

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

Wednesday, March 6, 2002

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

Members Present

Reed Hastings, President
Susan Hammer
Robert J. Abernethy
Nancy Ichinaga
Carlton Jenkins
Marion Joseph
Suzanne Tacheny
Don Fisher
Vicki Reynolds
Erika Goncalves

Members Absent

Joe Nuñez, Vice President

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
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 9:05 a.m.

Salute to the Flag

Ms. Reynolds led the Board, staff, and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

Approval of Minutes (February 2002 Regular Meeting)

- ACTION: Mrs. Ichinaga moved that the State Board approve the Minutes of the February 2002 Regular 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 member, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Hammer, and Mrs. Joseph were not present when the vote was taken.

Approval of Minutes (February, 14, 2002, Special Meeting)

- ACTION: Mrs. Ichinaga moved that the State Board approve the Minutes of the February 14, 2002, Special Meeting. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present, except that Ms. Reynolds did not vote on the motion. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Hammer, and Mrs. Joseph were not present when the vote was taken.

Announcements/Communications

President Hastings announced the following changes in the agenda:

- Item 15, State Education Agency Intervention in Long-Term Program Improvement Schools: An Overview of the 2001 Scholastic Audit Process, was deferred until April at the request of the Department.
- Item 16, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, will be heard on Thursday morning.

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

Ethics Training: Seminar in May

President Hastings suggested that the seminar time in May be devoted to the state-required ethics training.

Form 700 Due

President Hastings reminded the Board members that their Statement of Economic Interests, Form 700, are due April 1. Ms. Reynolds suggested that the next ethics training be scheduled before the Form 700 is due.

April Meeting Highlights

President Hastings noted that the seminar topic in April would be Technology in Instruction at the request of Marion Joseph. He added that he is looking forward to it. He said that there are six public hearings on regulations scheduled for Thursday, April 24, some of which are likely to have a number of speakers. The Board should be prepared for a longer than usual second meeting day on that date.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

Mr. Mockler added that the Board would also have the test designation in April. He remarked that it would be a long meeting.

[Item 1 was continued on Thursday. See minutes for March 7, 2000.]

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

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Catherine Garbaez, Advisory Commission on Special Education

Teresa Pina, parent, Indio Charter School

Report of Superintendent

Superintendent Eastin reported on the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) review of the state budget. She commented that she is proud that Governor Davis has not proposed suspending Proposition 98. She noted that the LAO was again presenting a block-grant approach to addressing education funding. IN her opinion, the block grants purposed by the LAO, the professional development block grant is the most likely to occur. Superintendent Eastin informed the Board that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires some changes in state programs, including the assessment system.

Superintendent Eastin reported on her visits to schools throughout the state, including a charter high school in San Diego. Pruess School is a charter school for students whose parents have not graduated from college. It is the highest performing school in San Diego County. Doris Alvarez is the principal of Pruess. The school has lots of funding and is housed in beautiful buildings. Superintendent Eastin compared the buildings at Pruess School with those of a charter school she had visited in Northern California. This school is focused on the arts and also has outstanding academic achievement. However, the facilities are a problem. She added that it is her hope that a state school bond will address the facility shortage.

President Hastings announced that a school had been named for Superintendent Eastin and asked her to tell the Board about the school. Superintendent Eastin described the school, which is located in Union City. This K-5 school is housed in permanent, two-story buildings and includes a music room, media center, science lab, and a garden. It is a wonderful school, a beautiful school. The school is in a majority minority community that has shown tremendous academic achievement. The school has a strong drama and music program. Superintendent Eastin remarked that she is very proud to have a school named after her.

Commenting on the election held the previous day, Superintendent Eastin noted that since the threshold for approval of local school bonds was lowered to 55 percent, 29 of 29 schools bonds have passed. She noted that while all the results of this election were not yet in, many bonds appear to have passed.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

ITEM 3	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Three-Year Plan for the Development of California's Assessment System.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Deputy Superintendent Paul Warren walked the Board through the changes in the proposed three-year plan. [Attachment 1, Three-Year Plan for the Development of California's Assessment System—March 6, 2002] He noted that the integrated science test blueprints are not working well and a more sequential test design is needed.

President Hastings stated there is a discussion here regarding the role of the state. Currently, there are tests for math high school courses that are subject specific, and there are integrated math tests. It is estimated that about 10 percent of students are enrolled in integrated math courses. The Board's role is not to specify how a subject is taught. However, it is the Board's role to determine what and how to assess the subject. President Hastings noted that supporting integrated math tests and an alternative course sequence requires additional work and costs. Most states do not support both a standard sequence and an alternative sequence. Test scores show integrated math students are not achieving as well as students in traditional courses. Once the integrated math test scores go into the API, integrated math will have to be continued. The question to consider is whether the Board wants to support an alternative sequence in math and other subjects. How far do we go? This is an issue the Board should discuss thoughtfully.

Mr. Mockler noted that as a technical matter the only action needed today would be to delete the final paragraph on page 3 of three-year plan. Superintendent Eastin suggested that the Board bring in people from Achieve and TIMMS to bring national information. Mr. Abernethy commented that for integrated math there are really only two curricular alternatives. This is different than the case of integrated science, in which there are many more curricula. President Hastings agreed that there was relative uniformity in integrated math and that this was different than in science where there are many alternative approaches. Ms. Hammer stated that she likes Superintendent Eastin's suggestion to bring speakers in. She said that she found it interesting that scores are higher in traditional math. She added that the discussion should focus on which approach results in higher achievement. President Hastings noted that the only Board action required now is to reserve the decision by deleting the paragraph in the three-year plan related to integrated math and science tests.

Ms. Tacheny acknowledged that Mr. Warren and his staff have done an excellent job of pulling the three-year plan together. Local districts need to know what will be assessed. She commented that this three-year plan is a mixture of policy and administration and that she would like to make the policy decisions more specific. She added that the Board needs the discussion of the open issues, such as integrated tests, more clearly delineated in the plan.

President Hastings said that he thinks Mr. Warren has tried, in this document, to have a road map of where the Board wants to go. Ms. Tacheny commented that the decisions the Board is making are not obvious in this three-year plan document. The document also has many administrative details that are in the Department's purview. President Hastings remarked that what he was hearing is that this is not an

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

effective communication document and that it does not make clear what the Board's policy decisions are. He asked for a cover sheet memo that would outline when the Board's major decisions need to be made. Ms. Tacheny commented that the field has not had a chance to review this document and finds this document confusing.

Mr. Warren responded that there are different audiences for the memo. The three-year plan has served well as a discussion point for the Board and the Department. Ms. Tacheny asked where in the three-year plan are the six issues the Board brought forward. Mr. Warren explained how each of the issues was included in the three-year plan or otherwise resolved. Ms. Hammer suggested that the Board consider approving the three-year plan as a draft, soliciting comments from field, and deleting the paragraph on integrated math and science. She asked Mr. Warren why he thought the three-year plan would change. Mr. Warren replied that legislation may change the assessment system and there will also be changes due to ESEA. He added that the plan is still undergoing fine-tuning. Ms. Hammer commented that while it is good to be flexible, she wants the message to the field to be that this is the Board's three-year plan.

Mrs. Joseph stated that the 11th grade writing test absolutely must be included in the plan. In science, it is completely in error to say that integrated science courses cover all of the state standards. She noted that the state does not have any obligation to create tests to fit all integrated science courses. Mrs. Joseph stated, in response to Superintendent Eastin's suggestion to bring in speakers on integrated math, that in the development of the standards for math we had input from many high level people in TIMMS and that there was not agreement on how to approach math.

Ms. Reynolds commented that she found the three-year plan document useful but would like a timeline for Board decisions. She said that she had two thoughts: (1) remove the paragraph on page 3; and (2) communicating to field that this plan is a work in progress, a proposal. She added that it is important that the field know when decision points come. Mr. Warren agreed that it was a good idea to send a timeline to the field.

Mr. Mockler stated that it is very important to have this three-year plan. It communicates to the field and to the Legislature that the Board and Department have a common plan. Superintendent Eastin noted that we have been on a fast track. She stated that she hopes we do what good corporations do in times of great change and have a reiterative process. We can tell the field this is the best plan we can have in an environment of change.

President Hastings asked if delaying the decision until April would cause a problem. Mr. Warren indicated that it would not. President Hastings asked if there were other issues that the Board would like to have addressed in the three-year plan, such as the issue that Mrs. Joseph mentioned, writing in the 11th grade language arts test. Mr. Abernethy stated his opposition to integrated tests in math and science.

Mr. Warren continued walking the Board through the three-year plan. President Hastings asked if the plan mentions including the California High School Exit Exam in the API. Mr. Warren replied that he has asked staff to prepare a document on the API similar to the three-year plan for assessment. Mr. Mockler noted that the Board had passed a Golden State Exam (GSE) policy last month and asked if the

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

policy should not be in the three-year plan. Mr. Warren stated that the Department would bring back the plan in April and he hoped that the Board would approve the three-year plan at that time.

President Hastings commented that there were four things the Board wants to discuss or include in the plan: (1) integrated tests; (2) writing in the 11th grade English-language arts test; (3) GSE policy; and (4) an abstract of the big policy decisions in the next three years.

The following individual addressed the Board:

Karen Staph-Walters, Association of California School Administrators

ITEM 4	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Approval of Performance Standards (Levels) for the California General Mathematics Standards Test	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Mr. Warren informed the Board that in the STAR Program there is now a general math test that is taken by 8th and 9th grade students who are not taking algebra. One problem with having this test is whether it sends the wrong signal to the field. The signal we want to send is that 8th graders should be taking algebra. Option 3 in the agenda materials is the best approach to signaling the field and informing parents that we have high expectations for students. He noted that the expert panel suggested Option 3. Communications to parents would indicate that the student test score is for 6th and 7th grade standards. Mr. Warren explained how the general math test scores would be calculated in the API.

Mr. Mockler commented that this is a very complicated problem. The Department did an excellent job with the technical issues and in presenting the options. Superintendent Eastin acknowledged the work of the expert panel.

- ACTION: Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board accept Option 3 – which includes setting performance standards (levels) equivalent to those already adopted for the grade 7 California Mathematics Standards Test, communicating clearly in the parent/student report that the test reflects grade 6 and 7 mathematics content standards, and incorporating the results in the API with adjusted weights – for purposes of holding regional public hearings on the proposed performance standards (levels) in accordance with Education Code section 60605(a)(1)(C). Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Fisher and Mrs. Joseph were not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 5	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Approval of Performance Standards (Levels) for the California 1 st , 2 nd , and 3 rd Year Integrated Mathematics Standards Tests.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Mr. Warren noted that the Board, following the Department's recommendation, did not set performance standards in integrated math when the standards were set for the course specific, traditional tests. Since then, the Department has looked into the alignment of the tests to state standards and the alignment of integrated math curricula to the math tests. The expert panel concluded that the tests themselves are not

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

the reason for the lower test scores on integrated math tests. The expert panel recommended using the performance standards set for the traditional math tests to set the performance standards for integrated math. Mr. Warren explained the methodology recommended by the expert panel. He stated that the Department recommends Option 2. President Hastings commented that Option 2 does not bind us to having integrated math tests.

Ms. Goncalves asked why teachers would choose to teach integrated math. Phil Spears, Standards and Assessment Division, responded that it is more of an issue of the teaching method than a content issue and that integrated math has more of a problem-solving approach. Ms. Tacheny observed that to teach integrated math, the teacher must have a deeper understanding of math. The state does not have the capacity to scale up integrated math courses. She added that she personally has not supported integrated math because of the capacity issue. She noted that we now have some data on student performance and that she would like to continue to measure student performance in integrated math. President Hastings noted that the Board would have a fuller discussion on integrated math in April.

The following individual addressed the Board:
Leigh Childs, California Mathematics Council

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board accept Option 2 – which includes setting performance standards (levels) for the integrated tests based on the already-adopted performance standards (levels) for the course-specific tests – for purposes of holding regional public hearings on the proposed performance standards (levels) in accordance with Education Code section 60605(a)(1)(C). Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-1. Mr. Abernethy voted against the motion. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Fisher and Mrs. Joseph were not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 6	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Continuation of Primary Language Test for 2003.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Mr. Spears reported that the STAR contract submissions are on schedule. The submissions are due to the Department on March 11.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board designate SABE/2 as the primary language assessment in accordance with Education Code section 60640 (f) and (g). Mrs. Ichinaga seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Fisher and Mrs. Joseph were not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 7	California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Including, but not limited to, an Update on the March 2002 Administration and on the Assembly Bill 1609 Study.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Mr. Spears informed the Board that more than 300,000 students in 10th grade are taking the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) today. Students who took and passed both sections last year as 9th

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

graders are not taking the test this year. The test contractor held training sessions on test administration. He reported that the assessment staff had received 92 questions in just the last three days regarding the judge's preliminary injunction. He informed the Board that the test data on the released items from last year included individual student performance on each released item, which the field very much appreciated.

Mr. Spears stated that SB 1609 requires the Board to act on or before August 1, 2003, on whether to delay the date upon which each student is required to pass CAHSEE as a condition of receiving a high school diploma. The Department has developed a study design concept in coordination with the Board staff. The work plan outline has seven tasks, including reporting the results of the study and making recommendations to the Board.

Ms. Belisle commented that when the Board is making its decision on whether to delay the test, it would be valuable to have information about students, if any, who are doing high school-level coursework who could not access the test with accommodations or modifications. Mr. Jenkins said that it is important to look at equal access to education. Superintendent Eastin stated that it is important to make the point that these are skills students have to master to do well in the work world. Mrs. Joseph commented that in the SB 1609 study, the major efforts in staff development should not be ignored.

Jan Chladek, Standards and Assessment Division, noted that the Department staff had noticed the lack of professional development questions in the study and asked that contractor include such information in the study. Mr. Mockler commented that the study should analyze STAR data and CAHSEE data to determine the level of student mastery of the content standards.

Referring to the language under Task 3, Mrs. Joseph remarked that we need to be very careful that the outline does not give the impression that we are going to make major changes in the test. These really are the things students need to know. Ms. Hammer said that she wants to be sure that we are not sending out a message that we do not expect all 9th graders to have taken algebra. Ms. Reynolds noted that it is one thing to look at problem areas, but it is another thing to say we would reduce the scope of the test. Ms. Reynolds asked if, in reviewing the CAHSEE, the survey could include inquiry into whether there are students doing high school-level content standards-coursework who could not access the test with accommodations or any of the modifications that may be specified in the student's Individualized Education Program or Section 504 Plan and thus needed an alternative assessment. She asked Mr. Spears if she needed to put that suggestion into the form of a motion.

Mr. Spears replied that the discussion today on this point would inform the work of the contractor and a motion is not necessary. Mr. Jenkins asked if survey teams would actually go to schools and how the schools in the survey would be chosen. Mr. Spears responded that the plan is to initially go to five schools to develop the survey. The survey will go out to all high schools, and then a survey team will visit ten percent of the responding schools to verify their survey responses. Mr. Spears added that there are criteria for selecting the schools that will be visited by the survey team.

[Ms. Hammer presided until the lunch break.]

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Maureen Culpepper, Learning Disability Association of California
Jo Beam, President, Learning Disability Association of California

Lunch Break: Ms. Hammer called for the lunch break at 12:05 p.m. President Hastings reconvened the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

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

Mr. Spears reported that 334,000 students took the CELDT in fall. He drew the Board's attention to the charts on the test results. [Attachment 2, CELDT Preliminary 2001 Results] The Department will be matching student STAR and CELDT test scores and analyzing the test results and will report the findings to the Board in April. Department staff is working on posting the CELDT test results on the website at the end of April. He cautioned about drawing conclusions from data.

Mr. Spears walked the Board through data tables. He noted that 52.9 percent of test takers were kindergarten students. He explained that "II" indicates the test was given as an initial identification and "AA" indicates that the test was an annual assessment. Twenty-one percent of students who took the test for initial identification scored early advanced or advanced in overall proficiency. He drew the Board's attention to Table 6, *Estimate of Fluency Based on Initial Identification Criteria*. He reported that for all grades, 21 percent of test takers scored at least early advanced overall with skill area scores of at least intermediate.

Mrs. Ichinaga expressed concern that schools still have not received scores from the testing done this summer and fall. Mr. Spears responded that the initial assessment is scored locally. He agreed that there were unacceptable delays in scoring and reporting the test results for the annual assessment. He added that the Department has worked with the contractor and expects improvement. He noted the third bullet on page 10, which shows the total percent of students taking the annual assessment and scoring early advanced or advanced was the lowest for the listening/speaking skill area (24 percent). For the reading portion, 29 percent of test takers scored early advanced or advanced. The percentage of students scoring at the early advanced or advanced was the highest for writing, 32 percent. Table 12 shows the overall proficiency level for students taking the test for annual assessment. Statewide, 24 percent of all English learners who took the CELDT for annual assessment scored high enough to meet the criteria for review for possible reclassification to Fluent English Proficient (FEP). Mr. Spears commented that this data gets to the issue of when we should reclassify students. This test is the primary measure for reclassification, but the reclassification decision includes other information, including input from the student's teacher and parents.

Mrs. Joseph noted that the Board recommended that students who score in the higher ranges of the intermediate level be considered for reclassification. She asked what do we know about the middle and high school students who took the test. Mr. Spears replied that all the demographic information was gathered, but has not yet been analyzed. This would be reported to the Board in April.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

Mr. Fisher noted that the high school students who score on the beginning level would not be able to pass the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE). Mrs. Ichinaga commented that the percent of students that should be considered for reclassification is considerably higher than the ten percent or so of students who are currently reclassified each year.

ITEM 9	Seminar Session: The Public's View on Standards and Accountability.	INFORMATION
--------	---	-------------

Superintendent Eastin introduced Andy Plattner. She noted that Mr. Plattner had done extensive research on the public's views on assessment and that the Board would find his presentation to be very informative.

Mr. Plattner presented information about public support for standards and accountability. [Attachment 3, Seminar Presentation]

President Hastings thanked Mr. Plattner for his outstanding presentation.

ITEM 10	Report of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	-----------------------

[Ms. Hammer presided for the remainder of the day's session.]

Curriculum Commission Chair Sue Stickel gave the Commission's monthly report and informed the Board that no action was being requested under this item. She announced that Commissioner Philibosian had sent a letter of resignation this week, which was accepted with regret.

ITEM 11	Draft Health Framework Addendum and Criteria for Evaluating K-8 Health Instructional Materials.	ACTION
---------	---	--------

Ms. Stickel informed the Board that the purpose of the health addendum was to add important, updated information to the framework. The new section on scope and sequence is of particular importance because it will guide instruction. Ms. Stickel introduced Laura Griffin, Vice Chair of Health Committee, who was available to answer any questions from the Board.

Mr. Mockler noted that the framework was submitted to the Board last month. The Board office received public comment and met with a number of people, including Commission Chair Sue Stickel, about the comments. As a result of those conversations, the Board staff has some additional changes that are technical in nature. [Attachment 4, Memo to the Board on Changes to the Health Framework and Addendum]

The following individual addressed the Board:
Phyllidia Burlingame, American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

Ms. Reynolds expressed concern about adding information about programs that have not been seen by the Board. Mr. Mockler noted that all three individuals who had signed up to speak are requesting the addition of information that the Curriculum Commission had discussed on several occasions. The Commission's decision is clear and the result of a deliberative process. There is no reason to overturn the Curriculum Commission's decision. Ms. Reynolds stated that the greater concern is listing research we have not seen and have not reviewed for ourselves.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Sue Dunlap, Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California
Shannon Smith-Crowley, California Medical Association

In response to a speaker's comment, Ms. Stickel noted that the Commission had a lengthy discussion about Doug Kirby's research. Among the Commission's concerns about mentioning that specific research was the length of document and the timeliness of specific research in a document that is not updated more than every eight years. Ms. Hammer said that she is concerned that schools have somewhere to go when they want good information. Ms. Stickel replied that with all the information available on the Internet, districts have many resources available to them.

Ms. Reynolds stated that she had enormous respect for the speakers and the work of their organizations. However, including this information in the addendum is tantamount to endorsing it. She added that she wants to reference the responsibility of districts to provide current and accurate research and information. Ms. Reynolds noted that there were a couple of clean-up issues. She said that she is particularly interested in parental notification and is pleased to know that the information in the addendum conforms to parental notification statutes. She expressed concern that *Education Code* sections in the addendum have outdated ethnic references. She wanted to recognize that the language in the code is not appropriate. Ms. Reynolds suggested a correction in the syntax of one of the purposed changes. Ms. Reynolds thanked the Curriculum Commission and staff for their work on the addendum.

Ms. Stickel informed the Board that the Commission is requesting a legal review of codes in framework, addendum, and criteria.

- ACTION: Ms. Reynolds moved that the State Board approve the draft Health Framework Addendum and criteria, as recommended by the Curriculum Commission, with technical changes to the framework, addendum, and criteria as deemed necessary by the legal review, as presented by Board staff at the meeting, and as discussed during the meeting. The technical changes are to be agreed upon by CDE staff, the Chair of the Curriculum Commission, and the Executive Director of the State Board of Education. Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Hastings was not present when the vote was taken.

Mr. Mockler remarked that the three individuals who spoke on this issue were very helpful in their interactions with staff and the Board and provided technical suggestions that were both useful and in keeping with the Board's desire to make only necessary, technical changes to the framework.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

ITEM 12	Implementation of the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program (AB 466, Strom-Martin).	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

(Attachment 5, Memo from UCOP-CDPI, Governor's Reading Initiatives)

Bill Vasey, Professional Development and Curriculum Support Division, informed the Board that the Department would be sending a letter to local education agencies (LEAs) that week to notify them of availability of funds. Ms. Hammer reported that 120 representatives of county offices of education had attended a rollout of the professional development program. It is very exciting to be implementing one of Governor Davis' major education initiatives. Ms. Hammer publicly thanked Alice Furry and her staff at the Sacramento County Office of Education for all their work on the criteria and the rollout.

Mr. Mockler informed the Board that AB 466 has three pieces. The Board develops criteria for approving providers and creates a process for reviewing and approving providers. The third piece is the piece Mr. Vasey mentioned, the funding to LEAs. He asked the Board for a motion authorizing the Board president to enter into a contract with a local education agency, or agencies, for the review and recommendation process.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board authorize the Board President to enter into an agreement on behalf of the State Board with a local education agency (or agencies) to review provider applications and make recommendations to the State Board regarding approval of professional development providers and programs using the funds specifically appropriated for that purpose. Ms. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Hastings was not present when the vote was taken.
- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board concur with the finding of the report from the California Professional Development Institute, Governor's Reading Initiative, that the University of California Professional Development Institutes may serve teachers in grades 4-6 in the Los Angeles Unified School District from schools at or below the 40th percentile on the SAT 9 in the 2000-1 institutes. Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Hastings was not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 13	AB 466 Revised Proposed Emergency Regulations.	ACTION
---------	--	--------

Mr. Vasey reported that these regulations had been amended to reflect changes requested by the Office of Administrative Law. One additional change was made regarding the hours of required professional development for instructional aides and paraprofessionals.

The following individual addressed the Board:
 Don Bridge, California Teachers Association

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 6-7, 2002

- ACTION: Mr. Jenkins moved that the State Board approve the proposed emergency regulations as revised. Mrs. Joseph seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Hastings was not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 14	Implementation of Principal Training Program (AB 75, Steinberg).	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	-----------------------

Mr. Vasey stated that the Department wants to create the easiest system possible for local education agencies. The Department will be putting information about AB 75 on the website and the LEA funding application will be an on-line process.

ITEM 15	State Education Agency Intervention in Long-Term Program Improvement Schools: An Overview of the 2001 Scholastic Audit Process.	INFORMATION
---------	---	-------------

Item 15 was deferred until the April 2002 meeting.

ITEM 16	Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	-----------------------

Item 16 was postponed to the morning of the Thursday session. (See minutes for March 7, 2002.)

Adjournment of Day's Session: Ms. Hammer adjourned the day's session at 3:33 p.m.)