development. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Ms. Goncalves was not present when the vote was taken.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

ITEM 14	AB 466 Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program Proposed Emergency Regulations and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Related to "Otherwise Authorized" Instructional Materials.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Ms. Steentofte noted that the Board staff had hoped to be able to develop a list of otherwise authorized instructional materials without regulations. In discussions between Board and Department staffs, it became clear that regulations were needed. [Attachment 8, Emergency Statement, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, and Initial Statement of Reasons.] Ms. Steentofte suggested technical changes to the proposed emergency regulations drafted by Department staff.

Sherry Griffith, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division, noted that the Department concurred with the suggested changes in the regulations. She added that she appreciated Board staff working with Department staff to ensure that provisions related to materials for English learners were included in the proposed regulations. [Attachment 9, Background Material for Discussion on AB 466 Emergency Regulations.] Superintendent Eastin thanked staff for addressing the issue of materials for English learners.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board:
 - (1) Approve the proposed Emergency Regulations with the modifications presented by State Board staff pertaining to (a) addressing the needs of English learners through a specially designed component of instructional materials and (b) date of purchase.
 - (2) Direct that an appropriate notice of proposed rulemaking be filed with the text of the Emergency Regulations as the proposed text for permanent regulations in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act. The public hearing on the permanent regulations is anticipated to be held at the September 2002 meeting.

Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Abernethy and Ms. Goncalves were not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 15	Approval of Training Providers for AB 75, The Principal Training Program.	ACTION
---------	---	--------

Mr. Vasey stated he had no AB 75 training providers to recommend for the Board's approval at this meeting. He added that he expects to have providers to recommend at the next meeting.

President Hastings stated that the State Board is eager to get the program in place. He asked if potential providers that were not recommended for approval could make changes and resubmit their applications. Mr. Vasey responded that the Department staff had contacted the potential providers and informed them of which criteria they had not met. Many of the potential providers indicated they would make the

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

changes and resubmit their applications. Mr. Vasey added that Department staff and the reviewers take the Board's criteria for approval very seriously.

Ms. Franklin noted that the Board staff was recommending two actions, as outlined in the memorandum. [Attachment 10, Memo from D. Franklin.] She added that both recommendations address the issue of capacity.

- ACTION: Mrs. Ichinaga moved that the State Board:
 - (1) Approve a process to be implemented by staff for bringing to the State Board at the June 2002 meeting those AB 75 training providers and training curricula recommended for conditional approval as well as for unconditional approval. Conditional approval shall include the subsequent review of modifications by a subcommittee of reviewers who shall make a recommendation to the Executive Director of the State Board. Upon certification by the Executive Director that the specified conditions have been satisfied, any affected training provider and training curriculum will be listed as approved to provide AB 75 principal training.
 - (2) Authorize State Board-approved AB 466 training providers to be approved providers of the AB 75 Module 1 Follow-Up Practicum only.

Mrs. Joseph seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Abernethy and Ms. Goncalves were not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 16	Approval of Local Educational Agencies (LEA) program funding for AB 75, The Principal Training Program.	ACTION
---------	---	--------

Mr. Vasey informed the Board that the total funding requested by the districts included in the recommended list of LEAs is \$22 million. He noted that the actual funding that each LEA receives will be determined by the amount of funding available and the number of principals and vice principals trained.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the funding of local education agencies (LEAs) under the provisions of AB 75 in accordance with the listing presented by CDE staff, subject to the satisfaction of any applicable conditions with respect to that funding by individual LEAs. Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Abernethy and Ms. Goncalves were not present when the vote was taken.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
May 29-30, 2002

ITEM 17	Report of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Curriculum Commission Chair Sue Stickel noted that the Curriculum Commission is requesting action on one item. The Commission recommends that the Board approve the scheduling of the mathematics follow-up adoption in 2004.

Superintendent Eastin thanked Ms. Stickel for her many, many hours of hard work. She also thanked Elk Grove Superintendent Dave Gordon and the district board for graciously allowing Ms. Stickel to do this work.

- **ACTION:** Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board approve the Curriculum Commission’s recommendation pertaining to the scheduling of a follow-up mathematics adoption in 2004. Mrs. Joseph seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Abernethy and Ms. Goncalves were not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 23	Seminar Session: Ethics Orientation for State Officials	INFORMATION
---------	---	-------------

Before introducing the seminar presenters, President Hastings informed the audience that Items 18 and 20 through 22 would be heard on Thursday. He added that there would not be a Closed Session, so the Public Session would begin at 8:00 a.m.

President Hastings introduced Ted Prim, Deputy Attorney General, and Natalie Bocanegra, Staff Counsel for the Fair Political Practices Commission. Mr. Prim specializes in the areas of conflicts of interest, open meeting laws, and public records. Ms. Bocanegra primarily works in the area of conflicts of interest and other areas governed by the Political Reform Act.

Mr. Prim and Ms. Bocanegra provided the state-required ethics training for the Board and Board staff.

President Hastings thanked Mr. Prim and Ms. Bocanegra for their presentations.

Adjournment of Day’s Session: President Hastings adjourned the day's session at 4:45 p.m.