FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
January 9-10, 2002

Wednesday, January 9, 2002

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

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

Members Absent
Don Fisher
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
John B. Mockler, 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
Camille Esch, Education Policy Consultant, State Board of Education
Deborah Franklin, 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 9:02 a.m.

Salute to the Flag
Ms. Tacheny led the Board, staff, and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
January 9-10, 2002

Approval of Minutes (December 2001 Meeting)

- ACTION: Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board approve the Minutes of the December 2001 Meeting with minor corrections. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Abernethy and Mrs. Ichinaga were not present when the vote was taken.

Announcements/Communications
President Hastings informed the audience that the presentation of the Teacher of the Year awards would begin at approximately 11:30 a.m. and that the Board would break for lunch after the awards presentation. He noted that the United States Senate Youth Program Awards (Item 8), originally scheduled for January, would be presented in February.

President Hastings announced that the Screening Committee would meet during the lunch break in the Executive Conference Room (Room 524) to interview candidates for appointment to the Advisory Commission on Special Education.

Report of Superintendent
There was no report from Superintendent Eastin this month. Superintendent Eastin was in Washington, D.C., for events related to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

ITEM 1	STATE BOARD PROJECTS. Including future meeting plans; agenda items; State Board office budget, staffing, staff 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; election of officers; and other matters of interest.	INFORMATION ACTION

President Hastings informed the Board and the audience that the election of the 2002 officers would be the first business considered under this item. He explained that Chief Deputy Superintendent Hill would be presiding for this portion of the meeting. Mr. Hill called for modifications and additions to the nominations made at the December meeting. Ms. Hammer noted that in December she and Ms. Reynolds had nominated one another for the office of vice president and that both she and Ms. Reynolds had declined.

Ms. Tacheny thanked Ms. Hammer for her outstanding service as vice president. Ms. Tacheny added that she had personally learned a lot about leadership from Ms. Hammer. Ms. Tacheny nominated Mr. Nuñez for the office of vice president; Ms. Hammer seconded the nomination.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board elect Reed Hastings to the Office of President for 2002 and Joe Nuñez to the Office of Vice President for 2002. Ms. Hammer seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Abernethy and Mrs. Ichinaga were not present when the vote was taken.

February Meeting Highlights
President Hastings noted that some of the major issues on the February agenda include:

- The adoption of the model curriculum on the life and work of César Chávez
- A seminar presentation on the arts in our schools

ITEM 2	PUBLIC COMMENT. Public Comment is invited on any matter not 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:

Marilyn Langlois, California Coalition for Authentic Reform in Education
Bob Lucas, Delta Education
David Patterson, California Network of Educational Charters
Jacki Fox Ruby, California Federation of Teachers

In response to issues raised by Mr. Lucas regarding possible waivers for non-adopted instructional materials, Ms. Hammer asked that the issue be placed on a future agenda, possibly as soon as February. Mr. Mockler noted that how the Board would address the issue of instructional materials waivers depends in large part on the budget. He explained that since Governor Davis would be presenting the budget the next day, February would be too early for an informed discussion. He added that the Board needs to look at all funding for instructional materials in Governor Davis' budget when it considers a waiver policy.

ITEM 3	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Proposed California Long-Term Plan.	INFORMATION ACTION

Paul Warren, Deputy Superintendent, presented a revised proposed plan for the STAR program. This plan would be a three-year plan. [Attachment 1] Mr. Warren walked the Board through the differences between the revised plan and the plan that was presented in the original agenda materials. He noted one difference is that the science test in grade five would be field tested in 2003, not administered in 2003. In the revised proposed plan, the grade five science test would first be administered in 2004. However, fifth grade students will see science questions on the 2003 test because of the field testing. He noted that the discussion on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) is general in nature and that the CELDT would be discussed more specifically under Item 7. Mr. Warren drew the Board's attention to the seven bullets on the last page, which are common issues for all tests.

Mrs. Joseph suggested the Board begin by looking at the document on policy issues that was developed after the testing liaisons met with the Board and Department staffs. [Attachment 2] Ms. Tacheny stated the policy issues outlined in the document are significant and warrant discussion by the entire Board.

STAR English-Language Arts CST/NRT Augmented Format and Test Security
Regarding the issue of whether to have a stand-alone California Standards Test (CST) in English-language arts and shorter form of the norm-referenced test (NRT), Ms. Tacheny commented that her concern was that virtually all diagnostic information from the NRT would be lost by using the short form of NRT. Mr. Mockler stated that the old STAR law called for an NRT with a standards-based augmentation. Current law, SB 233, calls for more focus on standards-based tests. It asks the Board to look at the feasibility of using a short form of the NRT. Governor Davis believes that English-language arts is so important to all the other core academic subjects that we need three years of data to help inform this decision, which SB 233 calls for by 2005. Mrs. Joseph noted that another policy issue tied to this discussion of the NRT is test security. Mr. Warren stated that the Department's view is that SB 233 leaves to the Board the decision of when to transition to a short NRT. He added that the proposed three-year was plan developed on that basis. He agreed that test security is tied to this issue and noted that the release of items on NRT would be a significant change for test publishers.

President Hastings commented that in math there are stand-alone tests and that he would like to understand why we are comfortable with those tests and how English-language arts is similar and different. Mrs. Joseph replied that the issue was alignment to standards. The math NRT did not cover our standards. In English-language arts, the NRT was more aligned to our standards. She stated that the Board needs more information on the question of how much diagnostic information we would lose if we went to a short NRT. She added that there would have to be a reason to make a change.

Mr. Hill stated that the policy question is this: how important it is to have a basic skills test in addition to the standards-based test? We will not know that until we have had the new NRT for several years. He added that the Department probably needs to draft some very specific tasks and timelines for the critical decision points for the Board.

Ms. Hammer commented that she reads the language in SB 233 as very permissive and that the Board has lots of flexibility. Mr. Warren responded that the Department interrupts the law as meaning we will have a short NRT. President Hastings stated that there are different interruptions of the legislation, as well as different points of view on whether a shorter NRT is a good thing. Two years from now we will have more information than we do now. Mrs. Joseph agreed with Mr. Hill that until we have the new test and know about its properties, this is an open issue that should not be in the three-year plan.

Ms. Belisle stated that legislation gives the Board all the flexibility it wants. The Board needs to make a finding about the feasibility of using a short form of the NRT by 2005. The Board could find that it does not have all the information it needs to make a decision in 2005.

Ms. Tacheny noted that the liaisons are not asking for a decision today but for continuing discussion by the Board on these important policy issues. Mr. Nuñez remarked that Bullet 3 in the three-year plan document says the California Standards Tests are end-of-course exams, but the Board just approved cumulative tests in science and history-social science.

Mrs. Joseph asked about the test security and the release of test items. She commented that releasing test items would provide more diagnostic information. Mr. Warren responded that assessment staff has

talked with publishers about a second test form. It is complicated because you are talking about changing test forms every year. We can ask about the costs for a second test form that has different questions but covers the same subject matter and has the same psychometric properties.

Ms. Belisle stated that there are parallel forms of the NRT now. Ms. Goncalves expressed concern that if teachers have the test questions, they might use them to teach to the test and spend time prepping for the test instead of teaching the subject content.

Integrated Science Tests
Moving to a different issue, Mr. Warren noted that there are four integrated science tests in addition to four subject specific science tests. The issue we face with these integrated science tests is that there are many different curriculums in schools. We have not been able to match the integrated science tests with all integrated science curriculums. He reminded the Board that it did not set performance standards (levels) for the integrated science tests. Mrs. Joseph posed the question of whether there should be integrated science tests. Ms. Tacheny stated that when we develop a blueprint for the tests, we are telling schools what is important to teach in each course. Mr. Warren reported that he has heard some comments from the field that schools are changing their curriculum in response to the test.

President Hastings commented that teaching practices vary widely. If you have only subject-oriented tests, you will drive the curriculum that way. He added that the Department has said that approximately 25 percent of students enrolled in science are taking integrated science courses. Mr. Abernethy stated that we need to know whether teaching science as an integrated curriculum has advantages. He added that one concern is teachers' ability to teach integrated science courses when most have a single subject credential. President Hastings called for a seminar on this topic. Ms. Hammer expressed interest in learning whether integrated science students fare better or worse than students in subject specific courses.

Mr. Warren commented that it was hoped that the STAR test would provide information about student performance, but it has not. Ms. Belisle noted that 25 percent is a large number of students and asked if there are data to verify this estimate. Mr. Nuñez stated that another issue is the credentials for teachers; teachers need to be credentialed in the subject they teach.

Fifth Grade Science Test
Mr. Warren said that developing the grade five science test for 2003 administration just as a new test contractor takes over is too much work. Mrs. Joseph stated that some people think we need to promote science by having the test sooner rather than later. President Hastings asked how hard would it be to have the grade five test ready in 2003. Mr. Warren responded that quality is a concern and that the current contractor would need to work on test development. Ms. Tacheny commented that she was personally comfortable with waiting until 2004 for the grade five science test. She added that the NAEP science test results have added a sense of urgency about teaching science.

Addition of an 11th Grade Writing Assessment
Mrs. Joseph remarked that the question on the grade 11 writing test is who takes it. Ms. Tacheny commented that this is an exciting decision to make because the Board is adding a performance item to the test. Mr. Warren stated that this is a cost issue. The hand scoring of essays is a big and expensive undertaking. The grade 11 response would be longer and more costly to score than the grade four and grade eight responses. Another question is whether a writing prompt that could be given to all grade 11 students would provide the performance discrimination that higher education needs for placement purposes.

Mrs. Joseph asked what percentage of students take the Golden State Exam (GSE) writing test now. Mr. Warren replied that he would get the information. Ms. Hammer expressed concerns about testing time and redundancy. President Hastings commented that higher education is expecting us to add writing on a grade 11 test. Mr. Warren stated that the GSE is designed as a higher-level test and it is more useful for placement. President Hastings replied that not all students take the GSE. If you have a writing prompt in the CST, all 11th grade students would take a writing test. Grade 11 has different standards than those tested on the High School Exit Exam.

Ms. Goncalves stated that one of the good aspects of having a writing test in 11th grade is if students do well, they can use it for college placement. This would motivate students to do well on the test. Ms. Tacheny inquired as to when the decision needs to be made for 2003 implementation for higher education placement purposes. Mr. Warren stated it would have to be included in this contract, so a decision would be needed by next week.

Mr. Hill suggested that if there was a general concensus that the Board wants the option of a writing exam as part of the CST, we could include that option in the request for submissions. President Hastings stated problem with not having writing in the CST is that there is no writing in the Academic Performance Index (API) for high schools. The API sends a message about what is important. Ms. Belisle stated if an 11th grade writing test is not an option in the STAR request to submit, the contract would have to be amended later. Mr. Warren emphasized that this is a very expensive option. President Hastings stated that the Board just wants to explore the option and get information about the costs. President Hastings noted that there was consensus that this option be included in the request to submit.

Exemptions to the HSEE
Mr. Warren stated that the idea of exemptions to High School Exit Exam (HSEE) has been discussed for several years. Reducing testing time and redundancy are important. The idea is that a student who takes an algebra CST and does well, achieving at the advanced level for example, would not take the math part of the exit exam. The issue is a technical one. Some experts think that all students must take the exam. Mr. Warren informed the Board that this issue is being referred to the panel of experts.

The following individuals addressed the Board on this item:
Sally Bennett, Association of California School Administrators
Mike Weimer, California Federation of Teachers

ITEM 4	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Draft Document Request to Submit for the Implementation of the STAR Program as Authorized by Senate Bill 233.	INFORMATION ACTION

Mr. Hill explained that the complicated nature of the request to submit caused the delay in getting the draft document to the Board. [Attachment 3]

Phil Spears, Standards and Assessment Division, informed the Board that next month the Department would have a report on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) science test results. He reported that there is a problem with getting the level of participation necessary for NAEP. If there are not enough participants, California will not have state level NAEP scores.

Mr. Spears explained that the Request to Submit is divided into five major components: (1) Nationally Norm-Referenced Achievement Test, (2) California Standards Test (CST) Development, (3) Corporate Capacity for Improvement of Program Operations and Policy, (4) Administration, Scoring and Reporting, and (5) Cost Proposal

Mr. Spears drew the Board's attention to the timeline for the designation process, including the decision dates for Board. He reminded the Board that Superintendent Eastin had asked for names of people the Board would like to have on the review panel. He explained the roles of three different reviewing panels. Mrs. Joseph noted the members of the content review panels (CRPs) for STAR have knowledge of both the NRT and CST and could look at both of those components together.

Mr. Spears informed the Board that the Superintendent would make her recommendation to the Board by April 9. He pointed out the section on projected costs for new or expanded requirements and noted that these would include a grade 11 writing test. Mr. Spears briefly explained the weighting of the request to submit components.

Mr. Hill asked the Board members to get comments to the Department as soon as possible. Mrs. Joseph noted that the Board would need to think about and develop its own process for reviewing the Superintendent's recommendation.

ITEM 5	California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) for Students with Disabilities.	INFORMATION ACTION

Pamela McCabe, Special Education Division, informed the Board that she was coordinating the California Alternate Performance Assessment (CAPA) for the Department. She noted that an alternative assessment is a requirement of Title I and IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act). It is important that all students are expected to achieve high standards. Ms. McCabe explained how functional performance indicators show progress towards standards. Students who would take the CAPA have moderate to severe disabilities. A new CAPA is being developed to link to the state standards and to improve the validity and reliability of the assessment.

Ms. McCabe reported that the Department is seeking funding for CAPA development and hopes to be able to send out a request for proposals this winter for field testing in fall 2002 and first administration in spring 2003.

ITEM 6	California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Approval of New Regulations to go out for a 45-day Public Comment Period.	INFORMATION ACTION

Mr. Spears noted that these proposed regulations were developed after the Board approved a waiver policy for special education students. He reported that the Department agrees with Ms. Belisle's changes in the latest version of the proposed regulations. [Attachment 4]

Ms. Belisle informed the Board that the proposed regulations direct school districts to bring a waiver forward to the Board when a student has meet the requirements outlined in the waiver policy.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the proposed regulations as presented by staff for the purpose of commencing the rule-making process in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act. The proposed regulations will be circulated for a period of 45 days for public comment, followed by a public hearing before the State Board. The specific period of review and the date and time of public hearing will be established by staff. Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mrs. Ichinaga and Ms. Tacheny were not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 7	California English Language Development Test (CELDT): Status Report on Administration and Upcoming Projects.	INFORMATION ACTION

Mr. Spears stated that the Department has received much comment from the field on this test regarding the burden districts and schools are experiencing. The Department has been looking at streamlining test administration and improving test design. [Attachment 5] The most controversial issue is streamlining the test. The Department has heard some comments from the field that the test has value for schools despite the administrative burden. The Department is proposing temporarily removing the written essay and story retelling test items for annual test administration.

Mr. Hill said that clearly the Department has tried to respond to concerns from the field and the Board. The Department continues to ponder the options. He added that the Department has presented reasonable options.

Mr. Jenkins asked about the comparability of test scores if the retelling and writing components are removed. Mr. Spears replied that the contractor says it can produce comparable scores. Ms. Hammer asked about the timeline for the decision and whether the Board would need to act in February. Mr. Mockler replied that we have an obligation to take time to consider the options. The foremost concern is that we have a comprehensive test that meets the needs of the students. He suggested that the Board and the Department continue discussions with the field, perhaps bringing in groups such as the Board's

English Learner Advisory Committee. Mr. Spears stated that for the Department and the current test contractor, time is important. The next test administration is in July 2002.

Mr. Nuñez stated that he welcomes public input and is pleased to have the time for more public comment. Ms. Tacheny asked about inclusion of an option to allow students who have passed a portion of the test to not take that portion again. Mr. Spears replied that if the burden of the story retelling is removed, it might not be as difficult to have students take all parts of the test. In addition, if students do not take all the components of the test, the contractor would need to develop some way of creating a score for those students. Ms. Tacheny requested that the Department present the pros and cons for this option at February meeting.

President Hastings called for public comment.

The following individuals addressed the Board on this item:
Karen Cadiero Kaplan, California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages
Sharolyn Hutton, Chaffey High School District
Jeanne Herrick, Alisal USD
Kathy McGrath, Santa Cruz City Schools
Curtis Washington, California Teachers Association
Linda Paulson, Garden Grove USD
Andrea Ball, Long Beach USD
Sally Bennett, Association of California School Administrators
Peggy Barber, Los Angeles USD

Mr. Warren said that as we discuss options for this test, we need to keep in mind the intentions and purposes of this test. He suggested using the test with the writing and story retelling for initial testing of students. For annual testing, the schools have other data available on the students so a shorter test is appropriate. Mr. Warren said that we want a test that teachers can administer.

ITEM 8	United States Senate Youth Program Awards.	INFORMATION

This item was deferred until February.

ITEM 9	California Teachers of the Year 2002.	INFORMATION

President Hastings and Mr. Hill presented certificates to the five outstanding teachers who were named California Teachers of the Year by Superintendent Eastin.

The 2002 California Teachers of the Year are:
Carol Brouhle, Huntington Beach Union High School District, Orange County
Mary Eileen Gerr, West Covina Unified School District, Los Angeles County
Janet Gower, Mount Diablo Unified School District, Contra Costa County
Marvin N. Inmon, Anaheim City School District, Orange County
Chauncey Veatch, Coachella Valley Unified School District, Riverside County

Lunch Break: President Hastings called for the lunch break at 12:30 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 1:20 p.m.

Item 10 was deferred until Thursday. (See minutes for Thursday, January 10, 2002.)

ITEM 11	Report of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission.	INFORMATION ACTION

Sherry Griffith, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division, gave a brief report on the Commission's December meeting.

The following individual addressed the Board:
Marc Leibman, Superintendent Marysville Joint Unified School District

In response to Mr. Leibman's comments regarding the need for technology-based instructional materials and consideration of a review process for adoption of such materials, Mrs. Joseph noted that CLRN provides ongoing review of technology-based instructional materials.

ITEM 12	Curriculum Commission Recommendations and Report on the 2002 Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Adoption of Instructional Materials	INFORMATION ACTION PUBLIC HEARING

Patrice Abarca, Past Chair of the Curriculum Commission, reviewed the adoption process and timeline.

Marilyn Astore, Chair of 2002 Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Adoption, reminded the Board that the criteria for this adoption were based on universal access. She noted that four types of programs could be submitted for this adoption: (1) K-8 basic comprehensive programs, which had to include a daily 30-to-45 minutes component for English learners; (2) reading intervention programs for grades 4 through 8; (3) reading intervention programs for English learners in grades 4 through 8; and (4) primary language programs.

Ms. Griffith reported on the legal and social compliance review and the assessment review of all the submitted programs. [Attachments 6 and 7] She informed the Board that all the publishers whose programs were submitted for adoption had met the requirements for legal and social compliance except one. Pearson Education (Scott Foresman Accelerating English Language Learning Program) did not submit revisions to comply with the legal and social review criteria. As a result, these materials cannot be purchased by schools in California. In the assessment review, two programs were required to make changes in their programs, which the publishers agreed to do. Ms. Griffith stated that she was pleased to report that all materials recommended for adoption are in full compliance with the legal and social compliance review and the assessment review criteria.

Ms. Abarca reported on the edits and corrections meetings with the publishers. Ms. Abarca also reported on the Commission's review of the reasons that fewer than five basic programs were

recommended for adoption. She noted that the Commission found that the rigor and specificity of the evaluation criteria resulted in fewer than five basic instructional programs being recommended for adoption and that, overall, the rejected programs failed to meet the evaluation criteria. The Commission also found that the evaluation criteria were applied fairly and consistently to each program.

Ms. Astore read the list of submitted programs and the Curriculum Commission's recommendations on each program. She remarked that the recommended programs are exemplary materials that will help all children succeed.

Ms. Astore said that it had been a great privilege to serve on the Commission, especially to work with Mrs. Joseph. There is no one who cares more for or works harder for children without a voice than Mrs. Joseph. Ms. Astore also acknowledged the knowledge, the advice, and wisdom of so many people, including: President Hastings, the Board, Mrs. Ichinaga, Mr. Mockler, Mr. Geeting, and David Meany and Alice Fury, her bosses at the Sacramento County Office of Education, who supported her work on the Commission. Ms. Astore recognized the extraordinary efforts of the Commission Past Chair Abarca, Commission Vice Chair Sue Stickel, and all the Commissioners, each of who was committed to the adoption. Ms. Astore thanked Ms. Belisle for her wise advice. Ms. Astore stated that in her opinion the Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division (CFIR) is the best in the Department. She recognized the outstanding staff of the division, in particular Ms. Griffith, Deborah Keyes, Suzanne Rios, and Sandi Adams-Jones. All of these people are committed to ending a two-tiered system of education and to ensuring that all children learn.

Ms. Abarca noted that teachers make up a majority of the Commission. Ms. Abarca commented that the materials before the Board for adoption were high-quality instructional tools to teach all students in English. She added that it is fortunate that the publishers of two K-5 programs have agreed to provide alternative format materials. She expressed her disappointment that more alternative format programs and English learner intervention programs were not submitted. She stated that alternative format programs need to be reviewed and encouraged the Board to take on this review. Ms. Abarca said that as a bilingual teacher and a teacher of English immersion, she appreciates the 30 to 45 minute component of English language development for English learners. Never before have teachers had materials that bring English learners into the core curriculum so quickly.

President Hastings called the Public Hearing to order at 2:00 p.m.

The following individuals addressed the Board on this item:

Lennie Tate, Aroboga Elementary School
Doug Escheman, Covillaud Elementary School
Mark Leibman, Marysville Joint USD
Jacqueline Rhoades, Rhoades to Reading
Bob Roliardi, Electronic Education
Merle Price, Los Angeles USD
Dale Petrulis, Los Angeles USD
Jim Konantz, Los Angeles USD
Tim Taner, Oceanside USD
Ali Sullo, Houghton Mifflin
Elizabeth Jimenez, Californians Together

President Hastings closed the Public Hearing at 2:30 p.m.

In response to a comment made by one of the speakers, Mrs. Joseph stated that the publishers of Open Court had committed to provide the new 30-to-45 minute English language development materials to districts that had bought the Open Court program in the previous year.

Ms. Hammer thanked Ms. Abarca, Ms. Astore, and the CFIR staff for their extraordinary work. Ms. Hammer inquired why *Trofeos* was not recommended for adoption. Ms. Abarca said she personally went to the panel reviewing the program to ask if the concerns could be addressed by the edits and corrections process. The panel told her that the problems with the program were beyond the scope of edits and corrections. Some of the problems with the program were the content, depth of coverage, groupings, and learning modalities. Ms. Astore added that the instructional design does not make clear to teachers how to achieve the goal of all children learning the standards. Ms. Astore noted that the English learner components and tasks lacked rigor, as did the advanced learner tasks. The instructions to the teacher and the guidance in the teacher's manual did not support the goal of all students accessing grade-level materials. The entire program would need to be rewritten. Ms. Abarca said that she had re-reviewed the program after meeting with the publisher. She reported that as she looked through it a second time, it reconfirmed for her the reviewers' recommendation to not adopt the program.

Mr. Jenkins asked for the Commissioner's thoughts on the concerns expressed by one of the speakers about the adoption process as it applies to technology-based instructional materials, such as Waterford, which was not recommended for adoption. Ms. Abarca informed the Board that her master's degree is in technology-based curriculum design. Ms. Abarca stated that the program in question is an excellent supplemental, though there are flaws in the program even as a supplemental program. She added that she loves technology and believes in technology but this program is not a full basic program. Ms. Abarca noted that she had served on two previous technology-based instructional materials review panels. The problems with the technology-based programs we have seen so far have been with the content.

Ms. Tacheny thanked Ms. Abarca and Ms. Astore. Ms. Tacheny posed two questions about the process to review instructional materials for future consideration and discussion: Is there a way to look at the comparative success of programs in the adoption process? Do we have a process that would be an incentive to the education technology industry to development programs?

There was considerable discussion about technology-based instructional materials, including how districts could pay for these materials. During that discussion, Mrs. Ichinaga reported that her school used Waterford with great success. Ms. Hammer and Ms. Goncalves related that they had seen the program and were impressed by it. Mr. Jenkins expressed a more general concern about the need for technology-based programs to ensure that students learn to use technology because it is such an important tool in today's economy. Mr. Mockler told the Board that while he could not reveal details of Governor Davis' budget, which would be presented the following day, he could say that Governor Davis' budget would include an education reform package for instructional materials. Mr. Mockler stated that as he understands Governor Davis' policy, once a district has purchased the basal program and other state-adopted instructional materials, the district could purchase these kinds of supplemental materials.

Mr. Hill recognized Mrs. Joseph's efforts and those of the Curriculum Commission. He also thanked Ms. Griffith for her extraordinary efforts. He recognized CFIR staff from Ms. Keyes on down for their work. This is an important day! It has taken three years worth of hard work to get here. Mr. Hill praised the process and the Commissioners for sticking to the adoption criteria.

Mr. Jenkins asked for additional information on instructional materials funding. Mr. Mockler provided a preview of how instructional materials will be funded with emphasis on basic programs and flexibility after those programs have been purchased. Mrs. Ichinaga expressed a desire to help schools purchase technology-based instructional materials. President Hastings suggested considering a policy for supplemental programs in February or March after the Board knows what is in the budget for instructional materials.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board (1) adopt and reject the Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development instructional materials submissions in accordance with the recommendations of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission; (2) approve as the specific written explanation of the reasons for rejecting each of the submissions not adopted that the State Board found the submission did not adequately meet the criteria for adoption, taking into account the totality of the information received, in accordance with Education Code Section 60200(d); (3) approve the Curriculum Commission's report (amended as appropriate) as the final report of the 2002 Reading/Language Arts/English Language Development Adoption; and (4) find that fewer than five submissions meet the criteria for adoption for kindergarten and grades one and two, and accept the review conducted by the Curriculum Commission and CDE staff of the degree to which the criteria and procedures used to evaluate the submitted materials were consistent with the State Board's adopted curriculum framework, in accordance with Education Code Section 60200(e)(2). Mr. Abernethy seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-2. Ms. Goncalves and Mrs. Ichinaga voted against the motion.

- MOTION FAILS: Mrs. Ichinaga moved that the State Board recognize the success in reading of the pupils in the school at which she was principal which she credits in part to the use of a particular supplemental, technology-based reading program. Mr. Abernethy seconded the motion. The motion failed passage by a vote of 2-7. Mr. Abernethy and Mrs. Ichinaga voted in favor of the motion.

President Hastings stated this is a truly historic day. In the past, in most basal programs the materials for English learners took a back seat. In this adoption, the materials meet the needs of the English learners in the core program.

ITEM 13	Draft Model Curriculum on the Life and Work of César E. Chávez.	INFORMATION

Tom Adams, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Materials Division, provided background on the development of the model curriculum on the life and work of César Chávez. SB 984 (Polanco) required the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to develop a model curriculum. The Board has already, in

the recently approved history-social science framework, met the requirements to ensure that instructional materials include instruction on César Chávez and the history of the farm labor movement where appropriate. Conversations with Senator Polanco led to the decision to develop an internet-based curriculum. Scientech was awarded the contract to develop the model curriculum. The draft model curriculum is on the website. Mr. Adams stated that he would welcome suggestions and comments from the Board.

Mr. Adams introduced Jay Stretch of Scientech. Mr. Stretch outlined efforts to make the curriculum comprehensive, to develop lessons prepared for and by teachers, and to present the materials electronically. Mr. Stretch noted that the model curriculum will also be available on CD-rom. The curriculum includes oral interviews, over 500 photos, and numerous original sources. Mr. Stretch acknowledged the assistance of the Chávez Foundation, which introduced them to many individuals who worked with, knew, and were affected by César Chávez. Mr. Adams remarked that Scientech has done an excellent job. It has been a pleasure to work with them.

Mr. Adams also acknowledged Andres Irlando of the Chávez Foundation and thanked him for his invaluable assistance. Mr. Irlando said that he and the Foundation became involved in the development of the model curriculum because of a desire to keep alive the universal values of César Chávez. The Foundation has been a subcontractor on this project. Mr. Irlando commented that the curriculum will tell a compelling story of Chávez's life and legacy. He added that the Foundation and the Chávez family will continue to collaborate with Scientech and Department staff.

Mr. Adams asked Mrs. Joseph to provide her first person story of the march from Delano for use in the model curriculum. Ms. Hammer stated that she could not be more pleased with this curriculum project. She related that she knew César Chávez, who was from San Jose, and also knows members of his family. Ms. Hammer said that she is pleased that the family has been involved in developing the curriculum. Ms. Hammer recalled meeting with César Chávez during one of his fasts and what a memorable experience it was. Mr. Adams informed the Board that the model curriculum would be presented for Board action in February.

ITEM 14	Draft Science Framework.	INFORMATION PUBLIC HEARING

Sue Stickel, Vice Chair of the Curriculum Commission, introduced Richard Schwartz, Past Chair of the Science Subject Matter Committee, and Veronica Norris, Vice Chair of the Science Subject Matter Committee. Ms. Stickel stated that the Curriculum Commission's work on the framework has been within the parameters of mandates from the Board. The Commissioners agree with Superintendent Eastin that we want to train future scientists and future science teachers. Ms. Stickel noted that the Commission has worked to trim the original draft of the framework to make it more inviting. Ms. Stickel provided background information on the development of the draft framework and the timeline for its development. She commented that the Commission had wrestled with many of the issues mentioned in Superintendent Eastin's letter. [Attachment 8] Ms. Stickel applauded the work of the CFIR staff, Rollie Otto, Mr. Schwartz, Ms. Norris, Mr. Abernethy, and former Board Member Marian Bergeson.

Mr. Schwartz commented that when the framework is approved we will have completed the work of adopting science standards, adopting standards-based instructional materials, and adopting the science framework. Mr. Schwartz presented the draft framework as approved by the Curriculum Commission in November and posted on the web in December. The framework consists of seven chapters and the audience is defined as teachers, parents, students, and publishers. Mr. Schwartz gave an overview of the content of each chapter, with the exception of the chapter on universal access.

Ms. Norris outlined the content of the chapter on universal access. She stated that the chapter on universal access is about bringing great science to all students. Every child deserves to have the same access to the high-quality science in this framework and in the standards.

Mr. Hill reported that since the Commission approved the draft framework there have been a lot of discussions involving very knowledgeable and important people, including Mr. Abernethy, Mr. Otto, Mrs. Joseph, Ms. Griffith, and Mr. Adams. There are some policy issues that the Board will need to make a determination on, such as the percentage of time devoted to investigation and experimentation. He noted that there has already been some clarification on issues because of these discussions. Mr. Hill said that he would recommend that Mr. Abernethy, the Board staff, and the Department staff work together to try to process what we hear in public comment today. Mr. Hill commented that Superintendent Eastin would like to see more language supportive of science in the framework, which she feels has some sections with a negative tone. Mr. Hill mentioned other issues raised in the Superintendent's letter.

Mrs. Joseph drew the Board's attention to the proposed revision of Chapter 1. [Attachment 9]

President Hastings called the Public Hearing to order at 4:12 p.m.

The following individuals addressed the Board on this item:

Nancy Pavelsky, Riverside COE
Art Sussman, WestEd
Nancy Harms, Association of California School Administrators
Gary Nakagiri, San Mateo COE
Ze'ev Wurman
Richard Filson, California Science Teachers Association
Pat Seawell, San Mateo County Biotechnology Education Partnership
Carol Balfe, Independent Science Education Consultant
Jody Skidmore, K-12 Alliance
Brad Huff, University High School
Dave Massey
Stan Metzenberg, California State University, Northridge

President Hastings closed the Public Hearing at 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Abernethy thanked the people who brought the framework to the Board for all of their fine work. Ms. Hammer asked about deleted paragraphs mentioned in the side-by-side comparison in the agenda. Ms. Reynolds commented that it appears from her reading of the side by side that it does not list some of the material that is in the current draft. Ms. Hammer stated that she has several questions related to the

side by side. Ms. Griffith explained that the July version of the framework is the post field review version. The July version is what the Curriculum Commission worked with to develop the draft approved by the Curriculum Commission in November. Ms. Hammer asked if, for example, a paragraph is said to have been deleted, does that mean that the information is not in the framework. Ms. Griffith replied that it does not always mean the material was deleted, sometimes it has been moved.

Ms. Tacheny commented that the overarching principle in the revision was to shorten the document and make it more usable. She related that she has found that side by sides are not useful for this type of work. President Hastings stated that he would like to focus the discussion on how the Board should proceed in the next month.

Ms. Hammer noted that living in Silicon Valley she knows the importance of science and technology. She expressed her disappointment that the framework does not reflect that importance, that the tone is negative in some cases. The California science framework ought to be the best in the nation, of the very highest quality. Ms. Hammer suggested that the Board and the Department staffs work together, get comments from the field, and bring a new document to the Board in February for discussion and action in March.

Mr. Nuñez commented that he had a different point of view about what we need to get out of the framework, particularly in the elementary schools. Reading-language arts is critical, especially in grades K-4, with so many English learners. There are also choices we make about what we do with our money. Science is expensive. Are we, at the elementary level, going to take money from reading to pay for the equipment for a science lesson? In creating documents on science, we need to be aware of those choices. Certainly as children get older, starting in grades 6, 7, and 8, the science instruction becomes more important, and the framework should reflect that importance.

Ms. Tacheny stated that before the revisions, this document was overwhelming. She added that she is comfortable with the more streamlined version and trusts teachers to be able to use this document to teach science well. Mrs. Joseph remarked that she has a different view of what this document says about the importance of science. In her opinion, the framework clearly supports investigation and experiments as one method of teaching science. Ms. Hammer said that she wanted to be clear that she is not backing away from instructional minutes for math and reading, but that there are fantastic K-3 science programs teachers have made time for in her area.

President Hastings asked Mr. Abernethy to work with staff to develop a new draft, hopefully to be completed in two weeks and presented on the website for public review. The Board will discuss (and possibly act on) the framework in February. There was an informal consensus of the Board on this process.

Adjournment of the Day's Session: Before adjourning for the day, President Hastings informed the audience that Item 15 to be heard the next day. He added that the meeting will begin at 8:00 a.m. with a Closed Session of approximately 30 minutes. President Hastings adjourned the day's session at 5:15 p.m.