

California Association of Student Councils



Change the future >

Student Advisory on Education

2014 Proposals

Student Advisory Board on Education (SABE)

Proposals developed November 11-14, 2014

Table of Contents

Commendations	3
Staff Members	3
Proposal #1: Standardized Assessments	4
Proposal #2: Next Generation Science Standards	7
Proposal #3: Student Involvement in LCFF	10
Proposal #4: Role of Technology	13
Proposal #5: Evaluation of Schools	16
Proposal #6: Student Voice on the IQC	18

The California Association of Student Councils (CASC)

Executive Director: Dr. June Thompson (cascmail@aol.com)

President: Paige Amormino, Cardinal Newman High School (paige.amormino@casc.net)

1212 Preservation Parkway

Oakland, CA 94612

Phone: 510-834-2272 | Fax: 510-834-2275

<http://www.casc.net> | cascmail@aol.com

Justin Ingram, Bellarmine Preparatory High School

Director, Education Policy, CASC

justin.ingram@casc.net

COMMENDATIONS

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, is honored to extend the following commendations:

The Student Advisory Board on Education commends the Honorable Tom Torlakson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, for supporting student voice.

The Student Advisory Board on Education commends Karen Stapf Walters, Executive Director of the California State Board of Education, for her dedication to the education system and support of the student voice in education decision-making processes.

The Student Advisory Board on Education commends Bruce Holaday, member of the California State Board of Education, for his commitment to improving the lives of students and for addressing the Student Advisory Board delegation this year.

The Student Advisory Board on Education commends the California State Board of Education for its dedication to enhancing the quality of public education in California and for its encouragement of student input in decision-making, especially by considering the proposals of the Student Advisory Board.

The Student Advisory Board on Education commends Patricia de Cos, Deputy Executive Director of the California State Board of Education, for her invaluable knowledge and continued support of the California Association of Student Councils and the Student Advisory Board program.

The Student Advisory Board on Education commends the staff of the California State Board of Education for sharing their extensive expertise and providing generous help in arranging for the Student Advisory Board to present proposals before the Board every year.

STAFF MEMBERS

Director: Justin Ingram, Bellarmine Preparatory High School, San Jose

Assistant Director: Jennifer Yi, Troy High School, Fullerton

Advisors: Karina Hwang, Claremont McKenna College, Claremont

Administrative Team: Paige Amormino, Cardinal Newman High School, Santa Rosa

Counselors: Sunshine Cho, South Pasadena High School, South Pasadena; Samantha Hunt, Dominican University of California; Emily Sim, Troy High School, Fullerton; Heather Vaughn, University of California, Los Angeles; Simon Zhou, Canyon High School, Anaheim Hills

Research Team: Matthew Lee, University High School, Irvine; Michelle Min, Sage Hill School, Newport Beach; Michael Moon, Diamond Bar High School, Diamond Bar; Gina Wu, Rio Americano High School, Sacramento; Vivian Yang, Mira Loma High School, Sacramento

Presented to California State Board of Education
Thursday, November 13, 2014, Item #1

Topic: Standardized Assessments
Speaker: Amanda Parker, Lincoln High School, Stockton,
Writer: Jzov Stith-Gambles, Inderkum High School, Sacramento
Group Members: Shawn Adhout, Beverly Hills High School, Beverly Hills; Ana Alvarado, Metwest High School, Oakland; Aisha Khan, Aptos High School, Aptos; Ethan Kwan, Canyon High School, Anaheim; Christopher L. Paludi, Redondo Union High School, Redondo Beach; Amanda Parker, Lincoln High School; Nandeeni Patel, Vista Murrieta High School, Murrieta; Stockton; Jzov Stith-Gambles, Inderkum High School, Sacramento; Taylor L. Wang, Newbury Park High School, Newbury Park

I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, establishes a standardized test that assesses the California State Standards that are represented by Common Core.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

The Student Advisory Board recommends that the State Board Education:

- 1) Beginning with the current freshmen, the class of 2018, the SBAC shall serve as the high school exit exam in their junior year while the CASHEE serves as an alternative exam that they can take their senior year if they do not initially pass the SBAC.
- 2) Beginning in 2020, the CAHSEE will be eliminated as the high school exit exam and the SBAC will serve as the only high school exit exam in addition to its current role as an assessment of the Common Core Standards.

III. LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Policies

Amend EC Section 60850 in order to

- A.) accurately address and assess the Common Core Standards
- B.) smoothly transition towards Common Core Standards

Programs

Similarly to current CASHEE assistance courses implemented in California Public schools, the State Board should continue to promote this program application for students who have not passed the SBAC or met Common Core Standards in order to assure that Common Core standards are met by students and core skills are attained by the students of the California Public Education System.

IV. KEY ISSUES

Student Attitude and Assumption

- The CAHSEE does not challenge most students and it does not accurately reflect the new Common Core State Standards that students are now expected to learn.
- Students do not take the current standardized test seriously.

Student and Teacher Experience

- Administering two standardized tests takes away too much time from core material delivery and comprehension.
- Students and teachers are finding it difficult to shift to Common Core Standards.

CAHSEE's Role

- The CAHSEE does not reflect Common Core Standards.

V. PROVEN RESULTS

- Currently other states have or are planning on implementing the SBAC or PARCC as a high school exit exam.

VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS

This recommendation saves the state money in the short term (years 2017-2020) because SBE is required to administer less CAHSEE tests overall due to it being an alternative assessment for students who do not pass the SBAC initially. In the long term (year 2020 and post 2020) it saves the state money because two tests will be consolidated into one; although the SBAC will be open for retakes, the overall cost to administer one SBAC assessment is less per student compared to that of the CAHSEE, which is administered 7 times a year. In addition, there will be a decrease in the necessary finances required to pay graders and to administer test materials.

VII. RATIONALE

Mandating the SBAC as the high school exit exam forces the consistent implementation of Common Core curriculum and reinforces the transition to common core in California schools existing under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Education. The transition formulated in our proposal keeps in mind current and incoming generations. The proposal of implementing the SBAC in a way in which it eventually becomes the high school exit exam will hold students to a higher standard and better prepare them for the future because students who are currently in elementary school, middle school or in early years of high school will have more exposure to common core curriculum due to the fact that it is implemented in early grades. There have been discussions

regarding implementing the SBAC as the high school exit exam but we want this implementation to occur in a gradual manner increasing preparation time and familiarity for students. The date mentioned in our proposal was made definite with knowledge and consideration of how little common core is being implemented now and what it will take for common core to be established; the year 2020 accounts for the time it will take to thoroughly disseminate common core to all regions of California. Based on a quote from a Sacramento Bee article it is safe to say that “state education officials say a new test is unlikely until July 2017”.

VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATEWIDE DISCUSSION AND ACTION

After determining that local proficiency standards were established in EC Section 51215 (repealed January 1, 2000) were generally set below a high school level and were not consistent with the state’s content standards, the Legislature proposed the CASHEE in order to ensure that pupils who graduate can demonstrate effective state standards. EC Section 60850 (Chapter 1, statutes of 1999-2000, S.B.2, O’Connell) authorized the CAHSEE to be developed in accordance with State Board of Education adopted-content.

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

<http://imentorcorps.blogspot.com/2012/08/what-is-actual-cost-of-state-high.html>
<http://www.sacbee.com/news/local/education/article2620174.html>)
http://newamerica.org/downloads/ExitExam_FINAL.pdf
<http://www.smarterbalanced.org/resources-events/faqs/>
<http://www.fairtest.org/common-core-assessments-factsheet>

Presented to California State Board of Education
Friday, November 14, 2014, Item #2

Topic: Next Generation Science Standards
Speaker: Ellen Wang, Troy High School, Fullerton
Writer: Erica Huang, Arnold O. Beckman High School, Irvine
Group Members: Rachel Alaynick, High Tech Los Angeles, Woodland Hills; Evie Klaassen, Windsor High School, Windsor; Andrew Kwak, South Pasadena High School, South Pasadena; Kyle Mehrian, Beverly Hills High School, Beverly Hills; Jack Mitchener, Heritage High School, Brentwood; Julian Mo, Mater Dei High School, Tustin; Kali Smiley, San Benito High School, Hollister; Emma Boggs, Oakdale High School, Oakdale; Ellen Wang, Troy High School, Fullerton; Erica Huang, Arnold O. Beckman High School, Irvine

I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, identifies a method for student involvement in the implementation plan for the Next Generation Science Standards in California as a priority.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

The Student Advisory Board recommends that the SBE:

- 1) Establish an annual student survey on the implementation of NGSS in California schools on statewide assessments of NGSS;
- 2) Establish a framework for communication between the State Board of Education and the county and district Student Board Members to ensure that the standards are implemented effectively.

III. LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Policies

The state should establish a standard survey attached to the statewide assessment on NGSS that would give feedback to the State Board of Education on the success of the implementation and content of the NGSS in schools throughout California. The survey should offer student opinion **regarding all, but not limited to, the following:**

- A. Methods Teachers Use in Implementing NGSS
 - a. For example: Select all of the following methods (hands-on activities, videos, current events, professional exposure, field trips, etc.) your teacher(s) used in teaching NGSS standards.
- B. Student Readiness
 - a. For example: Rate how prepared you felt about this assessment.
- C. Administration Involvement
 - a. For example: Rate how well your administration prepared you for the test.
- D. Resource Implementation

- a. For example: Rate the effectiveness of the resources provided to you for the mastering of NGSS standards

Programs

The State Board of Education should solicit information from the Student Board Members or ASB/student government presidents (in absence of existing Student Board member) on a local level to gather student opinion by their method of choice (e.g. through surveys/polls, forums) and relay gathered information via email (or any other means of active communication the State Board of Education devises) to the State Board of Education periodically during the implementation of NGSS.

Student Action

Every student will be assessing the state of implementation of NGSS based on their experiences through the surveys in the aforementioned policy. In addition, district and county student board members will be gathering feedback from their respective area's student population and relaying this information to the Board of Education.

IV. KEY ISSUES

- a. The current framework for NGSS includes a survey for stakeholders to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of NGSS; however, the current survey of stakeholders do not include students, hindering the ability for students to give their input.

V. PROVEN RESULTS

- The CAHSEE survey at the end of the CAHSEE is used to gauge student preparation for the test and student intentions after graduation. The survey at the end of the CAHSEE, which allows for high school graduation, demonstrates how current high school graduation standards have influenced students.
- LCFE includes a student involvement aspect through possible surveys, which demonstrates how previous legislative action has valued the voice of students through survey methods.
- Student United for the Representation of Fremont Unified School District Board (SURFBoardE) is a student group comprised of fifteen students from the five high schools in the Fremont Unified School District. It acts as a liaison between the 30,000 students of FUSD and the district's board of education.
- SB 1422, which is an avenue of student-teacher evaluation, demonstrates how student opinion is valued and is beneficial.
- Los Altos High School in Los Altos, CA conducts the annual Student Educational Conference, where student teams develop ideas to implement on the local level in the next school year. This demonstrates the

mutualistic relationship between the creators of policies and students, the primary stakeholders.

VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS

The cost of implementing a student survey at the end of the statewide NGSS assessment would not lead to any additional cost if the assessment is administered online. If the statewide NGSS assessment is a paper test, the cost would only constitute paper and ink. The only other administrative cost would account for the time needed for the interpretation of the survey results, and for the Board of Education to communicate with district and county student board members on NGSS implementation.

VII. RATIONALE

The Next Generation Science Standards is new standard that will be implemented in California's education system. The adoption of NGSS is a daunting project, much like the launching of Common Core has been. However, even after years of preparation, administrators, teachers, parents, and students alike are not prepared and educated enough on Common Core. Many teachers are confused as to what and how they should teach, resulting in falling test scores and disorder. To avoid this similar fate with the NGSS implementation, student voice will be instrumental. By gauging student progress and reactions (and in turn, effectiveness of teachers) in regards to NGSS in its early years, the Board of Education could take quick action to remedy any problems that should arise. The survey results should be used to revise the NGSS framework in accordance with student concerns. As a part of the field test of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, many of the Consortium states surveyed participants. Similarly, NGSS should feature student feedback. The survey will be a quick, easy, and efficient way to communicate student response.

Furthermore, by increasing effective communication between district and county district Student Board Members and the Board of Education would increase the insurance of the success of NGSS. Opening up this avenue of communication would allow the Board of Education to directly solicit student responses on the implementation of the NGSS framework.

With the addition of student voice, implementation of Next Generation Science Standards in California can be assessed effectively, in turn leading to the advancement of California science education excellence.

VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATEWIDE DISCUSSION AND ACTION

A. Previous Legislative Action:

- SB 300: provides a process for reviewing, updating, or revising science standards.

Presented to California State Board of Education
Friday, November 14, 2014, Item #3

Topic: Student Involvement in Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF)
Speaker: Deborah Lee, Beverly Hills High School, Beverly Hills
Writer: Michelle Tran, Valencia High School, Placentia
Group Members: Ka'Shauna Bartlow, East Bay Arts High School, Hayward; Anthony Chen, South Pasadena Senior High School, South Pasadena; Ariana Garrotto, Los Angeles Center Enriched Studies, Los Angeles; Deborah Lee, Beverly Hills High School, Beverly Hills; Maya Roshandel, South Pasadena Senior High School, South Pasadena; Michelle Tran, Valencia High School, Placentia; Darren Wang, Suzanne Middle School, Walnut; Allexandra Weil, Archbishop Mitty High School, San Jose; Jerome Yao, Walnut High School, Walnut; Victoria Yuan, American High School, Fremont

I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, identifies the incorporation of student input in the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP) assessment as a priority.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

The Student Advisory Board recommends that the SBE:

- 1) establishes a set of guidelines for best practices for ways to “consult students” as defined by the Local Control and Accountability Plan (LCAP);
- 2) distributes this set of guidelines to school districts throughout California

III. LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Programs

The State Board of Education would distribute a set of guidelines for best practices in methods of “consulting students” that would aid school districts in effectively soliciting student input. These set of guidelines could be drafted by the California Association of Student Councils.

IV. KEY ISSUES

- There is a lack of high quality options for implementing the defined methods for incorporating student input in the school’s LCAP evaluation, and more largely on the pertinent allocation of funds through the LCFF system.
- There is a lack of utilized student voice in the decisions that are made to benefit schools and students.
- District boards do not effectively utilize and take action upon student feedback.

V. PROVEN RESULTS

- In the course of three days, students have developed various implementation options for increasing student engagement. Among these optimal options, students found that one of the most effective ways in acquiring student voice is the formation of a student advisory committee, consisted of student representatives based on student population and diversity that would draft a survey evaluating a school's performance. The committee would then present the survey results to the district board of education to implement the feedback in funding. The survey results would also be attached to the annual LCAP update and the tri-annual LCAP report.
- The California Association of Student Councils and Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) have teamed up to create a video which outlines the best ways to solicit student opinion for LCAP which will go out to all ACSA members.

VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS

This would have minimal expense to the State Board of Education as the California Association of Student Councils has volunteered to establish guidelines for student engagement. The State Board of Education may incur the cost of distribution of the guidelines to school districts.

VII. RATIONALE

As key stakeholders in their own education, students must address their needs on a local level through structured implementation options. The California Association of Student Councils voluntarily offers to help formulate this set of guidelines by compiling the opinions of diverse groups of students. By endorsing one or a few of these options, students would be able to voice their concerns as essential participants of their own schools and the district's LCAP. This would furthermore ensure that districts are meeting the state's priority to include student engagement in the Local Control Accountability Plan.

As generations evolve, student demands must be met accordingly. Although we currently have the Student Advisory Board on Education that gives the students the opportunity to make change on a state level, it is evident that there is a lack of gathering meaningful student feedback on a local level. Providing options for districts to put into action allows for a more accurate and effective way to represent the large number of diverse students in California.

Students across California are advocating for their needs and concerns to be addressed. Because districts have no clear examples for soliciting student

input, students are standing idle as decisions for the allocation of funds are made with insufficient student feedback. A firsthand analysis of LCAP performance is critical and can only be illustrated through the students' firsthand experiences. Because LCAP highlights that student voice is vital and the State Board of Education dedicates time for students to express their own notions through the Student Advisory Board on Education, local district boards should adopt this model behavior.

VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATEWIDE DISCUSSION AND ACTION

B. Previous Student Advisory Board on Education Recommendations:

- *Student Voice and Decision Making, SABE 2013*
- *Funding and Resources, SABE 2013*

C. Present Pertinent Regulations and Policy:

- *Education Code Section 52060, 52066, 47606.5*

Presented to California State Board of Education
Friday, November 14, 2014, Item #4

Topic: Role of Technology
Speaker: Jacobzen Chang, Troy High School, Fullerton
Writer: Alisha Nagarkar, Capistrano Valley High School, Mission Viejo
Group Members: Jacobzen Chang, Troy High School, Fullerton; Savannah Edwards, Kearny High School, San Diego; Siena Getz, Kit Carson Middle School, Sacramento; Rachel Groberman, Los Angeles Center for Enriched Studies, Los Angeles; Helen Huh, Troy High School, Fullerton; Bridget Lee, West Ranch High School, Santa Clarita; Candice Matsumura, Calabasas High School, Calabasas; Alisha Nagarkar, Capistrano Valley High School, Mission Viejo; Noella Park, Troy High School, Fullerton; Sean Wang, Troy High School, Fullerton

I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, establishes updating the educational system to meet the needs of an evolving, technology-driven society as a priority.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

The Student Advisory Board recommends that the SBE:

- 1) Creates a new set of explicit educational technology learning standards specific to grades K-3, 4-6, and 7-8; and
- 2) Outlines specific ways for school districts to integrate technology into the classroom curriculum of all subjects for grades K-12

III. LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Policies

California's Content Standards should be revised to include a new, more detailed and more advanced set of technological learning standards for grades K-3, 4-6, and 7-8. Implementing these explicit learning standards will promote high school, college, and career readiness.

In grades K-3, students should learn:

- Alphabet/keyboard layout, basic typing skills, word processing, graphics (e.g. Microsoft Paint), and basic computer operations

In grades 4-6, students should learn:

- Online privacy/safety, basic web communication (e.g. Email), how to use search engines and conduct research, and basic digital presentation (e.g. PowerPoint), basics of spreadsheet software (e.g. Excel)

In grades 7-8, students should learn:

- Advanced typing skills, advanced word processing, and troubleshooting strategies for hardware/software issues

Students will apply and become more advanced in all of these skills in grades 9-12.

Programs

The SBE should encourage schools build computer labs accessible to all students or rotate laptop/computer carts between classrooms in order to ensure that all students have equal access to technology, specifically students of lower socioeconomic background who have historically been disadvantaged.

The SBE should also urge school districts and schools to provide increased professional development for teachers in order to ensure they are capable of effectively integrating technology in the classroom. These local teacher trainings/workshops should outline innovative and engaging ways K-12 teachers of *all subjects* can integrate technology into their classroom curriculum.

Examples:

- Videos, animations, PowerPoint, Google Classroom, digital textbooks, and other digital tools and online resources

IV. KEY ISSUES

- a. The current California Content Standards lack explicit educational technology learning standards appropriate for the 21st century
- b. Many students in California graduate high school without adequate proficiency in technology and are unprepared for their college and/or career-based futures
- c. Technology integration is essential to prepare students for their college and/or career-based futures, but technology is just another tool if teachers do not know how to integrate it
- d. Instead of discouraging students from using Internet-connected devices in the classroom, teachers should provide opportunities for students to connect and share in an online environment, which the primary method of communication in the 21st century working world

V. PROVEN RESULTS

- The top 15 public high schools in the U.S have implemented explicit and advanced technological learning standards
- Several school districts in California have outlined their own more detailed and advanced grade-based technology learning standards (Long Beach Unified School District, all 32 school districts managed by Fresno County Office of Education)
- 34 of the 50 states emphasize increased professional development in technology and have specific educational technology *state* standards

VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS

Due to the fact that state funds have already been allocated (CCSS Implementation Funds) to provide schools with computers and computer programs, it is estimated that schools in California will have the sufficient resources needed to effectively integrate technology in the classroom in the next three years. Therefore, the suggestions put forth in this proposal will incur *little to no cost* to the SBE.

VII. RATIONALE

K-12 teachers of all subjects in California need to integrate technology in the classroom in order to ensure that all students are prepared for college and/or career-based futures and can successfully compete in the technology-driven 21st century. The CCSS Implementation Funds will provide all schools in California with sufficient resources to integrate technology in the classroom within the next three years; however, technology cannot be effectively integrated without professional development for teachers and an explicit set of technology learning standards.

VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATEWIDE DISCUSSION AND ACTION

D. Previous State Board of Education Action:

- Adoption of the Common Core State Standards (2010), which recommend the use of technology in the classroom but lack explicit educational technology learning standards appropriate for the 21st century

E. Previous Pertinent Regulations and Policy:

- Education Code Section 52295.10-.55 (Education Technology Grant Act of 2002) allocated funding for technology “to improve pupil academic achievement”
- Education Code Section 52250-52254 (Digital High School Education Technology Grant of 1997) provided technology grants for high schools and declared that the computer knowledge is “essential for individual success for the continued economic prosperity of the State of California” and that “all students must be computer literate” before graduating high school

F. Previous Legislative Action:

- Enhancing Education Through Technology Act of 2001 (No Child Left Behind Act Part D), primary goal is to “improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools”

Presented to California State Board of Education
Friday, November 14, 2014, Item #5

Topic: Evaluation of Schools
Speaker: Michael McFarland, Palos Verdes Peninsula High, Rancho Palos Verdes
Writer: Olivia Nouriani, South Pasadena High, South Pasadena
Group Members: Monika Deukmejian, Verdugo Hills Sr. High, Tujunga; Nidhi Kakulawaram, Cypress High School, Cypress; Michael McFarland, Palos Verdes Peninsula High, Rancho Palos Verdes; Josephine Minnick, Kit Carson Middle, Sacramento; Olivia Nouriani, South Pasadena High, South Pasadena; Jessica Poepelman, Kit Carson Middle, Sacramento; Mani Roshandel, South Pasadena High, South Pasadena; Elitza Todorova, San Marcos High, San Marcos; Jane Xu, Albany High, Albany; Jasmine Yong, Oakdale High, Oakdale

I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, establishes accurate and holistic evaluation of schools as a priority.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

The Student Advisory Board recommends that the SBE:

- 1) Include holistic indicators in its measurement of the Academic Performance Index in addition to standardized testing by considering aspects of schools evaluated through SARCs.

III. LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Policies

The SBE should use data reported in School Accountability Report Cards (SARC) to calculate the API, primarily student-teacher ratios, attendance and dropout rates, teacher qualifications, conditions of facilities, number of AP courses, opportunities for parental involvement, and student-counselor ratios.

IV. KEY ISSUES

- API primarily accounts for standardized testing, encouraging teachers to teach students to perform well on standardized tests instead of focusing on college and career readiness, real-world experiences, and complete absorption of concepts.
- A school's API is considered the measurement of the quality of a school, despite the fact that it considers only limited factors.

V. PROVEN RESULTS

- Student feedback has been proven to be valid and reliable at the college and high school level when implemented effectively (Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation).
- Lower student-teacher ratios result in higher achievement on standardized tests (1985-89 Tennessee Student-Teacher Achievement Ratio experiment).
- SARC currently holds schools accountable for holistic aspects of their institution.

VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS

Because all schools are already required to submit SARCs to the government, there will be no cost of collecting data. The cost of evaluating data will be minimal to none.

VII. RATIONALE

The past method of school evaluation has placed its primary focus on standardized testing. This pressures teachers to teach students to test well, as opposed to fostering well-rounded and career- and college-ready individuals. Because of the link between higher APIs and wealthier communities, there is extreme pressure to raise test scores. By turning the focus of evaluations to the quality of schools holistically, evaluations will be more accurate representations of school quality, and students will be further encouraged to pursue interests outside of test-taking and academia. In addition, access to electives, student-teacher class size ratios and dropout rates are valuable measures of excellence of an educational institution. The purpose of high school is to adequately prepare students for college, careers, and other pursuits after graduation, but standardized test-based teaching cannot meet that standard.

VIII. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATEWIDE DISCUSSION AND ACTION

G. Present Pertinent Regulations and Policy:

- California Education Code Section 52051.5 - 52052.9 *Public School Performance Accountability Program*: Establishes general guidelines for indicators of API.

H. Previous Legislative Action:

- SB 1458 (2012): Standardized testing must comprise no more than 60% of high school evaluations and no less than 60% of middle and elementary school evaluations.
- SB 219 (2007): Dropout rates must factor into school evaluations.
- Public Schools Accountability Act (1999): Establishes API as an accountability system for all public schools K-12.
- The Classroom Instructional Improvement and Accountability Act (1998): Requires all public schools receiving state funding to prepare and distribute SARCs.

Presented to California State Board of Education
Friday, November 14, 2014, Item #6

Topic: Student Voice on the Instructional Quality Commission
Speaker: Paige Amormino, Cardinal Newman High School, Santa Rosa
Writer: Shawn Ahdout, Beverly Hills High School, Beverly Hills

I. PRIORITY

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, proposes the addition of two student members to the Instructional Quality Commission.

II. RECOMMENDED SBE ACTION

The Student Advisory Board recommends that the SBE

- 1) adds two students to the Instructional Quality Commission to provide advisory input; and
- 2) utilizes the current process for electing the student board member to appoint the student members of the Instructional Quality Commission.

III. LOCAL AND STATEWIDE IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

Policies

Amend California Education Code § 33530 in accordance with the provided revisions.

Amend California Education Code § 33000.5.e in accordance with the provided revisions.

IV. KEY ISSUES

- Students are given very limited control over the curriculum and instructional materials adopted by the State Board of Education
 - In a quickly evolving world with many different learning styles, students' needs are being neglected
 - Adults often lose sight of students' needs, and there is a need for a student perspective on the Instructional Quality Commission
 - The one student member on the State Board of Education has a difficult time accurately representing the 6.3 million students of California
-

V. PROVEN RESULTS

- The student members on the California State Board of Education, and the State Boards of Education of other states, help represent student opinions to their respective Boards.
- Local district Boards of Education utilize student members to solicit student opinion on policies.
- The California State Board of Education utilizes a student member on the Child Nutrition Advisory Council

VI. FISCAL ANALYSIS

As a result of including two student members on the Instructional Quality Commission, the State Board may incur the cost of transporting the student members to and from meetings.

VII. RATIONALE

Currently, the student member on the State Board of Education brings a student opinion to the Board but has limited control over the curriculum and instructional materials that go out to the millions of students in California. The student member simply has one vote on whether or not it is passed, but plays no role in the development of the curriculum, standards, or instructional materials. Adding student members to the Instructional Quality Commission will allow students to have more power over both how and what they are taught. Students are the largest stakeholders in their education system and deserve to have the opportunity to have their voices heard on the issues that the Instructional Quality Commission discusses. There is already a system in place for students to apply to be the student member on the state board of education, and the state board can easily adapt this process to identify two students to serve on the Commission.

33530. (a) There is in the state government the Instructional Quality Commission consisting of a Member of the Assembly appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, a Member of the Senate appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, one public member appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, one public member appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, one public member appointed by the Governor, and 15 public members appointed by the state board upon the recommendation of the Superintendent or the members of the state board.

(b) So far as is practical and consistent with the duties assigned to the commission by the state board, at least 7 of the 15 public members appointed by the state board shall be persons, who because they have taught, written, or lectured on the subject matter fields specified in Section 33533, in the course of public or private employment, have become recognized authorities or experienced practitioners in those fields. The state board shall make its appointments to ensure that, at any one time, at least seven of the public members shall be current classroom teachers, or mentor teachers, or both assigned to teach kindergarten or any of grades 1 to 12, inclusive.

(c) So far as is practical and consistent with the duties assigned to the commission by the state board, at least 2 of the 15 public members appointed by the state board shall be students appointed by the process specified in Section 33000.5

(d) Notwithstanding the requirement that seven of the public members shall be current classroom teachers or mentor teachers, current members of the commission who were appointed on or before December 31, 1989, shall be allowed to complete their terms.

(e) In making the remaining appointments to the commission, and in establishing the commission's advisory task forces or committees, the state board is encouraged to consider the role of other representatives of the educational community in the development of curriculum and instructional materials, including, but not limited to, administrators, governing school board members, and parents who are reflective of the various ethnic groups and types of school districts in California.

33532. (a) Commission members, with the exception of the student members, shall serve for four-year terms and shall not be eligible to serve more than one full term. Prior service on the commission for a term of less than three years resulting from an initial appointment or an appointment for the remainder of an unexpired term shall not be counted as a full term.

(b) With respect to the appointment of 15 public members by the State Board of Education to the first commission, four shall be appointed for terms of two years, four shall be appointed for terms of three years, five shall be appointed for a term of four years, and the two student members shall be appointed for a term of one year.

33000.5. (e) The process for selecting the student member shall be as follows:

(1) The State Board of Education shall notify every school district governing board, district superintendent, high school principal, high school student activities director, and student body president by September 15 of each year that applications are being accepted for the student member's position.

(2) Applications for the student member's position shall be submitted to the State Board of Education no later than October 31 of each year.

(3) A screening committee of the State Board of Education shall select 12 semifinalists for the student member's position.

(4) The school district governing board student members shall select six candidates from the 12 semifinalists.

(5) The State Board of Education shall, by December 31 of each year, select three finalists for the Governor's consideration and shall rank the finalists according to their preference.

OPTION #1: (6) Those 11 semifinalists (specified in (4)) who are not chosen as the student board member on the State Board of Education will be invited to interviews by the Screening Committee to be members of the Instructional Quality Commission.

OPTION #2: (6) Those finalists (specified in (5)) who are not chosen as the student board member on the State Board of Education will be appointed as members of the Instructional Quality Commission, upon approval of the Screening Committee.