

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

Wednesday, April 24, 2002

Resources Building Auditorium  
1416 Ninth Street, First Floor Auditorium  
Sacramento, California

**Members Present**

Reed Hastings, President  
Joe Nuñez, Vice President  
Robert J. Abernethy  
Erika Goncalves  
Susan Hammer  
Nancy Ichinaga  
Vicki Reynolds  
Suzanne Tacheny

**Members Absent**

Donald Fisher  
Carlton J. Jenkins  
Marion Joseph

**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  
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 9:00 a.m.

**Salute to the Flag**

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

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

**Approval of Minutes (March 2002 Meeting)**

- ACTION: Mr. Abernethy moved that the State Board approve the Minutes of the March 2002 Meeting with minor corrections. Mrs. Ichinaga seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Ms. Goncalves and Ms. Hammer were not present when the vote was taken.

**Announcements/Communications**

President Hastings welcomed Rick Brandsma, the State Board’s new executive director. He stated that he thought Mr. Brandsma was up to the difficult task of serving as the Board’s executive director and that the Board was looking forward to working with him.

President Hastings informed the audience that the public comment item, the opportunity for people to speak on issues not on the agenda, would be on Thursday morning.

President Hastings announced that Item 34, Title 5 Regulations on Administration of Medication in Public Schools, had been deferred until May at the request of Department staff.

ITEM 1	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Designation of New Nationally-Normed Test and Contractor	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

President Hastings informed the audience that the test designation item would take the entire morning. The Board would be taking a late lunch after acting on the test designation to allow sufficient time for discussion on this important decision.

President Hastings outlined the morning’s schedule. Each of the proposal submitters would have 30 minutes to make a presentation. After each presentation, the Board would ask questions. At the end of the presentations, the public would be invited to comment. Then, Department staff would present the Superintendent’s recommendation. After hearing the Superintendent’s recommendation, the Board would deliberate.

Submitter Presentations

President Hastings informed the Board and the audience that the order of the presentations was determined by a random draw and would be as follows:

1. CTB/McGraw Hill/Riverside, Iowa Test of Basic Skills
2. Harcourt Educational Measurement
3. CTB/McGraw Hill, California Achievement Tests
4. Educational Testing Services

President Hastings noted that this is not a request for proposal (RFP) process. It is a request for submissions process (RFS), which is a different process. It is possible that the Board could choose a contractor today and in two months the Board could make another choice if an acceptable contract agreement cannot be reached. President Hastings stated that there are a number of factors to consider in this decision—validity, reliability, test security, alignment to standards, fast reporting of scores. The

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

Superintendent's recommendation gives weights to each of these factors. But the Board can weigh the factors differently.

The Board listened to the presentation of each of the proposal submitters. The Board asked the proposal submitters questions regarding the following:

- Test security
- Statistical equating of the SAT-9 and a new nationally-normed test
- Corporate capacity and ability to "build-out" to meet the demands of the California assessment system
- Eliminating redundancy in the assessment system
- Capacity to manage partners named in the proposal
- Corporate structure
- Test equity
- Communications

Comments from the Public

President Hastings called for comments from the public. The following individuals addressed the Board:

Geno Flores, Long Beach Unified School District

Nancy Giberson, San Diego County Schools

Bill Barr, Monterey County Superintendent of Schools

Dee Alarcon, Deputy Superintendent, Solano County Office of Education

David Swart, Assistant Superintendent, Auburn Union School District

Mayrene Bates, Solano County Board of Education

Betty White, Curriculum Director, Calaveras Unified School District

Superintendent's Recommendation

Chief Deputy Superintendent Fausset reported that Superintendent Eastin was in Washington, DC., to participate in the ceremonies honoring a California Teacher of the Year who was selected as a National Teacher of the Year. On behalf of the Superintendent, Ms. Fausset thanked the publishers for their professional submission and acknowledged the work of Paul Warren and Phil Spears. Ms. Fausset noted that Superintendent Eastin was involved in the process from the beginning and had looked at all the proposals and all of the nationally-normed tests. Ms. Fausset informed the Board that because of time constraints, her comments and the Superintendent's recommendation would serve as the monthly Superintendent's report.

Deputy Superintendent Paul Warren reported on the process used for reviewing and evaluating the submissions, including the roles of the various review panels. Drawing the Board's attention to the evaluation summaries, Mr. Warren noted the Harcourt Education Measurement (HEM) and the Education Testing System (ETS) proposals both scored appreciatively above the other two submittals. Mr. Warren noted that the final review panel looked at the totality of each submission and the two proposals--HEM and ETS--which were seen as better than others. The panel's decision discussion focused on the future of California's assessment system, which is the California Standards Test (CST). In addition, the panel members considered test administration.

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

Mr. Warren stated that the cost information is less than meets the eye. The submitters did not include all of the same costs in their cost estimates. All of the submissions are for less money than the current contract. No matter who is chosen, we are staying the course. Mr. Warren concluded his comments by noting that the California Standards Test remains the focus of our assessment system.

Board Deliberation

Ms. Hammer asked about the possible pitfalls in changing contractors and how the Department will smooth those changes. Mr. Warren responded that the Department is prepared to work with the contractor to chart out the administration issues. Ms. Fausset noted that early on all the districts would be notified of the change to be sure that they know who to contact. Mr. Warren advised that both submissions proposed that NCS handle the scoring and that the Department has worked with NCS for many years. Communication with parents, students, and teachers will be important no matter which contractor is chosen because the nationally-normed test is going to change under either proposal.

In response to Ms. Goncalves' question about the scoring grid, Mr. Warren said that the grid was developed to assist the review panels' identification of important components and was not designed for the purpose of "whoever has the most points wins." Mr. Warren also noted that the final review panel felt that the submissions were actually closer than the grid scores reflected.

Ms. Tacheny noted that as the testing liaison, she had read all the review panel reports. She stated that the designation process allows the Board to consider other information. She added that she views these panel reports as preliminary and many statements in them are not ones she would have made.

President Hastings suggested that out of respect for Superintendent Eastin, the Board would first vote on her recommendation when the Board is ready to take action. If there are not six votes for the recommendation, the Board would then vote on each submission in turn, in the order of the presentations.

Mr. Nuñez thanked the publishers for their submissions. He stated that the long-term analysis of the assessment system in California is of great importance in making the designation decision and that ensuring we are testing the standards we teach and moving towards the CSTs is crucial. He noted that ETS is the contractor for the CAHSEE. He said that these are the things he would like the Board to consider today as it makes the designation decision.

Ms. Hammer thanked the publishers for their submissions and Mr. Warren and his staff for all of their work. She stated that we can all feel proud of the open process used to review the submissions. The CSTs are going to define the future of assessment and the success of our California standards system. She said that she supports the recommendation to designate ETS. We need to stay the course in ensuring that as the next test is developed, we will have fully implemented the California standards system. Mrs. Ichinaga voiced her sympathy for the teachers' and districts' concern about change.

Ms. Reynolds said that she joined her colleagues in thanking the test publishers for their submissions. The submissions reflect an extraordinary effort. This has been an extraordinary process. Ms. Reynolds

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

acknowledged the work of the Superintendent's staff. She noted that HEM made very good points that should not be taken lightly, but staying the course is about focusing on the standards and using this exciting opportunity to bring new energy to the assessment system. Ms. Reynolds noted that the responsibility for dealing with the changes will fall most heavily on the Department, so the Superintendent's recommendation of ETS is a factor in her support of the ETS proposal.

Ms. Tacheny commented that this has been an awesome process. When you look at all the documents in each submission, you are impressed with the effort and investment. All the bids were interesting and exciting in some way. She noted that the Board had heard clearly that districts are concerned about keeping the service contacts they have developed. Our role is to help ensure that these relationships are working. The CSTs are our tests; they will stay the same. She remarked that in the ETS proposal, she saw leadership, someone to help the Board make decisions. ETS also seems to be capable of helping to reduce testing redundancy. ETS offers a different kind of continuity, a comprehensive testing program. She noted that the ETS proposal also had the support of staff.

Ms. Goncalves expressed her thanks for the opportunity, as a 17-year old high school student, to be a part of this important decision-making process. Ms. Goncalves stated her agreement with Mrs. Ichinaga about a need for consistency and added that she has a deep concern about communication as well. Ms. Tacheny noted that in the designation process, the Board's role is to work with the designee to develop a scope of work and then to approve to the scope of work.

- INITIAL ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board designate the submission of Education Testing Service (submitting company) with the California Achievement Test as the nationally-normed test for the next three years and reject all other submissions. If the law extends this program beyond 2005, the State Board reserves the right to extend this designation for two additional years. This designation is expressly conditioned on the submitting company meeting each of the following conditions:
  1. A contract shall be executed at the June 2002 State Board meeting with substantial progress in the drafting of a contract reported at the May 2002 State Board meeting.
  2. In no event shall the contract price exceed the amount that is estimated to be included in the annual Budget Act, based on the cost of the current Statewide Testing and Reporting (STAR) program, and it is the intent of the State Board that it be less.
  3. The following provisions shall be included in the contract, with policy discussion related thereto being presented to the State Board at the May 2002 meeting:
    - A work plan with a clear implementation timeline, including a calendar of specific policy decisions that will be required of the State Board. The scope of work should provide that the contractor work with the California Department of Education (CDE) and the State Board and provide analyses for those decisions, which spell out the pros and cons of each of the options presented.
    - One of these analyses shall discuss possible options to provide that the STAR program complies with the *No Child Left Behind Act*, especially with respect to science.

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

- The contract must offer specific commitments of staffing in the scope of work, including (1) a senior decision-making executive staff person of the submitting company, who maintains an office in Sacramento, to facilitate timely decision-making in the program and (2) sufficient staffing in the STAR service centers.
- Firm cost figures of a per-item cost for item development to enable the State Board to determine a specific timeline for item release for the California Standards Tests (CSTs).
- A plan to continue to improve the parent, teacher, and public reporting with input of the State Board's testing liaisons to improve communication with parents, teachers, and the community.
- A commitment to improve the data return time; looking for a turn-around time that is as aggressive as possible.
- Provisions on ownership of data to protect the privacy of individual student records and ensure that California continues to own the item statistics on the CSTs.
- Provision to allow any no-cost changes in the scope of work with the approval, in writing, of the Executive Director of the State Board and of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

If these conditions are not satisfied at the June 2002 State Board meeting, the State Board reserves the right to rescind this designation.

Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-1-1. Ms. Goncalves voted against the motion. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Abernethy did not vote on the motion.

President Hastings thanked the all of the submitters for their efforts in preparing and submitting their proposals.

**Lunch Break:** President Hastings called for the lunch break at 12:45 p.m. The State Board reconvened at 1:50 p.m.

Upon reconvening the Board meeting, President Hastings apologized that the last motion moved so quickly. He stated it is his responsibility to ensure that all members of the Board are fully aware of the motion before them when a vote is called. He added that this morning he had not done this and a Board member had misunderstood the content of the motion before the Board.

- **RECONSIDERATION OF INITIAL ACTION:** Mrs. Ichinaga moved that the State Board reconsider the action whereby it approved the motion set forth above. [If successful, the motion to reconsider would again place the main motion exactly as it was made by Ms. Tacheny and seconded by Mr. Nuñez (as set forth above) before the State Board.] Mr. Abernethy seconded the motion to reconsider. The motion to reconsider was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

- FINAL ACTION: The motion to reconsider having been approved, the main motion exactly as it was made by Ms. Tacheny and seconded by Mr. Nuñez (as set forth above) was again placed before the State Board. The main motion was approved by a vote of 6-2. Ms. Goncalves and Mrs. Ichinaga voted against the motion.

ITEM 2	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Three-Year Plan for the Development of California's Assessment System.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Mr. Warren discussed the three-year plan, which was before the Board for approval. He noted that the Department and the State Board had been working together on this plan for many months.

The following individuals addressed the Board:  
Geno Flores, Long Beach Unified School District  
Lisa Ramer, Association of California School Administrators

Chief Deputy Superintendent Hill noted that the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act will necessitate the three-year plan being brought before the State Board again in the coming weeks.

Ms. Hammer inquired about the status of a decision on the grade 11 writing test and whether by approving the plan today, the Board would be making a decision. Mr. Warren replied that a decision would not necessarily be made today and noted that in the request for submissions, the STAR proposals were to include options for this component. President Hastings noted that a decision would have to be made in the next few months.

Ms. Hammer expressed her concerns about redundancy because of the writing test in the high school exit exam. President Hastings responded that University of California President Richard C. Atkinson has stated that writing is the most valuable predictor of college performance. Writing tests are the best indicator of student academic achievement. For non-college bound students, the only writing tests are the exit exam and, if we decide to do it, the 11th grade test. President Hastings remarked that if students are not tested on writing, it is not seen as important. Ms. Reynolds stated that a writing sample is important as an indicator, and she too remembers President Atkinson saying it was the most important indicator. Mr. Warren noted that scoring written essays is an expensive activity. In making a decision about an 11<sup>th</sup> grade writing test, it would be helpful if you knew how much this option would cost.

Ms. Reynolds asked about the status of the RFP on the California English Language Development Test (CELDT). Mr. Warren responded that the CELDT would be brought before the State Board next month. The Department did release an RFP but pulled it due to Ms. Belisle's request that the Board Members have the opportunity to review and approve it. This will allow time to address some questions the Department received from test publishers. It was proposed that the Board sign off on the RFP and that the Department let the contract.

Mr. Abernethy commented that it is easy to say, "let's test writing." The problem is to develop a good

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

test of writing.

- **ACTION:** Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve the proposed Three-Year Plan for Development of California's Assessment System with the minor modifications discussed at the State Board meeting. [The final document is to be approved by the Executive Director of the State Board prior to distribution.] Ms. Goncalves seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

Ms. Tacheny stated that she finds it difficult to discuss such issues, but is concerned that the CELDT RFP did not go to Board staff or the Board for review and approval. She proposed Board action on a motion requiring that any request for proposals or contracts be reviewed by the Board and, when statutorily appropriate, approved by the Board. Ms. Hammer commented that she objected to the motion because it would place in perpetuity a policy when there had just been a misunderstanding on the part of Department staff. Mr. Warren said that it was his error that the RFP did not come to the Board for review. He added that it was no more than a slip through the cracks.

Ms. Reynolds commented that this morning's discussion on the test designation is a good example of a climate of mutual trust that is productive for all of us. She suggested developing some fairly simple, more legalistic language for a motion. Ms. Hammer stated that given all the cooperative efforts between the Department and the Board and all the pressure to get the STAR contract out, this was not the appropriate time to have this conversation.

President Hastings noted that he understands that Mr. Hill agrees with the general direction of the motion. President Hastings said that he would like to have a Board policy on this issue.

- **MAIN MOTION MADE:** Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board direct that no assessment or accountability contract be let (or request for proposals be released) without prior review and opportunity for comment by State Board staff and, where appropriate or required by law, approval of the State Board. Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. Prior to action being taken, a motion to postpone consideration of this matter to the May 2002 State Board meeting was made.
- **MOTION TO POSTPONE DEFEATED:** Ms. Reynolds moved that the State Board postpone action on the main motion (as set forth above) to the May 2002 State Board meeting. Ms. Hammer seconded the motion to postpone. The motion to postpone was defeated by a vote of 2-3-3. Voting in favor of the motion to postpone: Ms. Hammer and Ms. Reynolds; voting against the motion to postpone: Mr. Hastings, Mr. Nuñez, and Ms. Tacheny. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Abernethy, Ms. Goncalves, and Mrs. Ichinaga did not vote on the motion.
- **MAIN MOTION DEFEATED:** The motion to postpone having been defeated, the main motion as made by Ms. Tacheny and seconded by Mr. Nuñez (as set forth above) was placed before the State Board. The main motion was defeated by a vote of 3-2-3. Voting in favor of the main motion: Mr. Hastings, Mr. Nuñez, and Ms. Tacheny; voting against the main motion: Ms. Hammer and Ms. Reynolds. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Abernethy, Ms. Goncalves,



FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

and Mrs. Ichinaga did not vote on the motion.

ITEM 9	The Academic Performance Index (API): A Six-Year Plan for Development (2001-2006).	INFORMATION
--------	--	-------------

Bill Padia, Policy and Evaluation Division, drew the Board's attention to the six-year plan for the development of the API in the agenda materials. The No Child Left Behind Act may require changes in the API. When the staff knows what changes might be required, those changes will be brought before the Board for discussion. President Hastings suggested that past 2006, the Board would still want the growth and base model. Mr. Padia stated that the fundamental principal would still be the growth and base model.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 3	Regional Public Hearing: Proposed Performance Standards (Levels) for the General Mathematics Standards Test and Integrated Mathematics Standards Tests.	PUBLIC HEARING
--------	---	----------------

Mr. Geeting reported on the two other Regional Public Hearings and noted that a summary of the comments from those hearings was in the agenda materials.

President Hastings opened up the Public Hearing at 3:05 p.m. There were no speakers. President Hastings closed the Public Hearing at 3:05 p.m.

ITEM 4	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Approval of Performance Standards (Levels) for the California General Mathematics Standards Test.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

[Attachment 1, Proposed Performance Standards (Levels) for Mathematics.]

Mr. Spears, Standards and Assessment Division, acknowledged Mr. Geeting's diligence in preparing the memoranda with the comments from the field. It is important that parents, students, and teachers know what it means to be advanced or proficient. The parent reports for students taking the general mathematics test need to communicate effectively to parents and students that the content on the test is primarily sixth and seventh grade standards.

Mr. Nuñez raised the issue of releasing test items and exemplars. He asked when we would be able to release test items. Mr. Spears responded that everyone agrees we need to release test items, but the Department does not have a timeline for releasing items.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board take the following actions with respect to performance standards (levels) for the California General Mathematics Standards Test:
  1. Approve the use of the same five performance standards (level) designations used in the

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

other standards-aligned mathematics tests.

2. Approve the proposed “cut scores” (minimum number and percentage of correct responses) on the California General Mathematics Standards Test that determine the performance standards (levels), recognizing that, for use in reporting in 2002 and beyond, the cut scores will be converted to scaled scores that comparably reflect student achievement.

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

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

[Attachment 2, Proposed Performance Standards (Levels) for Mathematics.]

Mr. Spears introduced Gina Koency, Los Angeles County Office of Education, who provided an overview of the differences and similarities between an integrated math approach and the "traditional" math sequence, and participation rates in STAR math tests in 2001. [Attachment 3, Integrated and Non-Integrated Approaches.] Ms. Koency suggested learning more about the national scene and what other states are doing. There are also questions about student achievement and demographics and other variables the Board could learn about.

Ms. Tacheny stated it is her understanding that teaching integrated math courses requires a more skilled teacher as it is harder for those teachers with less mathematics training. Ms. Koency responded that the struggle is more with a new curricular model. Once teachers are familiar with the curricular structure, they are as comfortable with it as they are with traditional programs. Ms. Tacheny commented that she thinks it is good to test both ways to gather additional data.

Ms. Goncalves commented that at her school the students in integrated math courses are the students who are having difficulty learning math. The integrated math course gives students options. Mr. Nuñez stated that he would like to test what is taught.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Jack Smith, South Pasadena High School

Holly Jacobsen, California School Boards Association

- ACTION: Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board take the following actions with respect to performance standards (levels) for the California Integrated Mathematics Standards Tests:
  1. Approve the use of the same five performance standards (level) designations used in the other standards-aligned mathematics tests.
  2. Approve the proposed “cut scores” (minimum number and percentage of correct responses) on the California Integrated Mathematics Standards Tests that determine the

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

performance standards (levels), recognizing that, for use in reporting in 2002 and beyond, the cut scores will be converted to scaled scores that comparably reflect student achievement.

Ms. Goncalves seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 7-1. Mr. Abernethy voted against the motion.

ITEM 6	California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Including, but not limited to, Update and Status.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Mr. Spears reported that 260,000 sophomores took the test in March and that the students' test scores would be available during the week of May 1. In mid-June, the contractors would have the aggregate scores. Mr. Spears informed the Board that he would report on the March testing at the May meeting.

President Hastings asked which contractor administered the March test. Mr. Spears responded that ETS was the contractor. He added that he appreciated their good communication, openness, and willingness to resolve problems.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 7	Report of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Sherry Griffith, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division, presented the Commission's request for action on two items, the approval of the timelines for the 2003 primary adoption of K-8 foreign language and the 2003 follow up adoption for history-social science, science, and visual and performing arts.

- ACTION: Ms. Reynolds moved that the State Board approve the timelines recommended by the Curriculum Commission for (1) the 2003 adoption of foreign language instructional materials and (2) the conduct of the 2003 follow-up adoptions of instructional materials for history-social science, visual and performing arts, and science. Mr. Abernethy seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

ITEM 8	Implementation of the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program (AB 466, Strom-Martin).	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Ms. Franklin informed the Board that the first provider application for AB 466 professional development had been received at the Board office. She drew the Board's attention to her memo, which included four recommendations. [Attachment 4, Memorandum from D. Franklin.] She noted that the first three recommendations were concerned with expanding the grade levels that the California Professional Development Institutes are authorized to serve under AB 466. The fourth recommendation was concerned with instructional materials that are "otherwise authorized" by the Board. She asked the Board add Linda's comments to delay action on the fourth recommendation because of concerns raised

FINAL MINUTES  
State Board of Education  
Wednesday, April 24, 2002

by the Department. [Attachment 5, Memorandum from S. Griffith.]

Ms. Cabatic noted that if the Board approved the third recommendation, the issue of the instructional materials that the teachers trained on would be subject to the definition ultimately resolved for the term “instructional materials otherwise authorized by the Board” and that the Board would only be concurring that the CPDI may serve fourth and fifth grade teachers. Ms. Franklin clarified that the third recommendation dealt only with the grade level of the teachers.

- ACTION: Mrs. Ichinaga moved that the State Board approve the staff recommendations to:
  1. Give the State Board’s concurrence for the University of California’s California Professional Development Institutes (CPDIs) to provide professional development in reading/language arts in grades four through eight, provided that the criteria set forth in a memorandum (dated April 16, 2002, from Gretchen Laue to Rick Brandsma) requesting such concurrence are met.
  2. Give the State Board’s concurrence for the CPDIs to provide professional development in mathematics in kindergarten through third grade, provided the criteria set forth in a memorandum (dated April 15, 2002, from Elizabeth K. Stage to the State Board of Education) regarding such concurrence are met, and provided the University of California provides quarterly reports by grade level on the numbers of teachers, schools, and districts served under the State Board’s authorization.
  3. Concur with the finding of the report from CPDI Governor’s Reading Initiative that the University of California’s Professional Development Institutes may serve teachers in grades four and five in the Oakland Unified School District from schools at or below the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile on the SAT-9 in the 2000-01 institutes.

Ms. Hammer seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

**Adjournment of Day’s Session:** President Hastings informed the audience that Thursday’s session would begin at 8:00 a.m. and that there would not be a Closed Session. President Hastings adjourned the day’s session at 4:03 p.m.