

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

Wednesday September 11, 2002

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

**Members Present**

Reed Hastings, President  
Joe Nuñez, Vice President  
Robert J. Abernethy  
Susan Hammer  
Nancy Ichinaga  
Carlton J. Jenkins  
Marion Joseph  
Stephanie H. Lee  
Suzanne Tacheny

**Members Absent**

Donald Fisher  
Vacancy

**Principal Staff to the State Board of Education**

Delaine Eastin, State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Leslie Fausset, Chief Deputy Superintendent, California Department of Education  
Scott Hill, Chief Deputy Superintendent, California Department of Education  
Richard Whitmore, Chief Advisor to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Linda A. Cabatic, General Counsel, California Department of Education  
Rick Brandsma, Executive Director, State Board of Education  
Phil Garcia, Deputy Executive Director, State Board of Education  
Greg Geeting, Assistant Executive Director, State Board of Education  
Rae Belisle, Chief Counsel, State Board of Education  
Deborah Franklin, Education Policy Consultant, State Board of Education  
Karen Steentofte, Education Policy Consultant, State Board of Education  
Hazel Bailey, Executive Assistant, State Board of Education  
Maryanna Bogard, Legal Secretary, State Board of Education  
Robin Jackson, Executive Secretary, State Board of Education  
Katherine Gales, Office Technician, State Board of Education

**Call to Order**

President Hastings called the meeting to order at 9:11 a.m.

**Salute to the Flag**

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

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

**Moment of Observance for September 11, 2001**

President Hastings called for a moment of silence in respect for the victims of one year ago.

**Introduction of New Student Board Member**

President Hastings introduced Stephanie Lee, the new student member. She is a senior at Palos Verdes Peninsula High School. She is a scholar and a leader in her school. She was a Governor's Scholarship recipient in 2001, is on the principal's Honor Roll every year, and participated in the summer 2002 National Student Leadership Conference in Washington, D.C. Her other awards include the Junior State of America "Best Speaker Award" in 2000-01 and first place in the Bay Math League in 1999-2000. She participates in Mock Trial, Youth and Government, and the Science Olympiad. She was the student representative to her local school board.

**Approval of Minutes (June and July 2002 Meetings)**

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheney moved that the State Board approve the minutes of the June and July 2002 meetings with minor corrections. Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mrs. Ichinaga, Mr. Jenkins, and Mrs. Joseph were not present when the vote was taken.

**Announcements/Communications**

President Hastings informed the audience that the Board would meet in closed session today right before lunch to review the test blueprints related to Item 6.

President Hastings announced the following changes in the agenda:

- Item 30, the regulations on administration of medication in public schools, has been postponed.
- Waiver Item W-1 has been withdrawn.

**Report of the Superintendent**

Superintendent Eastin welcomed all in attendance to the new building. She stated that it is the greenest office building in the state and is built with recycled marble and other materials. There are photovoltaic cells, which are designed specifically to produce energy. The heating and cooling and ventilation systems are remarkably energy efficient.

Superintendent Eastin reported that there were no major programmatic additions to the recently passed state budget. K through 12 education funding fared well, although the Department's funding was reduced by 20 percent. Staff is working to determine what cuts can be made without jeopardizing federal funding. She noted that these cuts are being made as the Department's responsibilities are expanding because of the state accountability system and the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB). She added that education funding is 41 percent of the state budget and only 1,600 people work for the California Department of Education. Superintendent

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

Eastin requested the Board's assistance in assuring the funding to staff these expanding responsibilities.

Superintendent Eastin reported that the Department and the Board had sent a joint letter to the U.S. Department of Education commenting on the NCLB regulations. She informed the Board that she had attended a meeting of the Chief State School Officers and that U.S. Education Secretary Rod Paige had also attended the meeting.

Superintendent Eastin inquired about to a letter from a Stanford University professor requesting information on a study that the professor had been told was sponsored by the State Board of Education. She noted that she had no recollection of any conversation about such a study and asked for clarification.

Superintendent Eastin reported that the STAR test results show that academic achievement in elementary schools is improving. There is a lot of good news in the elementary school test results, although high school test results continue to cause concern.

Superintendent Eastin announced the publication of *Kids Cook Farm Fresh Food*, a cookbook that is standards-aligned material. The cookbook was made possible with the help of many donors. She reported that there are currently gardens in over 3,000 schools. She noted that a publication on teaching the standards through gardening will be available before the end of her term.

Ms. Hammer stated she was impressed by the public art inside and outside the building and also the wonderful children's artwork throughout the building. The art enhances the building. Ms. Hammer thanked the individuals responsible for the selections.

Mr. Abernethy lauded Superintendent Eastin's role in the "green" nature of the building. He went on to state that the \$8 million draft proposal for budget reductions provides an opportunity to focus on what the primary goals are for education. We need to look at legislation that has us doing work that is not focused on our goals, and then work for the legislative changes that are necessary to reduce the education code. Ms. Hammer agreed with Mr. Abernethy's comment, but noted that it is a long-term solution and the \$8 million reduction is immediate.

Superintendent Eastin stated that she has attempted to reduce the education code. Many mandated programs have constituencies supporting those programs. She further noted that the Department is under mandate to do many things. Mr. Abernethy reiterated that it is important to work towards reduction of the education code. Superintendent Eastin noted that the Department has already cut 5 percent of its current budget, and then 15 percent more. She does not know where additional cuts can be made without impacting many important programs.

Mr. Abernethy asked for more information regarding the letter that Superintendent Eastin had mentioned earlier. Mrs. Joseph informed the Board and the Superintendent that the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, and not the State Board, is conducting the study.

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

|        |  |                    |
|--------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 1 | STATE BOARD PROJECTS AND PRIORITIES.<br>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 |
|--------|--|--------------------|

**Board Member Reynolds' Resignation**

President Hastings informed the audience that Ms. Reynolds had resigned effective August 20, 2002 due to family demands. He remarked that Ms. Reynolds had worked hard over the last several years. She was an advocate for arts education and was the Board's liaison to the California State Summer School for the Arts. She was also a member of the Board's Legislative Committee and Screening Committee and the Board's liaison for the History-Social Science Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee. On a personal note, her graciousness and her consensus building were both assets to the Board.

|        |   |             |
|--------|---|-------------|
| ITEM 2 | PUBLIC COMMENT.<br>Public Comment is invited on any matter <i>not</i> 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:  
Bill Chavez, Association of Urban School Districts

Mrs. Joseph commended Deputy Director Joanne Mendoza and her staff for the outstanding letter on AB 961. The letter is timely, simple, and direct.

|        |                               |             |
|--------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| ITEM 3 | Education Technology Seminar. | INFORMATION |
|--------|-------------------------------|-------------|

President Hastings recognized Mrs. Joseph's role in asking the Department to put together the technology in education presentation.

President Hastings congratulated Nancy Sullivan on her promotion to the position of division director of the Data Management Division, which consists of Education Demographics, Education Technology, and the Education Data Office, which includes CSIS.

Ms. Sullivan introduced her co-presenter, Catherine Banker. Ms. Banker is a member of the Curriculum Commission and is the Commission's liaison to the Technology and Learning Commission.

The seminar covered the following topics:

- The potential of technology and the conditions needed for success

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

- The current status of technology in California schools
- Current programs and future directions.

Mr. Jenkins expressed his concern about the potential for parental disengagement when children “do their own thing” on the computer. He stated that he wonders how we can keep parents engaged as students’ use of technology increases. Ms. Banker responded that she would encourage parents to use technology with their children. She also sees opportunities for enhanced communication between the school and the parents. Ms. Sullivan noted that in some schools the teachers post homework assignments on the Internet so parents can see what was assigned to their students. In addition, she noted that many schools are working to involve the parents.

President Hastings thanked Ms. Sullivan and Ms. Banker for their presentation.

No action was taken on this item.

|        |  |             |
|--------|--|-------------|
| ITEM 4 | Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Report of 2002 STAR Statewide Test Results. | INFORMATION |
|--------|--|-------------|

Deputy Superintendent Paul Warren referred to the charts on the California Standards Test (CST) and Stanford 9 results. He noted that the 2001 to 2002 comparisons show improvement in English-language arts. The 2002 results for mathematics and history-social science are the first year of data for those subjects and will serve as the base for tracking growth. The Stanford 9 results for 1998 through 2002 provide data to track cohorts through the years. We see stable, steady growth indicating consistent, sustained improvement.

Ms. Tacheny complimented Mr. Warren on the usefulness and clarity of the data display. Ms. Lee gave a student’s perspective on testing.

No action was taken on this item.

|        |   |                    |
|--------|---|--------------------|
| ITEM 5 | Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Approval of Revised STAR Integrated Science Blueprints. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|---|--------------------|

Phil Spears, Standards and Assessment Division, introduced John Oswald of Educational Testing Service (ETS).

Mr. Spears commented that this is the third time this topic has been brought before the Board. Mr. Spears noted that the scores on the integrated science test were lower than those on the single subject tests. It was thought that one reason for the lower scores was that the tests did not reflect what was being taught. A committee of integrated science teachers has developed new blueprints. The blueprints before the Board today are somewhat different than those presented in June—they reflect the changes made by the STAR Science Content Review Panel (CRP) on all the science tests. There are four tests in the proposed integrated science blueprints. Mr. Spears

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

remarked that are more reasons to continue to have integrated science tests than not to have the tests.

Prior to any discussion, Ms. Hammer announced that she would not participate in the consideration of this agenda item, exercising “an abundance of caution” with respect to a conflict of interest in regard to her position with the Synopsis Foundation.

President Hastings commented that in mathematics, we have tests in Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II. Then we have Integrated Mathematics I, Integrated Mathematics II, and Integrated Mathematics III. He inquired how the performance standards (levels) were set for integrated math and how comparability was achieved. In response, Mr. Spears said that they examined how students did on the traditional course tests on individual items and that became the basis for setting performance levels for items in integrated mathematics.

President Hastings asked how this procedure was viewed—was it novel or respected—by the nationwide testing community. Mr. Spears replied that this method was recommended by the expert panel. President Hastings then asked if the derived performance level was viewed as bold or conservative. Mr. Spears responded that he has heard nothing negative, only positive comments.

Ms. Tacheny asked about the state graduation requirements for science and what the districts do to meet the requirements. Mr. Spears said that at the high school level the state requires one year of physical science and one year of life science. The integrated science courses meet both the California State University (CSU) and the University of California (UC) admissions requirements. Ms. Tacheny then asked if the proposed tests were meant to be taken in sequence, one through four, or if there would be instances when students might take the tests in out of sequence. Mr. Spears replied that the schools will likely give the tests that best match their science courses.

Christine Bertrand, California Science Teachers Association, thanked the Board for supporting the efforts of the integrated science community to reach consensus. She reported that the integrated science panel reconvened during the summer to develop blueprints without the items on asterisked standards, as was recommended by the STAR Science Content Review Panel. She further advised that the blueprints do have the support of the integrated science community. She added that a number of districts have decided that integrated science is the way they want to teach science.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Greg Gardiner, teacher, Huntington Beach Unified School District

Ron Hughes, professor, CSU Bakersfield

Elizabeth Sullivan, assistant superintendent, Los Angeles County Office of Education

David Seidel, NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory

Susan Liberti, Association of California School Administrators

Holly Jacobsen, California School Boards Association

Curtis Washington, California Teachers Association

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

Dean Gilbert, science consultant, Los Angeles County Office of Education

President Hastings stated that there are two or three surrounding issues that need to be addressed: (1) the NCLB requirement that highly qualified teachers have subject-matter expertise; (2) we do not test in 12<sup>th</sup> grade, but the proposed sequence of tests calls for four years of high school testing; and (3) whether the STAR Science CRP had an opportunity to review this draft of the blueprints. Mr. Spears responded that the CRP had not reviewed this draft. He said that on the testing sequence issues, it might be that students take the tests out of sequence.

Ms. Tacheny noted that the many letters received by the Board were supportive of teaching integrated science, but the letters did not specifically address the blueprints. She stated that this policy discussion is not a referendum on integrated science, but an effort to design an appropriate test.

President Hastings inquired as to which students would be likely to take the fourth-year test. Phil LaFontaine, Mathematics and Science Leadership Office, explained that students taking an integrated science one-through-four sequence could take the fourth-year test in their junior year if they had integrated science in middle school. Mr. Spears added that tests are designed as a sequence, but there are students who are advanced and would take the fourth year test as juniors. Ms. Tacheny asked if it was the expectation that most students would be taking integrated science four in their senior year. Superintendent Eastin responded that efforts to improve science achievement have been made so that some students could take the tests early.

Ms. Tacheny summarized that as it was explained to her, there are bedrock standards that are predominantly in the third- and fourth-year tests. If the students do not ever take those tests, they do not get the more difficult standards. President Hasting remarked that only the CRP could answer the question of how the test items on each standard are distributed through the tests.

Phil Fitch, Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), informed the Board that the subject specific credentials for science—physics, biology, chemistry, earth/planetary—require 18 semester units in the area of concentration and 24 units in “breadth” courses. For integrated science credentials, the requirement is for 24 units in breadth courses.

President Hastings commented that teachers who can teach—and are who are subject matter qualified under the NCLB to teach—fourth-year integrated science as it is proposed in the blueprints must have a very high level mastery of all four major areas of science. Mrs. Joseph asked for confirmation that according to the CTC requirements, a teacher who has taken 24 breadth units and 18 units in one subject area can teach integrated science. Mr. Fitch confirmed that statement.

Mr. Nuñez stated that speaking as a holder of an applied science credential, teachers do teach a number of subjects. He personally taught not only science, but mathematics, as well. He noted that the issue is whether the CRP has reviewed and recommended the blueprint.

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

President Hastings summarized the discussion on the issues he had outlined: 1) on the sequence of four tests, some students may take all four tests or take tests out of sequence; 2) the CRP has not reviewed this version of the blueprints; and 3) integrated science teachers may or may not meet the definition of highly qualified teachers. He asked what the impact would be on the Academic Performance Index (API) and the testing system if the decision was delayed until October. Mr. Spears advised that the schools will start ordering the tests in October and this postponement could delay the test development.

Superintendent Eastin pointed out the blueprints are supported by several organizations and many school districts. She encouraged the Board to let the local districts make their own decisions about how to teach science.

President Hastings recalled that four or five months ago, the Board thought that developing appropriate integrated science tests was an impossible task because of the variety of approaches to teaching this subject. Now, the integrated science community has developed a set of blueprints. Summarizing, he stated that the Board can take a vote today independent of a CRP review, or the Board can request a CRP review and vote in October. He added that the Board would commit to the path it will go down to give a signal to the field.

Mr. Nuñez stated that it is important to make the Board's position clear. Ms. Belisle noted that the Board had not yet reviewed the test specification blueprints for the proposed integrated science tests and suggested that the Board review them after the CRP has reviewed them.

- **ACTION:** Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board approve in concept the inclusion of four integrated science tests generally in keeping with the public blueprints proposed in the agenda item and with administration to begin in spring 2003. The motion took into account that the proposed test blueprints were to be reviewed by the content review panel, and that detailed (non-public) blueprints would be presented for action by the State Board at a future meeting (probably the October 2002 meeting). Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-1-1. Mr. Abernethy voted against the motion. Ms. Hammer did not participate in the consideration of this agenda item.

Mrs. Joseph acknowledged that when the standards and framework were developed, there was an understanding that integrated science could be one approach to teaching science. She stated that she wants to be clear the Board is not endorsing the integrated science approach.

**Lunch Break:** President Hastings informed the audience that the Board would meet in Closed Session immediately following the lunch break and that the Public Session would reconvene in approximately one hour. He called for the lunch break at 12:44 p.m.

**Closed Session:** The State Board met in Closed Session from 1:40 p.m. to 1:59 p.m.

**Public Session Reconvened:** President Hastings reconvened the Public Session at 2:00 p.m.

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

**Closed Session Report**

President Hastings reported that the Board met in closed session as allowed by law to review and discuss the content of the state tests to be considered under Item 6.

|        |  |                    |
|--------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 6 | Adoption of Revised and New Blueprints for California Standards Tests (CST): Including, but not limited to, English Language Arts, Grades 2-10; Math, Grades 2-10; History-Social Science, Grades 8, 10-11; Science, Course Specific, Grades 9-11. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|--|--------------------|

Mr. Spears noted that the Department is recommending that the Board approve the California Standards Tests (CSTs) blueprints as reviewed by the STAR Content Review Panels and approve the public blueprints. He thanked the CRPs for their work this summer. The CRPs discussed a number of issues with ETS related to the content and construction of the test blueprints. The CRPs made recommendations to ETS regarding the development of the public blueprints, cognitive levels of test items, and guidelines for test construction. The CRPs took on a monumental task. The result of this work by the CRPs and ETS is a number of changes to the blueprints.

Mr. Spears clarified that the Board was not asked to approve the 11<sup>th</sup> grade English-language arts and high school summative mathematics tests blueprints today. Those blueprints are being revised and will be brought to the Board in October. At the CRP's recommendation, the mathematics public blueprints identify key standards. The history-social science CRP suggested increasing the number of items on the 8<sup>th</sup> grade test to 75. The test covers three years of standards and more items are needed to sufficiently cover the standards. Mr. Spears noted that only the English-language arts CRP has seen the final blueprints as they are presented to the Board today. The CRPs will meet again this month to review the blueprints and minor cosmetic changes may be made. These changes will be brought to the Board in October.

Mrs. Joseph noted that on the mathematics blueprints, some of the standards have double checks. These are the asterisked standards, the key standards. Mrs. Joseph stated that despite her enormous respect for the mathematics CRP, she wants consistency between the blueprints and believes the key standards are already clearly identified with the asterisks and the double checks are unnecessary and possibly confusing.

- **ACTION:** Ms. Tacheny moved that the Board approve the content of the detailed (non-public) blueprints for the California Standards Tests in English Language Arts, Grades 2-10; Mathematics, Grades 2-10; History-Social Science, Grades 8, 10-11; Science, Course Specific, Grades 9-11. The motion was made with the understanding that the mathematics, history-social science, and science blueprints had yet to have final review by the content review panels, and that any modifications resulting from the work of the content review panels would be brought back to the Board for action at a future meeting (probably October 2002). The motion recognized that the detailed (non-public) blueprints for Mathematics, High School Summative Mathematics Test, English-Language Arts, Grade 11, and for the four Integrated Science tests would be brought to the State Board for action at a future meeting (probably October 2002). Mrs. Joseph

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 8-0-1. Because this item included blueprints for science tests, Ms. Hammer did not participate in the item's consideration for reasons stated earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Spears reported that the Department's recommendation for the public blueprint is different than the CRP's recommendation. The Department believes the additional information in its recommendation enhances the utility of the test.

Ms. Tacheny expressed wholehearted support of the Department's efforts to enhance the utility of the test, which is why she feels improving the test reports is so important. She stated that the CPR recommendation is appropriate in that it identifies what is tested. Ms. Tacheny added that she agrees with Mrs. Joseph's previous comments regarding the double checks on the mathematics blueprints and the need for consistency.

Mrs. Joseph remarked that we have worked hard to steer people to the frameworks for direction on the curriculum and that the test blueprints are not intended to serve this purpose. Superintendent Eastin stated that this is a judgment call; the Department's recommendation for blueprints broadcasts what the expectations are. She added that some states give out the whole test each year.

President Hastings commented that we all agree test items should be released. He stated that the small areas of disagreement are really judgment calls.

The following individuals addressed the Board:  
Adrian Phillips, Palos Verdes Peninsula High School  
Geno Flores, Long Beach Unified School District  
Lisa Ramer, Association of California School Administrators

President Hastings summarized the issues before the Board: (1) going with the Department's recommendation or approving the CRPs' recommendation and (2) whether to have the double checks on the mathematics blueprints.

- **ACTION:** Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve the public blueprints of the tests (for which the detailed blueprints were approved under this agenda item) generally in keeping with the recommendations of the content review panels, except with revisions by staff to provide for the consistent use of asterisks and check marks. Following the revisions by staff, the public blueprints will be approved by the Executive Director of the State Board prior to being disseminated. Mr. Abernethy seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-0-2. Ms. Lee did not vote on the motion. Because this item included blueprints for science tests, Ms. Hammer did not participate in the item's consideration for reasons stated earlier in the meeting.

Mrs. Joseph complimented Mr. Spears on the "outstanding and straight up" job he did in presenting Item 6.

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

|        |   |                    |
|--------|---|--------------------|
| ITEM 7 | Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Approval of 2003 Spanish Assessment of Basic Education, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition, (SABE/2) Contract with CTB/McGraw-Hill. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|---|--------------------|

Mr. Spears presented the item to the Board.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve the 2003 contract with CTB/McGraw-Hill (and the associated scope of work document) for the administration of the Spanish Assessment of Basic Education, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition (SABE/2). Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-0-3. Mr. Abernethy, Mrs. Ichinaga, and Mrs. Joseph did not vote on the motion.

|        |  |                    |
|--------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 8 | California English Language Development Test (CELDT): Including, but not limited to, Options for Reclassification of English Learners. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|--|--------------------|

Mr. Warren explained that the statute requires the Board to set a range of basic skills for use in reclassification decisions and that this criterion is one of several criteria for reclassification of English learners. The Department recommends a range from the beginning of the basic level to the mid-point of the basic level.

The following individuals addressed the Board:  
Pilar Mejia, California Association for Bilingual Education  
Geno Flores, Long Beach Unified School District

Mr. Nuñez requested that at future meetings the Department staff provide analyses on how NCLB impacts English learners. Superintendent Eastin advised that next week Department staff will be talking to Rod Paige, U.S. Education Secretary, regarding English learner reclassification and academic improvement goals for English learners.

Mr. Nuñez commented that if we continue to reclassify English learners, moving them out of the category of English learner as they reach proficiency, the performance of English learner students will always appear to be lower than it actually is.

- ACTION: Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board approve the criteria for reclassification of English learners as proposed by CDE staff. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Abernethy did not vote on the motion.

|        |  |                    |
|--------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 9 | California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Including, but not limited to, Approval of Revised Regulations to go out for Public Comment and Approval of a Revised Waiver Policy. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|--------|--|--------------------|

Jan Chladek, Standards and Assessment Division, reported that the Office of Administrative Law has requested several technical changes in the proposed regulations and advised the Board that

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

the version currently before them includes those changes. Ms. Chladek pointed out that the change in the proposed waiver guidelines is also a technical change.

- **ACTION:** In accordance with the recommendations of CDE staff, Mr. Jenkins moved that the State Board (1) direct CDE staff to circulate proposed amendments to the California High School Exit Examination regulations for 15-day public comment in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, then return the amended regulations to the State Board for action in October 2002, and (2) approve the revised waiver policy. Ms. Hammer seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Abernethy and Ms. Tacheny were not present when the vote was taken.

|         |  |                    |
|---------|--|--------------------|
| ITEM 10 | Approval of District Apportionments for California's 2002-2003 Standardized Tests. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|---------|--|--------------------|

Mr. Warren presented this item.

- **ACTION:** Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board approve the 2003 district apportionments for the California English Language Development Test, California High School Exit Examination, and Statewide Testing and Reporting program in accordance with the recommendation of CDE staff. Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent member, Mr. Abernethy and Mrs. Joseph were not present when the vote was taken.

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

Curriculum and Supplemental Materials Commission Chair Sue Stickel reported on the Curriculum Commission's work on the *Visual and Performing Arts Framework*. She acknowledged the excellent work of the Visual and Performing Arts Framework and Criteria Committee. Ms. Stickel expressed her appreciation of Ms. Reynolds for her continuing contributions to and support of the arts in education.

Ms. Stickel asked if the Board had any questions related to her report on *Everyday Mathematics*, copyright 2002, grades 4 through 6. Mr. Nuñez asked if *Everyday Mathematics* covered the standards. In response, Ms. Stickel summarized her report. She noted that she had grave concerns about the coverage of the 4th grade standards. The 5<sup>th</sup> grade coverage of the standards is pretty good, and the 6<sup>th</sup> grade is less so. She stressed that it is important to know that if all three components of the program are not used together, the standards are not covered. There are standards that were omitted from the standards map provided by the publisher. Ms. Stickel noted that when she happened upon a standard that was not on the map, she counted that standard as covered.

Superintendent Eastin thanked Ms. Stickel for her contributions and work on the Curriculum Commission. She acknowledged Ms. Reynolds's leadership in the visual and performing arts.

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

Superintendent Eastin stated that the Department does not have the resources to staff the follow-up adoptions and that the funding for this work had been cut from the budget. She reported that the Department has requested that the \$350,000 for this work be restored. Superintendent Eastin indicated that she had directed CDE staff not to proceed with the follow-up adoptions for history-social science, science, and visual and performing arts (which had been scheduled for 2003) unless specific funding for those follow-up adoptions is restored. She noted that staff is continuing to work on the primary adoptions.

Mrs. Joseph raised concern about any legal ramifications that may be involved. President Hastings noted that the Board is not taking any action. The Superintendent is taking—or rather not taking—the action.

Sherry Griffith, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division, reported that the Department staff has been in conversations with the Department of Finance to clarify any legal issues and noted that because the invitation to submit was not mailed out, no commitment was made to publishers regarding a follow-up adoption.

President Hastings informed the Board that a representative from the Montecito USD had asked to address on the Board on W-31, which was on the agenda for Thursday.

The following individual addressed the Board:  
Richard Douglas, superintendent, Montecito Unified School District

No action was taken on this item.

|         |   |                    |
|---------|---|--------------------|
| ITEM 12 | State Board of Education Instructional Materials Fund (IMF) Expenditure Policy: Amendment for the purchase of core or supplementary instructional materials suitable for instruction in the “Structured English Immersion” program. | INFORMATION ACTION |
|---------|---|--------------------|

Ms. Stickel reported on the Curriculum Commission’s Executive Committee’s recommendation in response to the Board’s request to review its current Instructional Materials Fund (IMF) Expenditure Policy on purchasing instructional materials for use in “Structured English Language Immersion” programs. Ms. Stickel pointed out that this proposal did not include materials from the AB 2519 adoption. She noted that the AB 2519 adoption did not benefit from the framework and the specific criteria for instructional materials for English learners in the most recent adoption. This policy proposal is a win-win for the districts. The big winners will be the students who will have the benefit of standards-aligned material.

President Hastings pointed out that if AB 1781 is signed, the funding structure for instructional materials would change and the Board will need to review its policies related to instructional materials funding.

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

Superintendent Eastin stated that it was her recommendation that the AB 2519 adoption be included in this policy. Ms. Hammer asked why the Executive Committee did not include the AB 2519 materials in the policy. Ms. Stickel responded that the Executive Committee had concerns that the AB 2519 adoption predated the framework, contained many partial programs, and was really an interim adoption. Ms. Hammer agreed with Superintendent Eastin that it is a good idea to allow the districts to utilize the AB 2519 materials.

Mr. Geeting reported that the AB 2519 adoption includes many partial programs, not just full basal programs, as in the more recent adoptions. If allowing the use of the AB 2519 materials, the Board might want to differentiate between those materials that are partial and full programs.

- **MOTION DIES FOR LACK OF SECOND:** Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board approve the proposed amendments to the Instructional Materials Fund Expenditure Policy, except with the addition of a provision relating to language arts and mathematics instructional materials added to the state adoption lists pursuant to AB 2519. The motion died for lack of a second.
- **ACTION:** Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the proposed amendments to the Instructional Materials Fund (IMF) Expenditure Policy (as recommended by the Executive Committee of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission). The motion was made with the understanding that AB 1781 (Hertzberg), if signed into law by the Governor, would significantly change state statutes governing the IMF expenditures and would necessitate a comprehensive review of the IMF Expenditure Policy. Mrs. Ichinaga seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 8-1. Ms. Hammer voted against the motion.

|         |  |             |
|---------|--|-------------|
| ITEM 13 | Required 60-Day Response to the June 26, 2002 Report of the Bureau of State Audits #2001-124: <i>The Los Angeles Unified School District: Outdated, Scarce Textbooks at Some Schools Appear to Have a Lesser Effect on Academic Performance Than Other Factors, but the District Should Improve Its Management of Textbook Purchasing and Inventory.</i> | INFORMATION |
|---------|--|-------------|

Ms. Griffith gave a brief overview of the Department's response to the Bureau of State Audit's audit of the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Ms. Griffith reported that she had met with LAUSD staff to see how the Department could help them with the problems identified in the audit and to assist them in pursuing violations of the most-favored-nation clause

Mr. Jenkins inquired about the instances of violations of the most-favored-nation clause that LAUSD has experienced. Ms. Griffith responded that the complexity and number of transactions within the LAUSD and constant changes in *gratis* lists make it difficult for the district to track the *gratis* materials.

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

Mrs. Joseph thanked Ms. Griffith and her staff and Mr. Geeting, who is remarkable, for the *Reading/Language Arts/English-Language Development Adoption Report*. She noted that the report has been dedicated to former Board Member Kathryn Dronenburg.

No action was taken on this item.

|         |   |        |
|---------|---|--------|
| ITEM 14 | Approval of Training Providers for AB 75, The Principal Training Program. | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|

Bill Vasey, Professional Development and Curriculum Support Division, informed the Board that there was a corrected list of recommended providers. The previous list inadvertently included a non-adopted program. At President Hasting's request, Mr. Vasey briefly described the content of the three modules in the principal training. President Hastings asked about the delivery of the Module 1 trainings. Mr. Vasey replied that there have been approximately five trainings and that about 1,300 principals have been identified by name as people who will be taking the training.

- ACTION: Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board approve the corrected list of training providers for AB 75 (The Principal Training Program) as recommended by CDE staff. Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

|         |  |        |
|---------|--|--------|
| ITEM 15 | Approval of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and Consortia Funding for AB 75, The Principal Training Program. | ACTION |
|---------|--|--------|

Mr. Vasey informed the Board that there were two lists of local education agencies recommended for approval. One is a list of districts applying separately, and the other is a list of consortia or districts applying under a consortia. The Board is being asked to approve the applications, but not the dollar amounts or the number of principals and vice principals that will be trained.

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

|         |   |        |
|---------|---|--------|
| ITEM 16 | Implementation of the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program (AB 466, Strom-Martin), Including, but not limited to, Approval of Training Providers and Training Curriculum. | ACTION |
|---------|---|--------|

Ms. Franklin presented the item to the Board.

- ACTION: Ms. Hammer moved that the State Board approve AB 466 professional development providers and training curricula in accordance with the recommendation of

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
September 11-12, 2002

State Board staff. Mr. Abernethy seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

Mr. Vasey reported that the Departments had sent letters to 29 districts that the Board had previously approved for past training reimbursement requesting the districts to recertify that the instructional materials and training providers met the AB 466 criteria. There are still a few districts to follow up with.

**Adjournment of Day's Session:** Before adjourning the meeting for the day, President Hastings announced that Item 26, Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) Emergency Regulations, and Waiver W-5 had been withdrawn from the agenda. He informed the audience that the Board would meet in Closed Session at 8:00 a.m. on Thursday and that the Closed Session could take up to 90 minutes. President Hastings adjourned the day's session at 4:15 p.m.