

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

Wednesday, March 12, 2003

California Department of Education
1430 N Street, Room 1101
Sacramento, California

Members Present

Reed Hastings, President
Joe Nuñez, Vice President
Robert J. Abernethy
Donald Fisher
Nancy Ichinaga
Carol S. Katzman
Stephanie H. Lee
Suzanne Tacheny

Members Absent

Vacancy
Vacancy
Vacancy

Secretary and Executive Officer

Jack O'Connell, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Principal Staff

Gavin Payne, Chief Deputy Superintendent, California Department of Education
Susan Ronnback, Chief Policy Advisor to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Cindy Cunningham, Liaison to the State Board, California Department of Education
Marsha Bedwell, General Counsel, California Department of Education
Rick Brandsma, Executive Director, State Board of Education
Phil Garcia, Deputy Executive Director, State Board of Education
Greg Geeting, Assistant Executive Director, State Board of Education
Karen Steentofte, Chief Counsel, State Board of Education
Marion Joseph, Special Consultant to the State Board of Education
Debbie Rury, 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 9:10 a.m.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

Salute to the Flag

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

Approval of Minutes (February 2003 Meeting)

- ACTION: Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board approve the minutes of the February 2003 meeting with minor corrections. Mrs. Ichinaga seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken. Ms. Katzman, though present, had not taken the Oath of Office at the time the vote was taken and, therefore, did not participate in the vote.

Announcements/Communications

New Board Member

President Hastings welcomed and introduced the new State Board member, Carol Katzman. He noted that Ms. Katzman is the former chair of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing and has been involved in education for more than 30 years. She was an elementary school teacher for many years and served as an assistant superintendent in the Beverly Hills Unified School District.

Superintendent O'Connell administered the Oath of Office to Ms. Katzman.

Ms. Katzman thanked President Hastings for his warm welcome and stated that she is thrilled to have been appointed to the Board.

Agenda Changes

President Hastings announced that *Pazmiño, et al., v. California State Board of Education, et al.*, arose after the agenda was published and it will be discussed in Closed Session in order to comply with legally imposed deadlines.

President Hasting announced the following changes in the agenda:

- The NCLB-related items will be heard in the following order: Item 3, Item 5, and then Item 4.
- Item 20, High Priority Schools Grant Program – New Implementation Grant Awards, has been withdrawn at the Department's request.
- The Board will meet in Closed Session today at the end of the day and will also meet in Closed Session on Thursday morning.

Report of the Superintendent

On behalf of the entire Department, Superintendent O'Connell welcomed Ms. Katzman to the Board. He added that he looks forward to working with her.

Superintendent O'Connell reported that he had had numerous opportunities to speak about the new weighting of the Academic Performance Index (API). He stated that it is a positive step that the California Standards Tests (CSTs) comprise 80 percent of the elementary and middle school API and

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

that for high schools, 88 percent of the API is based on the CSTs and the California High School Exit Exam.

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

2004 Meeting Schedule

Referring to the proposed 2004 State Board meeting calendar, President Hastings asked the Board to review the dates for discussion at the April meeting. President Hastings noted that Superintendent O’Connell might want to suggest some alternative dates.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing Liaison Report

Commission on Teacher Credentialing Liaison Alan Bersin, Superintendent for San Diego Unified School District, stated that he would reserve his comments for items on the agenda.

Foreign Language Instructional Materials

President Hastings informed the Board that copies of the foreign language instructional materials submitted for the 2004 adoption are available to Board members who wish to receive them.

No action was taken on this item.

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

The following individual addressed the Board:

Larry Duff, Service Employees International Union, Local 790

ITEM 3	No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, Including, But Not Limited to, Update on NCLB	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Camille Maben, NCLB Coordinator, commented that this item was a catchall for everything not covered in Item 5. She reported that the Local Education Agency (LEA) Plan template has been mailed out to the districts and posted on the Department’s website. She noted that the Department and Board staffs continue to work together to develop the supplemental services survey that will be used to evaluate the delivery of supplemental educational services.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

Chuck Weis, Chair of the AB 312 NCLB Liaison Team (Liaison Team), reported on the Liaison Team meeting. He informed the Board that the majority of the day was spent discussing the definition of highly qualified teachers and paraprofessional qualifications. Because the Liaison Team felt it was important to explain to the U. S. Department of Education (USDE) and members of Congress about the rigor of the current state teacher credentialing process, the Liaison Team approved a motion that both State Senator John Vasconcellos and Assemblywoman Jackie Goldberg speak with appropriate members of Congress and USDE staff regarding California's current credentialing process and the definition of highly qualified teachers. A process for veteran teachers to demonstrate NCLB compliance was also discussed. The Liaison Team approved several motions related to NCLB requirements for paraprofessionals, including the number of required college course units, local flexibility for coursework requirements, and reciprocity with other local education agencies.

Mr. Weis informed the Board that the Liaison Team would meet again on April 3. The agenda for that meeting includes the definition of highly qualified teachers, paraprofessional qualifications, the State Consolidated Application, and an update on student information and data management.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 5	The May 1, 2003 submission to the United States Department of Education of specified information pertaining to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act.	INFORMATION
--------	---	-------------

Peer Review

Ms. Maben reported on the February 26 USDE peer review. The review team was comprised of two USDE staff members and three peer reviewers. Many Department staff members were involved in the discussion. We will receive a written report from the peer review team and then continue negotiations with the USDE. Overall, the discussion was very positive. Ms. Maben commented that there were "kudos" to be passed out to Department staff, especially to Bill Padia and his staff.

Ms. Maben noted that there are still issues that need to be resolved: subgroup size; parental opt-outs for assessment; the length of time English learners (ELs) stay in the EL subgroup; the timing of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) information and notification for schools; the definition of continuous enrollment; and the California High School Exit Exam as a proxy for the high school graduation rate.

In addition, Ms. Maben reported that Mr. Brandsma, Ms. Rury, and she had a conversation for USDE staff and clarified what information has to be included in the May submission, which will be brought before the Board at the April 2003 meeting.

Ms. Maben informed the Board that there are eight components for inclusion in the May 1st submission to the USDE. Each of these components will be discussed in turn. In addition, there would be a discussion of the definition of highly qualified teachers.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

Setting State Targets

Bill Padia, Policy and Evaluation Division, pointed out that the state targets are those that the Board adopted in January 2003 and were submitted as part of the Accountability Workbook.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Baseline Data

Mr. Padia informed the Board that Performance Goal 1 is that all students attain proficiency or better in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014. Performance indicators 1.1 and 1.2 are the percentage of students in the aggregate and in each subgroup attaining proficiency or better in reading and mathematics, respectively. Mr. Padia noted that the proposed starting points provided in the agenda materials are based on grades 2-8 only, and the English learner subgroup includes students redesignated as fluent English proficient (RFEP). President Hastings asked about the accuracy of the RFEP information by student. Mr. Padia answered that the RFEP information is reliable.

Mr. Padia noted that performance indicator 1.3 is the percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress (AYP). Based on the spring 2002 assessment results, 48 percent of the Title I schools met AYP. Performance Goal 5 is that all students will graduate from high school. Performance indicator 5.1 is the percentage of students, in the aggregate and by subgroup, who graduate from high school with a regular diploma. Performance indicator 5.2 is the percentage of students who drop out of school. The proposed data for these indicators are calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports.

Evidence of Adopting Academic Content Standards/Grade-Level Expectations in Math and Reading

Ms. Maben reported that for this evidence, the USDE was directed to the State Board-adopted standards for mathematics and English-language arts, which were adopted in 1997.

Detailed Timeline for Adopting Academic Content Standards/Grade-Level Expectations in Science

The USDE was informed that the Board adopted academic content standards in science in 1998.

Detailed Timeline for Developing and Implementing Required Assessments in Science, and Detailed Timeline for Setting Academic Performance Standards in Science

Geno Flores, Deputy Superintendent, presented a timeline for developing and implementing the required assessments in science. He reminded the Board that we must develop new science tests for two grade spans, middle school (6-9) and high school (10-12). The timeline is through 2007, with the first test administration of the middle and high school tests planned for spring 2006.

Evidence of a Single Accountability System (Alignment of State and Federal systems)

Mr. Padia reported that staff is working on the school classification matrix with its system of stars to communicate a school's status to the field. Five stars would indicate the highest performing schools. This matrix creates a convenient dividing line for the state achievement awards. The one-star category schools could be the focus for intervention resources.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

Ms. Tacheny expressed her appreciation for the Department staff, especially for the careful consideration of schools that might be “exceptions to the rule” and making the matrix fair to all schools. She remarked that she has spoken with school representatives who do not understand there is a 12-year timeline to meet the NCLB goal of proficiency for all students and that more, and better, communication to the field is necessary.

Integrating State and Federal Systems for Interventions and Accountability

Wendy Harris, School Improvement Division, noted that there are numerous school improvement programs at the state and federal levels. A workgroup has met for six weeks and will continue to meet on alignment. The following are issues that the workgroup is addressing: (1) focusing state interventions at the district level rather than the school level; (2) reserving state intervention for only the lowest performing schools, such as those in the bottom tier(s) of the classification matrix; (3) how long the schools should receive additional support without improvement before interventions become necessary; (4) whether the definition of the term “significant growth” should be revised; and (5) exit criteria.

Mr. Bersin commented that he was “putting on his local district hat” to express his interest in a district-level measure being added in the classification matrix and leaving in the capacity for district-level performance to be part of the matrix. He cautioned the Board not to underestimate how bewildering the current system of various interventions under different programs is for districts. He said that there is a need to explain to teachers, parents, and stakeholders the changes in the accountability system and the various interventions and identifications of lower performing schools.

Ms. Tacheny remarked that the challenge is to provide clear information in well-designed reports that simplify the information.

Standards and Objectives for English Proficiency: Annual Measurable Achievement

Jan Mayer, Language Policy and Leadership Unit, reported that Title III has specific accountability requirements for English learners and outlined the policy decisions to be made by the Board in April. The state plan for NCLB requires two major annual measurable achievement objectives: (1) gains in the percentage of students meeting the annual California English Language Development Test (CELDT) growth objectives and (2) the annual increase in the percentage of students attaining English language proficiency as demonstrated by the CELDT. The CELDT test data for the last two years will be used to develop a proposal for these measures. Ms. Mayer noted that assessment staff is assisting with this analysis of the data.

President Hastings asked if the CELDT header information includes the number of years a student has been in a school in the United States and was advised that it was included. President Hastings commented that the Board would like more feedback on the proposed models. It is difficult to track student proficiency for a grade-level cohort because new English learners are constantly coming into the cohort.

Mr. Nuñez asked for several models with predictions based on the last two years’ test data, such as those that Mr. Padia has provided on the AYP issues.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

Highly Qualified Teachers

Ms. Steentofte reported there was a good discussion at the AB 312 NCLB Liaison Team meeting. Staff is trying to cover all the bases by developing a plan in the event that the USDE does not accept the rigor of California's credentialing system as sufficient for identifying highly qualified teachers. At the crux of the issue is demonstrating subject matter competency. Ms. Steentofte explained the possible alternatives that comply with NCLB-allowable methods. President Hastings asked how clear the USDE guidance is on the definitions of "new" and "veteran" teachers. Ms. Steentofte responded that the guidance was not clear at all.

Ms. Steentofte said that the new CTC tests, the California Subject Examinations for Teaching (CSET) multiple subject and single subject tests, could be one option to determine subject matter competency. Staff is currently working with the NCLB Liaison Team and stakeholders to piggy back on to the Stull Act Review process for demonstrating subject matter competency of veteran teachers. The Multiple Subject Assessment for Teaching (MSAT) and the Single Subject Assessment for Teaching (SSAT) have been discussed as possible options, including how to modify both tests for California purposes.

Mr. Nuñez commented that the definition of new teacher is important. He recommended that the definition for highly qualified teachers be made "portable," that is once a teacher is identified as highly qualified in one district, the teacher is highly qualified for all California districts. Mr. Nuñez asked who the audience is for the CSET. Is the CSET for people coming out of a credentialing program or people seeking credentials by alternate means? Ms. Steentofte clarified that the CSET is currently used in place of coursework, but if used to meet the requirement of NCLB, teacher candidates who completed the coursework would take the test as well. She added that the validation issue on the CSET is still unresolved. Ms. Tacheny expressed interest in the National Teacher Subject Matter Exam, being developed by ABCTE, as a possible option.

Superintendent O'Connell stated that the definition of veteran teacher is also important. It is not clear whether a teacher who taught for many years, left the profession, and is now returning to the classroom would be considered a new or veteran teacher.

President Hastings said that students deserve teachers that actually know the material. He inquired if the highly qualified teacher requirement applied only to Title I schools. Bill Vasey, Professional Development and Curriculum Support Division, replied that it currently applies for all new hires in the Title I schools and in 2005-2006, the requirement will apply to all teachers instructing core subjects in all schools.

President Hastings remarked that the tension is that the districts want a definition as soon as possible so they can make staffing decisions, but the CTC and the Legislature want additional time to develop the definition. Much discussion has occurred, and the NCLB Liaison Team wants more discussion. President Hastings expressed concern that if the definition is rushed, these stakeholders will not be supportive.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

Ms. Katzman commented that the worst-case scenario would be for Board to get ahead of the CTC and the Legislature. She added that the current system is rigorous and worth a good look. She said that she is optimistic, that the stakeholders can all work together to develop a definition of highly qualified teachers. Ms. Katzman pointed out that there has not been much discussion of the teachers who are highly qualified in other states and what that means about their attainment of California's high standards.

Mr. Nuñez alerted the State Board to an issue related to defining veteran teachers as highly qualified teachers. When those teachers retire, schools, particularly in rural areas, may not be able to find teachers who are highly qualified in the several subjects they will need to teach. This potential teacher shortage in rural and small schools could be an unintended consequence of how we define highly qualified teachers.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Marlene Canter, Los Angeles USD Board Member

Dick Bray, Association of California School Administrators

Silvia DeRuvo, California Association of Resource Specialists and Special Education Teachers

Holly Jacobsen, California School Boards Association

Paraprofessional Requirements

Mr. Vasey recounted that the issues raised by the NCLB Liaison Team include local flexibility. He informed the Board that one issue in the agenda materials regarding community colleges and whether they meet the definition for institutes of higher education is no longer a concern. Community colleges are institutes of higher education for this NCLB purpose.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 4	No Child Left Behind (NCLB): School Accountability Report Card (SARC).	INFORMATION
--------	--	-------------

Mr. Padia noted that Item 4 was an information item. He reported that the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) is being brought into NCLB compliance. He added that the Department intends to provide the NCLB data in the template for local district use.

Ms. Tacheny commented that every effort has been made to keep the SARC short and now it is getting to be too long. She suggested seeking statutory change to eliminate some of the state-required information.

No action was taken on this item.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

ITEM 6	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Adoption of Performance Standards (Levels) for the California Integrated Science Standards Tests.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Mr. Flores welcomed Ms. Katzman to the Board and said that he looks forward to working with her in her new capacity. He informed the Board that the newly redesigned integrated science tests will be administered this spring. The test items on those tests are the same as those in the subject specific tests and the performance standards expectations for the integrated science tests are the same as for the subject specific tests.

Mr. Abernethy remarked that all of us have worked very hard to bring the best science curriculum to California's students, as presented in the new *Science Framework*. The framework does not, in grades 9-12, integrate the science fields. He said that he had two points to make. One is that generally the integrated science curriculum is watered down curriculum. Few students take 3rd and 4th year integrated science, and, therefore, do not get the whole of any single science discipline. Mr. Abernethy asserted that we are doing a disservice to our students to promote this form of instruction. The second concern is that there is a teacher shortage in science. He sees it as an impossible problem to find highly qualified teachers for integrated science, which covers several science disciplines. This gets back to President Hastings' comments that students deserve teachers who know their subject matter content. He does not think there are many teachers who have degrees in three or four fields of science.

Mr. Nuñez stated that he considers this an issue of an implied promise. A year ago the integrated science community came before the Board and agreed to return with a proposal for redesigned integrated science tests. In October 2002, the Board approved the integrated science community's blueprints. On that basis, Mr. Nuñez urged the Board to approve the performance standards.

Ms. Tacheny concurred with Mr. Abernethy's concerns regarding integrated science. She said that she wants performance standards adopted to hold the schools accountable for students who are taking integrated science. Over time, Ms. Tacheny pointed out, we will accrue empirical information on which to base discussion about the different methods of instruction. Ms. Lee stated her support for the traditional approach to teaching science and that she shares Mr. Abernethy's concerns about promoting integrated science.

President Hastings said the advantage to having data on student performance on integrated science tests is having that the data raise the discussion about approaches for teaching science above the theoretical level. Ms. Tacheny commented if we do not test integrated science students and hold schools accountable by adopting the performance standards, we could be setting up a perverse incentive to enroll more students in integrated science because those students would be outside the accountability system.

The following individuals addressed the Board:
Jacki Fox Ruby, California Federation of Teachers
Christine Bertrand, California Science Teachers Association

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board adopt the performance standards (levels) for the California Standards Tests in Integrated Science as presented in the agenda item. Ms. Katzman seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-2. Mr. Abernethy and Mrs. Ichinaga voted against the motion.

President Hastings acknowledged this is a difficult topic on which intelligent people disagree.

ITEM 7	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR): Including, but not limited to, the Plan for Releasing California Standards Test (CST) Items.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Mr. Flores presented the plan for releasing the California Standards Test items.

President Hastings observed that during his review of the CAHSEE items, he found the majority of items were very good, but some were not. It is important to ensure that when the items are released they are a random sample, so we are not hiding the not-as-good items. He asked for an explanation of the process for identifying those items to be released. Ms. Tacheny commented that she thinks content review panel (CRP) involvement is important in the item release process. Mr. Flores noted that there needs to be a selection process that ensures a range difficulty is represented in the released items.

President Hastings said that he wants the released items to honestly represent the items in the tests. Phil Spears, Standards and Assessment Division, stated that an important reason for item release is to provide information on how standards are addressed in the test.

Ms. Tacheny said that there is no measurable way to do this item selection. She added that she would like to get the first year release up to 25 percent if possible. She reiterated the necessity of the CRP involvement. Ms. Tacheny expressed her concern about how we will communicate about the released items to the field, parents, and the students.

Mr. Fisher expressed concern about the general policy of releasing items. President Hastings noted that in most states, high-stakes tests items are released. Releasing items shines a light on the tests. Ms. Tacheny stated that in addition to releasing the items, we would be releasing the P-values, the percent of students who answered that item correctly.

Superintendent O'Connell requested additional information on the methodology for releasing items.

No action was taken on this item.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

ITEM 8	California English Language Development Test (CELDT): Including, but not limited to, 2002 Preliminary Results.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

President Hastings remarked that there was great news on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT) results.

Mr. Flores presented the tables of CELDT results for students taking the exam as an annual assessment. He reported that there is an increase in the number and percent of students who scored at early advanced and advanced.

Mr. Fisher asked why only seven to eight percent of the students are reclassified each year. Mr. Flores responded that the CELDT results are just one piece of information used for reclassification. Another important piece of information is a student's CST English-language arts test score, which the school does not have until the end of the school year or the beginning of the following year.

President Hastings remarked that the beauty of the CELDT data is that it provides a standardized, objective measure of English language proficiency.

Mr. Flores referred to the longitudinal tables. President Hastings asked for the longitudinal information presented in Tables 6 and 7 to be presented in terms of the number of years students have been in schools in the United States. Mr. Flores replied that he would bring that information back in April.

President Hastings asked what would be the clearest way to communicate this information to the public. He observed that the test results show our teachers are doing a great job.

No action was taken on this item.

Lunch Break: President Hastings called for the lunch break at 12:15 p.m. He reconvened the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

ITEM 9	California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Including, but not limited to, CAHSEE Program Update.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Mr. Flores said that the high school exit exam law affects the class of 2004. AB 1609 called for an independent report and gives an August 1, 2003 deadline for a Board decision on whether to delay the requirement that students pass the high school exit exam to receive a diploma. The HumRRO study, under the provisions of AB 1609, is looking at instruction on the standards. HumRRO will report its findings in May.

No action was taken on this item.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

ITEM 10	Golden State Examination (GSE) Program: Update on the GSE Program.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

Mr. Flores reported that the in mid-year budget reductions, the Golden State Examination (GSE) funding would be cut by \$8 million. There is sufficient funding in that proposal for the three tests: the 11th grade reading, 11th grade writing, and high school summative mathematics test that California State University (CSU) plans to use for placement purposes.

President Hastings commented that from a communication standpoint, the GSE has been an important way to recognize high achievement and it is important to get the message out that the Golden State Recognition Program will continue even though the tests will be different. President Hastings said that at the April meeting he would like to see at least preliminary work on the use of the California Standards Tests (CSTs) for the Golden State Recognition Program.

Superintendent O’Connell stated that he also would like to have a conversation with the CSU about the need for the three tests. President Hastings said that he thinks CSU will continue to want the constructed response items, but he would like to see that discussion take place.

President Hastings commented that it was very exciting CSU is working with the Department and the Board to use the CSTs and the GSE augmentation for CSU placement. If this happens, California will be the only state in which such a strong, intersegmental relationship exists.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 11	Proposed intervention for 24 schools in Cohort 1 of the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) that failed to show significant growth in 2000-2001 and 2001-2002.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

Ms. Harris presented Item 11, including the recommendations for schools that failed to make growth for two years (2000-01 and 2001-02). She noted that provisions of SB 1310 need further clarifications, which are outlined in the Department’s recommendation. Ms. Harris explained the two types of interventions authorized under the II/USP. She reported on the Department’s survey of the 24 schools and its conclusion that nothing the Department learned in the survey seemed to justify the first type of intervention. These 24 schools could all benefit from solid, straightforward advice. The Department has been working very hard with the Board staff to strengthen the School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) process and to ensure that process is not disruptive. The Department recommends that (1) the districts be required to contract with a SAIT and (2) the governing boards retain their legal rights, duties and responsibilities.

Sue Stickel, Deputy Superintendent, informed the Board that that guiding principles and the evaluation tool focus the SAITs on the State Board-adopted instructional materials and AB 466 and AB 75 professional development. The SAIT evaluations will be concentrating on grade levels, as well as on the

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

school level. She added that there would be additional training for the SAITs on the guiding principles and the revised evaluation tool.

Mr. Nuñez expressed his hope that the SAIT process will be constructive and collaborative. He asked about the timeline for the districts to contract with a SAIT. President Hastings asked about the funding source. Ms. Harris responded that the funds are allocated for the SAITs and also for the implementation of the corrective actions.

Ms. Tacheny noted that with the addition of 2002 API data, she is more comfortable with saying that these schools need help and that we have real assistance to offer. Ms. Tacheny thanked Ms. Stickel for showing her grade-level data for these schools.

Mr. Nuñez mentioned the EdSource publication on low-performing schools and recommended it as a resource for the SAITs' work. He added that it has is very useful information. Mr. Bersin noted that there are two San Diego schools on the list and urged the Board not to approve any recommendations without having frequent monitoring in place.

Mr. Fisher noted that these under-performing schools are not the lowest-performing schools in the state. We should use limited resources to improve the lowest-performing schools. Mrs. Ichinaga expressed her concern about changing the criteria of the API and how that affects year-to-year comparisons. She concurred with Mr. Fisher that the focus should be on the lowest-performing schools. Ms. Stickel commented that is why it is important to look more closely at school-level and grade-level data. Sometimes it appears a school is doing well, but by looking at grade levels you may find that some grades are not doing as well. Mr. Flores noted that the High Priority Schools Grant Program does focus on the lowest-performing schools, the more than 500 Decile 1 and 2 schools. Ms. Katzman commented that the two San Diego schools are impressive in that zero percent of their teachers are not credentialed.

President Hastings pointed out that there were 430 Cohort 1 II/USP schools and 406 showed growth, just 24 did not.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Jean Fuller, superintendent, Bakersfield City USD

Dotty Leveque, assistant superintendent, Ontario-Montclair USD

Kate Lennox

David Smart, president, Parent Association, Sacramento High School

Ellyne Bell, parent, Sacramento High School

Heidi McLean, parent, Sacramento High School

Mario Galvan

Tracy Vance Trup

Jeanne Chasko

Speaking on the Board's behalf, President Hastings said that they heard the frustration of the Sacramento High School parents. Within our system of government, the next step for them is to direct their energies

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

toward the next election of the local school board. He added that the Board does not have the authority to overturn the local board’s action.

Mr. Nuñez said for the record he wanted it to be clear that the action by the Sacramento City School Board to close Sacramento High School was partly taken in response to information the district received from the Department staff about actions the Board would take—long before the Board took action on any of the 24 schools.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheney moved that the State Board approve the CDE staff recommendations to:
 - (1) Require 21 school districts to enter into contracts with School Assistance and Intervention Teams (SAITs) for each of the 24 Cohort 1 Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) schools that failed to show significant growth in 2000-01 and 2001-02 (as identified in the agenda item);
 - (2) Allow the governing board of each school district to retain its legal rights, duties, and responsibilities with respect to each state-monitored school within its jurisdiction; and
 - (3) Seek statutory modifications in the two areas of concern identified by staff.

Ms. Katzman seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0-1. Mr. Abernethy did not vote on the motion.

ITEM 12	2003 Foreign Language Primary Adoption Instructional Materials Advisory Panel (IMAP) and Language Expert (LE) applications for the 2003 K-8 Foreign Language Adoption of Instructional Materials – Third Cohort.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

Tom Adams, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division, presented the recommendations for approval of the Instruction Materials Advisory Panel members and Language Experts for the foreign language adoption.

- ACTION: Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board approve the appointment of members of the Instructional Materials Advisory Panel (IMAP) and Language Expert (LE) panel for the 2003 K-8 Foreign Language Instructional Materials Adoption as recommended by the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission. Ms. Katzman seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

ITEM 13	Implementation of the AB 466 Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program (Chapter 737, Statutes of 2001): Including, but not Limited to, Approval of Training Providers and Training Curricula.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

Ms. Franklin presented the recommendation to approve Scholastic Inc. as an AB 466 provider for *READ 180*. She noted that if the Board approved this provider, there will be approved AB 466 providers for all

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

five of the English-language arts/English language development intervention programs adopted by the Board in January 2002.

- ACTION: Ms. Lee moved that the State Board approve Scholastic Inc. as an AB 466 provider for *READ 180*, as recommended by State Board staff. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0-1. Exercising an abundance of caution, Ms. Katzman did not vote on the motion because (1) this action involved a specific private-sector organization and (2) she had not yet filed Form 700 (disclosure of economic interests) in connection with her appointment to the State Board.

ITEM 14	Approval of Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) and Consortia applications for funding under The Principal Training Program (AB 75).	ACTION
---------	--	--------

Mr. Vasey asked for the Board’s approval of Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) that have submitted funding applications.

- ACTION: Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board approve the local education agency applications for funding for the AB 75 Principal Training Program, as recommended by CDE staff, with the understanding that actual funding amounts will be determined by CDE staff pursuant to the provisions of AB 75. Ms. Katzman seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

ITEM 15	AB 75 Principal Training Program (Chapter 697, Statutes of 2001): Including, but not Limited to, Modification of Module 1 Criteria and Guidelines for Provider Applicants and Local Education Agencies.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	-----------------------

Ms. Franklin reported that the Board staff and the Department staff have been working cooperatively on modifications to the criteria and guidelines. In April there will be a proposal for Board action.

ITEM 16	For Information: Guidelines for administration and reporting locally adopted tests of achievement as indicators in the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM).	INFORMATION
---------	---	-------------

President Hastings reminded the audience that the Board would adjourn the Public Session and convene the Closed Session following this item and would continue the Closed Session on Thursday morning.

Sue Bennett, Education Options Office, introduced Vicki Barber, Co-Chair of the Alternative Schools Accountability Model (ASAM) Subcommittee, and Stan Rabinowitz of WestEd.

Ms. Barber provided background information on assessment instruments. Mr. Rabinowitz explained the proposed guidelines, which are intended to help alternative schools use the best tests available for their student population.

FINAL MINUTES
California State Board of Education
March 12-13, 2003

President Hastings asked about the ASAM in other states. Ms. Barber responded that most states roll up scores to the district level. Mr. Rabinowitz commented that he has found other states look to California.

Mr. Abernethy advised that he would not attend the April meeting as he would be inspecting NATO forces at that time. He expressed gratitude for Superintendent O'Connell's level of participation in the Board meetings.

Adjournment Of Day's Public Session: President Hastings adjourned the day's Public Session at 3:06 p.m. The Board met in Closed Session from 3:15 p.m. to 3:25 p.m., then recessed the Closed Session until the following morning.