

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

Wednesday, June 26, 2002

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

Members Present

Reed Hastings, President
Joe Nuñez, Vice President
Robert J. Abernethy
Donald Fisher
Erika Goncalves
Marion Joseph
Suzanne Tacheny

Members Absent

Susan Hammer
Nancy Ichinaga
Carlton J. Jenkins
Vicki Reynolds

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 9:09 a.m.

Salute to the Flag

Mr. Nuñez led the Board, staff, and audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

Approval of Minutes (May 2002 Meeting)

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve the minutes of the May 2002 meeting with minor corrections. Mr. Fisher seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mrs. Joseph was not present when the vote was taken.

Announcements/Communications

President Hastings announced that Item 25, Appointment of a Member to the Advisory Commission on Charter Schools, was withdrawn from the agenda.

Superintendent Eastin said that in deference to the speaker, she would defer her report until the following day.

[Note: The agenda items were heard in the following order: 1-9, 12, 11, 21, 10, and 13-19. The items appear in that order in these minutes. Item 20 was not heard.]

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
--------	--	-----------------------

Report on English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) Meeting

President Hastings reported that the State Board's English Learner Advisory Committee met on June 18th. Among the topics discussed were the results of the California English Language Development Test; State Board-adopted English Learner regulations; the federal *No Child Left Behind* Act as it relates to English learners; and the January 2002 Reading-Language Arts/English Language Development instructional materials adoption.

Resignation of English Learner Advisory Committee (ELAC) Member

President Hastings announced that Arturo Abarca has resigned from the English Learner Advisory Committee. His resignation is a loss for the Committee. However, the exciting news is that Mr. Abarca is working with SRA/McGraw-Hill to develop the Spanish language version of *Open Court Reading*, c. 2002.

September Seminar

President Hastings reminded the Board and the audience that the seminar in September would be on technology in education. Nancy Sullivan of the Education Technology Division is arranging for the presentation.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

September Meeting in New Building

President Hastings informed the Board that its next meeting would be held on September 11 and 12 in the new California Department of Education Building. The address is 1430 N Street, and the building is located at the corner of 15th and N Streets.

July Special Meeting

President Hastings announced that the State Board would hold a special session on July 25 at 10:00 a.m. to act on recommendations to approve additional AB 466 providers and district applications for both AB 466 and AB 75. The meeting will be held in Sacramento, but most of the Board members will participate by teleconference. President Hastings stated that he expected the meeting to be very short. He added that this extra meeting is part of the Board's efforts to approve as many AB 466 providers as possible.

- By consensus, there was agreement to hold a brief special meeting (probably with most members participating by telephone) in late July to approve provider and district applications pertaining to AB 466 and AB 75 and other limited actions as may be authorized by the Board President.

Ms. Goncalves' Last Meeting

President Hastings noted that this was Ms. Goncalves' last full meeting as the Board's student member and that there would be time for tributes on Thursday.

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
--------	---	-------------

There were no speakers for this item.

ITEM 3	Seminar Session: Charter School Accountability: A Framework for California.	INFORMATION
--------	---	-------------

Mr. Fisher introduced the seminar presenter, Paul Hill. Mr. Hill is a leading scholar in the area of public education reform. He is currently leading studies of school choice plans, charter schools, and school accountability. His most recent book, *Fixing Urban Schools*, is a primer for city leaders on strategies for transforming urban public school systems. Mr. Hill is a Professor in the University of Washington's Daniel Evans School of Public Affairs where he directs the Center for Reinventing Public Education. He is also a distinguished visiting fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University.

Mr. Hill spoke on "Fulfilling the Promise of Accountability for California Charter Schools." His presentation focused on current accountability and strategies for enhancing charter school accountability in California. The discussion included: (1) the State's role in charter school accountability, specifically the State Board's and the Superintendent of Public Instruction's

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

roles; (2) NCLB as it relates to charter schools; (3) how to improve failing charter schools; (4) the charter schools' "contract" with their chartering agencies; (5) oversight; and (6) how charter school accountability differs from non-charter public school accountability. [Attachment 1: Fulfilling the Promise of Accountability for California Charter Schools.]

Ms. Joseph stated her interest in a comparison of the academic achievement of charter schools and the other, non-charter schools within the chartering district.

Mr. Fisher asked for further Board discussion on what steps the State Board could take to strengthen charter school accountability. Mr. Fisher indicated he would work with Dr. Hill to develop some specific recommendations for the State Board's consideration at future meetings.

ITEM 4	School Accountability Report Card (SARC).	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Ms. Tacheny acknowledged the excellent work of the School Accountability Report Card (SARC) Advisory Committee. She noted that the group has met every month for two years. The result of their work is focused, simple measures that are streamlined.

Eric Crane, Research-Analysis Unit, acknowledged the work of staff members Chris Hartnett, Bruce Gordon, and Gayle Eggleston. Mr. Crane noted that Senate Bill 1633 required the Department to create a data template for local districts to use to create their own school accountability report cards. The Department has created a resource for districts to use, and it includes quantitative information about the district provided by the Department. The "breakthrough" is having all the data available in one place instead of in many databases. Mr. Crane added that the statute requires many kinds of information to be included in school accountability report cards and that using the data template makes it easier for districts to produce the report.

Mr. Crane reported that the Department has links to the school accountability report cards that are maintained by the districts. Not all the districts are linked to the Department's page, but 92 percent are linked to the Department site. Approximately 98 percent of children attend schools within districts that are linked.

Mr. Nuñez asked if charter schools are required to have an accountability report card. Mr. Crane replied that charter schools are required to have a school accountability report card.

Ms. Tacheny asked Mr. Crane to comment on the districts' response to the templates. Mr. Crane reported that the districts think the templates are great and enormously helpful, especially for the smaller districts. Ms. Tacheny reported that Mr. Crane has received standing ovations at district meetings when he has presented the template.

Napa County Superintendent Barbara Nemko, co-chair of the SARC Advisory Committee, reported that since July 2001, when the State Board approved some of the definitions, the advisory committee has addressed the State Board's concerns and also defined data elements for

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

which there were no definitions in July. Ms. Nemko drew the Board’s attention to several specific data elements definitions, in particular Definitions 9 and 12.

Mrs. Joseph noted that Definition 15 should contain information about teacher training on state-adopted and standards-aligned instructional materials and Definition 16 should include information on the kind of training that principals receive. Ms. Nemko responded that those requests could be added to the prompts. Mrs. Joseph thanked Ms. Nemko for committing to making the changes to the prompts.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve the recommendations of the School Accountability Report Card Advisory Committee regarding the definitions of the data elements and the template design. Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

President Hastings congratulated the Advisory Committee for its two years of hard work.

ITEM 5	The 2002 Base Academic Performance Index (API): Integrating the California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE) Results into the API and the Relative Content Weights of Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Science in the API.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Bill Padia, Policy and Evaluation Division, noted that the Board had asked for options for weighting content areas in the Academic Performance Index (API). It is the Department’s recommendation that the Board retain the current weighting. The Public Schools Accountability Act (PSAA) Advisory Committee also recommends maintaining the current weighting.

Mr. Padia commented that the current system is the product of much work and thoughtful deliberation. Mr. Padia outlined three options to the Board. Option 1 is the same option that was recommended last month. Option 2 is similar to Option 1, but addresses Mrs. Joseph’s concern about the three percent weight of the math nationally normed test (NRT). The changes in Option 2 result in the following weights: California Standards Test (CST) is weighted 50 percent, the NRT is weighted 35 percent, and the high school exit exam (CAHSEE) is weighted 15 percent. Option 3 is significantly different in that the relative weights of the subjects are an average based on such things as high school graduation requirements and number of questions on standardized tests.

Mrs. Joseph asked why the current weighting was 40-20-20-20 as originally recommended. Mr. Padia responded that they did not want science and social science to seem unimportant but with the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) looming, we will have to change the API. Mr. Fisher stated that mathematics should have more weight in the API.

The following individual addressed the Board:
Roger Yoho, Corona-Norco USD

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

Holly Jacobson, PSAA Advisory Committee co-chair, expressed the Advisory Committee's concerns about making any changes that would narrow high school curriculum. She added that it may be premature to make changes because changes will need to be made as the NCLB is implemented.

Superintendent Eastin stated that science has a critical place in our state. The world in which we live requires knowledge of science. She remarked that she wanted students to understand the magic of science, as well as the magic of democracy.

Mr. Abernethy said that an area of concern for him is that a greater percentage of students leave schools with the skills necessary to support themselves. The most important skills are the ability to read and write well. Next in importance is the ability to calculate. With those goals, it makes sense to weight English-language arts and mathematics more.

President Hastings summarized the trade offs. Option 1 is more stable, but a counter argument is that while the Board is making many changes, why not make one more? Option 3 is about the relative importance of the content areas and whether we want to set content weights that would reflect Mr. Abernethy's goals or set weights so that subjects are equally important.

Mr. Nuñez commented that one point to consider for Option 1 is how much time, work, and thought the PSAA Advisory Committee has given to its recommendation. Ms. Goncalves stated she does not think we should change subject area weights, but is concerned that the CAHSEE is only 15 percent of the API. Students take the CAHSEE seriously, so it is a better measure of student achievement. Ms. Tacheny noted that the API is a powerful pressure point for change, but not the only pressure point. There is a lot of pressure surrounding the CAHSEE. Ms. Tacheny added that she is compelled by the argument that we will have to make changes with the NCLB and does not want to make changes now and then more changes in the near future.

President Hastings said that he was concerned that only the survey form of the NRT will be included in the science measure. Mr. Padia commented that changing the NRT is not really a change in the API. Ms. Belisle informed the Board that science has to be included in the federal measure of adequate yearly progress (AYP) by the year 2008.

Mr. Fisher asked how the PSAA Advisory Committee came to recommend Option 1. Mr. Padia responded the equal weighting in Option 1 was unanimously supported. Ms. Tacheny asked how much the anticipated NCLB changes influenced the Option 1 recommendation. Mr. Padia responded that approximately 90 percent of the reason for recommending Option 1 was staying the course.

Mrs. Joseph asked for verification that the CST in science cannot be included in the API until the integrated science test issue is resolved. Mr. Padia responded that is the situation.

President Hastings stated that if the Board goes with Option 1, the survey NRT in science is weighted 20 percent. The science NRT is not a good match to our state standards.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

- **MOTION FAILS:** Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve Option 3 as presented in the supplemental agenda materials, i.e., modify the relative subject matter content weights in the high school API to place greater emphasis on mathematics and less emphasis on science and history-social science and integrate the California High School Exit Examination into the API as recommended by the Public Schools Accountability Act Advisory Committee. Mr. Abernethy seconded the motion. The motion failed passage by a vote of 4-3. Ms. Goncalves, Mrs. Joseph, and Mr. Nuñez voted against the motion.

Mr. Nuñez stated that he would vote against making changes to the weighting of the subjects without more time for discussion and input from the field. Ms. Goncalves remarked that she would like the CAHSEE to have more weight. Mr. Padia commented that the PSAA Advisory Committee did not want to give the CAHSEE more weight because the test is taken only once. Superintendent Eastin noted that with the exception of the CAHSEE, the State Board had previously approved the weights and to change now is to change horses midstream.

- **MOTION FAILS:** Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve Option 1 as presented in the supplemental agenda materials, i.e., maintain the existing relative subject matter content weights in the high school API and integrate the results of the California High School Exit Examination into the API as recommended by the Public Schools Accountability Act Advisory Committee. Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion failed by a vote of 3-3-1. Mr. Abernethy, Mr. Fisher, and Ms. Goncalves voted against the motion. Mr. Hastings did not vote on the motion.

President Hastings said that he thinks it is a bad course of action to make the science NRT results 20 percent of the high school API. Superintendent Eastin expressed her concern about sending the wrong message—that science is not important.

Mr. Nuñez stated that he does not want to see the State Board overturn the work of the PSAA Advisory Committee.

Ms. Jacobson reported that the API was designed with the NRT in place and the CST gradually being added in. Mathematics, social science, and science are seen as equally important, and English-language arts is seen as more important in that it is the gateway to all other subjects. The narrowing of elective options and high school curriculum is a concern.

Ms. Tacheny stated that her goal is to get the CAHSEE into the API, but does not think that schools will act so differently if the State Board makes a change of 5 percent. Mr. Nuñez asked about the implications of not moving forward today. Mr. Padia replied that in terms of communicating to the field, it is important that the Board act today.

- **ACTION:** Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve Option 1 as presented in the supplemental agenda materials, i.e., maintain the existing relative subject matter content weights in the high school API and integrate the results of the California High School Exit Examination into the API as recommended by the Public Schools Accountability Act

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

Advisory Committee. Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-1. Mr. Abernethy voted against the motion.

Lunch Break. President Hastings called for the lunch break at 12:00 noon. He reconvened the meeting at 1:11 p.m.

ITEM 6	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Approval of Educational Testing Services (ETS) 2003 Contract and Scope of Work.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Phil Spears, Standards and Assessment Division, drew the Board’s attention to the contract, scope of work, and related documents. [Attachment 2: Education Testing Services (ETS) Contract and Scope of Work.] Mr. Spears noted that this contract process began nine months ago and since the April Board meeting, the Department has been working with ETS to develop a contract and scope of work for the STAR program. Mr. Spears said that many people have worked hard on the contract and scope of work and their work is appreciated. He added that he also appreciates the diligence of the ETS staff and the work of the State Board staff.

George Powell, Educational Testing Services, commented that he is very appreciative of the excellent communication ETS has had with the Department, Board members, and Board staff.

Mr. Spears informed the Board that there was a typographical error on Page 5 of Attachment 3, in the last paragraph: December 15, 2006 should be corrected to December 15, 2005. He added that there are likely other typographical errors in the draft.

Mr. Spears reported that the contractor is responsible for licensing the NRT and the key scoring. These costs are calculated in the cost of the contract. There are new costs of \$1.8 million for the license and \$2.4 million for key scoring. The new cost is equal to 35 cents per pupil for licensing and 52 cents for key scoring, for a total of 87 cents per pupil.

Mr. Spears noted the last item on the improvement options is related to the Governor’s Scholarshare Program. He stated that the Department has been working with all the involved agencies to increase the student participation in the scholarship program. As a result of their discussions, a method to increase participation at a minimal cost has been determined. Mr. Spears informed the Board that the Grade 9-11 answer document separation is no longer on the list of improvement options based on discussions with districts.

Ms. Tacheny commented that the entire assessment program is only as meaningful as it is for the teachers. We are asking for a tool to link test results to classroom instruction. In rethinking the reports, we are working with some of the best minds and are currently looking at website access as a means of communication. Ms. Tacheny urged the Board to keep the funding for reports and communication efforts.

President Hastings noted that in the contract there is \$2 million for paper-based communication and \$4 million for website communication. Mr. Spears commented that the paper-based

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

communication proposal is to ensure all teachers have access to information, even if they are not online.

Ms. Belisle informed the Board that she would like to check through the contract and scope of work one more time to ensure that there are no problems. The English-language arts decision today on the survey or full battery will result in some changes in the scope of work. Ms. Belisle added that there are other issues that still need to be resolved in the scope of work. These include technical issues, communication efforts and materials, the role of Content Review Panels, and the 30-day contract cancellation provision that should be taken out. The resolution of these issues would be subject to oversight of the Board's testing liaisons.

Mr. Fisher stated that he wants the cancellation provision to remain in the contract so that the State Board is able to cancel the contract. This provision is a wise course of business. Ms. Belisle informed the Board that the language for cancellation provisions is standard language in requests for proposals. President Hastings commented that the contract cancellation provision cannot be for a period shorter than a year and it is only a three-year contract. The provision might not be worth the tradeoff in the negotiations. Ms. Tacheny noted that ETS has worked very hard on this contract. California is the biggest state in terms of assessment, which is an important motivation. President Hastings suggested a 12-month contract cancellation provision.

Michael Wilkening, Department of Finance (DOF), stated that the DOF supports the policy goal of communication to teachers and parents, but is concerned about the website communication option. He raised the issues of security and privacy, equal access to information, the sole source nature of the contract, and the need for proper feasibility studies and technical reviews for what will be a state-owned website. He added that the DOF is also concerned the \$2.3 million for ETS staffing is high for program support services. President Hastings responded that the Board takes the DOF's concerns seriously and thinks that process wise, the Board motion would include everything but these items.

Mr. Warren responded that the DOF does review the contract and approves the per student cost. The State Board's and the Department's requests generate a number of costs in the \$2.3 million for program support services, including a Sacramento office with staff that has the authority to make decisions and having good people to help us make policy decisions. ETS has been more forthcoming about costs than any previous contractor. They are responding to the State Board's requests.

Ms. Tacheny remarked that what the DOF and State Board have in common is support of the Governor and his assessment system. The two areas that the DOF has concerns about are probably the two most important aspects for the public. The website communication turns testing from what some teachers feel is punitive to something that helps them in their classrooms. The ETS staffing proposal is necessary to help make critical policy decisions.

President Hastings stated that the \$4.3 million in the contract is for a specification that is one paragraph long. It would be easier to get support for the funding if there was better specification. Mr. Wilkening commented that the website communication may be what we eventually have.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

Given the State's economic situation and the need to find savings, however, this part of the communication effort should be delayed. He added that the recent breach of security at the Teale Data Center has heightened security concerns.

Ms Belisle suggested that the Board consider approving the contract with the paper reports and continue to work on the website option, which could be brought back to the Board as an amendment to the contract. Mr. Abernethy concurred that for \$4.3 million we need more specification and suggested moving ahead with developing this aspect and having President Hasting approve it.

Ms. Belisle noted that the DOF has been very supportive of the Board's communication goals. Mr. Wilkening reiterated that the DOF supports the goals, but has concerns about the process. President Hastings recommended moving ahead with the paper communication proposal and continuing to work on website communications as a contract amendment.

Mrs. Joseph asked about the English-language arts content area on page 11. It states in Year One that 1180 items are required for the tests and 2400 items need to be developed. Then, on page 12, it states that 650 items are required and 2400 need to be developed. Mr. Spears responded that the requirement for more items is for attrition of items through the item review process. Mrs. Joseph stated that she hopes that the required number of required items is 650 so we have three times that number developed. She added that she is concerned about the role of Content Review Panels. The panels should not be too big. Mrs. Joseph expressed her concern that the CRPs review the field-tested items with the benefit of the field test data.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board do all of the following:
 - (1) Make a finding that it is feasible to use a short form of the nationally norm-referenced test (NRT) in English-language arts and to develop and administer stand-alone California Standards Tests in English-language arts in grades 2-11 in 2003;
 - (2) Approve the use of a California Standards Tests in English-language arts that has 65 items in grades 2 and 3 and 75 items in grades 4-11 (currently the California Standards Tests in English-language arts have 75 items in grades 2 and 3 and 90 items in grades 4-11); and
 - (3) Approve the 2003 contract and scope of work with the Educational Testing Service (ETS), subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) The revisions outlined by CDE staff at the meeting are incorporated;
 - (b) The documents are conformed to the State Board's decision regarding the stand-alone California Standards Tests in English-language arts;
 - (c) The contract amount is approved by the Department of Finance at a level no higher than the level approved by the State Board;
 - (d) The role of the Content Review Panel is clarified to ensure that the CRP continues to provide input for the final forms of the tests;

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

- (e) The minimum 30-day notice period for cancellation provision is extended to a minimum of one year;
- (f) The provisions related to development of Web-based distribution of testing results are stricken, and those provisions may instead be presented subsequently as a contract amendment following appropriate review and, as may be necessary, prior approval by other state authorities that govern contracts related to information technology; and
- (g) Technical revisions are incorporated as necessary by staff working under the oversight of the State Board's testing liaisons, including revisions relating to the communication materials and report to be developed for teachers.

Prior to execution, the contract and scope of work shall be reviewed and approved by the Executive Director of the State Board of Education. Staff, in consultation with the State Board's testing liaisons, were requested to review again the costs related to ETS staffing (in relationship to the concerns expressed by the Department of Finance) to see if reductions could be effectuated without diminishing the objective of efficient and effective communication with the contractor.

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

Mrs. Joseph requested that when the Content Review Panels meet in July, they attend to replacement of the items that were on the previous NRT. Ms. Belisle noted that the test items must test a range of skills.

Mr. Spears thanked the English-Language Arts Content Review Panel, ETS, and assessment staff for their efforts in making a recommendation on the English-language arts exam. He noted that it was a very cooperative effort and a good beginning for ETS. Mrs. Joseph remarked that she had attended the panel meeting and it was a very cooperative effort indeed.

Ms. Tacheny thanked ETS and the Department staff for the enormous amount of work involved in developing the contract and the scope of work.

ITEM 7	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Approval of 2002 Contract Amendment of Harcourt Educational Measurement.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Mr. Warren drew the Board's attention to the proposed amendment and its associated costs. [Attachment 3: Amendment to the 2002 Contract with Harcourt Education Measurement.]

President Hastings expressed concerns about paying for information that we already own. Mr. Spears noted that the issue is that without this amendment, ETS will be without information it needs that Harcourt has. Mr. Fisher asked if Mr. Spears thought the costs were reasonable. Mr. Spears responded that he just got the figures a few days ago and had not fully reviewed them.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

President Hastings requested comments from Counsel. Ms. Belisle informed the Board that transition was an item in the Harcourt contract, but there was no specific delineation of costs for transition. Because of this lack of specificity, it is unclear whether transition costs were included in the contract.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the amendment to the 2002 contract with Harcourt Educational Measurement in accordance with the recommendation of CDE staff. Mr. Fisher seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

ITEM 8	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, the Selection of the Norm-referenced (complete or survey) Test for Science.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

Mr. Warren noted that the issue before the Board is whether to use the full battery test or the survey test in science. The Content Review Panel and the Department recommend using the survey test.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve administration of the survey form of the CAT 6 norm-referenced test in high school science under the STAR Program. Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-1. Mr. Fisher voted against the motion.

ITEM 9	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Approval of Revised STAR Integrated Science Blueprints.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

[Attachment 4: Public School Enrollment in Science 2001-02.]

Mr. Spears reported that since the May Board meeting, the integrated science group was reconvened to develop a new blueprint for integrated science. He pointed out that the integrated science tests use the same test items as the single subject tests.

Christine Bertrand, California Science Teachers Association, reported that the California Science Teachers Association would continue to be involved in informing science teachers and schools about the new blueprint. [Attachment 5: Consensus of the Integrated Science Community.]

President Hastings asked Ms. Bertrand for her thoughts regarding the districts' willingness to adjust their curriculum. Most schools currently focus on two subjects, but the new blueprints have all four subjects in each year. Ms. Bertrand responded that the districts have expressed a willingness to conform to the new blueprints.

President Hastings then asked if the State Board needed to make a decision today or if it could be postponed until the September meeting. Mr. Spears responded that a September decision is not a

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

problem and would allow the Content Review Panel to review the blueprint during the summer meeting.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Elizabeth Lowe, Montebello USD
Marcia Lee Gans, integrated science teacher
Wally Boggess, Simi Valley USD
Peter Gillespie, retired science teacher
Susan Liberati, ACSA
Don Kawano, Los Angeles USD
Sally Bennett, San Diego City Schools
Dean Gilbert, Los Angeles COE
Jean Resler, San Jose USD
Andrea Ball, Long Beach USD
Holly Jacobson, CSBA

Superintendent Eastin commented that in some ways, it would be better if the State Board acted now so that teachers could begin the transition in the fall.

President Hastings asked why it is that consensus has developed so quickly around this blueprint when he understands that there was not such a consensus on the first blueprint. Mrs. Joseph replied that she thinks the integrated science community has become more accepting of the science standards and have gained more experience with them.

Phil Lafontaine, Mathematics and Science Leadership Office, noted that the first blueprint was the first time integrated science teachers had been told what had to be taught. Now, many schools have decided integrated science works and is a way to teach the standards.

Ms. Tacheny stated that the Board is trying to avoid having districts telling us that the blueprints do not match what they teach. Mrs. Joseph mentioned her concern that some students do not have the option of taking discipline-specific courses. Mr. Lafontaine explained that in some districts, students must take two years of integrated science and then they may take a discipline-specific course.

Mr. Nuñez commented that certainly, over time, we will be able to tell if students in integrated science are doing as well as students in traditional courses. Mr. Abernethy expressed concern that districts have had a short time to respond to the new proposal.

President Hastings noted that the Board could give preliminary approval now or decide to not act today and act in September. He mentioned that under the new blueprint there are four tests. This is a problem that must be addressed. There are fewer than 1,000 students taking a fourth year of integrated science.

Mrs. Joseph remarked that the Content Review Panel was notably absent from the discussion.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

- ACTION: Mr. Abernethy moved that the State Board postpone action on the proposal for a revised set of California Standards Tests in integrated science at the high school level until the September 2002 meeting. [The motion was made with commendation for the work that had been done between the May and June meetings to develop the proposal, but with recognition that a longer period for vetting of the proposal would be in order before action is taken.] Mrs. Joseph seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a vote of 6-1. Ms. Goncalves voted against the motion.

Ms. Tacheny stated that she would like to know if there is district level support for the blueprints and the number of students taking integrated science in the districts that express their support.

ITEM 12	California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Including, but not limited to, Adoption of CAHSEE Regulations.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

President Hastings explained that there were a number of students who had been waiting a long time to address the Board today. He said that Item 12 would be heard out of order so that the students had the opportunity to speak.

Jan Chladek, Standards and Assessment Division, noted that the regulations had been amended at the last meeting and then sent out for the 15-day public review period. Having gone through this review, the regulations could be adopted as permanent regulations today.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

- Melissa Pittman, student, Long Beach
- Jenny Huang, attorney, Public Advocates, Inc.
- Eric Avalos, student, San Jose
- Eric Mar, member, San Francisco USD Board of Education

Mrs. Joseph commented that there appears to be a lack of understanding that the CAHSEE is a criterion-referenced test of the standards students are supposed to be learning. Mrs. Joseph asked how the San Francisco School Board expends its funds and whether there is an equal distribution of these funds. Mark Sanchez, San Francisco School Board Member, responded that the funds are distributed equally.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board adopt the regulations as presented in the agenda item. Mrs. Joseph seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

President Hastings thanked the students for their participation in the Board meeting.

ITEM 11	California English Language Development Test (CELDT): Including, but not limited to, Options for Reclassification of English Learners.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

President Hastings announced that Item 21 would be heard immediately after Item 11 and that Item 20 was deferred to a future meeting.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

Mr. Warren noted that the reclassification of English learners is determined based on the CELDT, teacher evaluation, parent opinion and consultation, and student performance in basic skills. He noted that this agenda item contains information about student performance on the CELDT and how to establish a range of performance on basic skills. The chart matching results from STAR test and the CELDT displays the predicted reclassification rates based on the English-language arts standards test performance of students scoring Early Advanced or Advanced on the CELDT.

The Department recommends (1) using the California Standards Test in the English-language arts for comparison and (2) setting the range for reclassification consideration from the beginning of the basic level up to the midpoint of the basic level so that the districts have flexibility to set a cut score within that score range.

President Hastings noted that it is hard to get a handle on how students are progressing. As students are reclassified, we are not able to track their academic progress as a subgroup. Mr. Nuñez observed that we need to keep reminding ourselves that this data is only one of several measures to be used for classification.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 21	Adoption of Permanent Regulations Relating to Disputes Between School Districts and Charter Schools Regarding Facilities for Charter Schools.	ACTION
---------	---	--------

President Hastings noted that he began working on this issue four years ago and now he finds himself having to implement the proposition. He stated that binding arbitration is controversial. Most districts work cooperatively with charter schools, but some do not. For example, a Redwood City charter high school, Aurora, has had to move to a different location every year. The district has not only not cooperated with the charter, the district has sued the charter school. Binding arbitration is the controversial aspect of the proposed regulations. President Hastings stated that this charter school's experience has strengthened his support of these regulations.

Jan Sterling, School Fiscal Services Division, advised that what is before the Board today is the final approval of these regulations.

The following individuals addressed the Board:
David Patterson, CANEC
Peg Carew Toledo
Cindy Mogul, parent
Paul C. Minney, attorney representing charter schools
Mark Kushner, Leadership High School

President Hastings commented that the absence ACSA and CSBA should not to be taken as support for the regulations; these organizations remain in opposition to the regulations.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

Mr. Fisher emphasized that binding arbitration is a fast and efficient way to resolve disputes. It is his feeling that there will not be many disputes. The alternative is that charter schools are forced to go to court, which is very costly.

- ACTION: Mr. Fisher moved that the State Board approve the regulations as presented in the agenda item. Ms. Goncalves seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present.

ITEM 10	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) California Standards Tests (CST): Including, but not limited to, Content Review Panels' Survey Results Concerning Blueprints for School Districts, Teachers, and the Public.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

Mr. Spears noted that last month the Department brought to the Board a recommendation concerning the public blueprints for STAR and the Board requested input from the Content Review Panels (CRPs). The English-language arts panel has met since then, but was not supportive of the recommendations. In response to a survey sent to the CRPs, sixteen responses were received. The CRPs are not ready to make recommendations without further discussion. The Department would like the CRPs to discuss the blueprints when they meet this summer.

Superintendent Eastin advised that other states are releasing blueprints and telling students what is on the test. She pointed out that Texas releases the entire test every year. Ms. Tacheny remarked that the Board has voted to release items. The blueprints are architectural documents, technical documents for the development of the test items and forms.

President Hastings requested information on what other states are doing, what their blueprints contain, at the September meeting.

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 13	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 and Possible Revisions to the Emergency Regulations.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Ms. Franklin presented the recommendation of the review panels for AB 466. [Attachment 6: Memo from D. Franklin.] She reported that one of the providers is recommended to provide training for teachers and for paraprofessionals and instructional aides. Ms. Franklin informed the Board that the emergency regulations the Board adopted to define "otherwise authorized" instructional materials were being reviewed by the Office of Administrative Law and were not yet effective.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the list of training providers and training curricula for the purpose of providing mathematics and reading professional

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

development under the provisions of AB 466 (Chapter 737, Statutes of 2001). Ms. Goncalves seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken.

Superintendent Eastin thanked Sue Stickel and Leslie Schwarze for reviewing the materials for English learners. She stated that she would like the Board to consider a supplemental adoption of materials aimed at beginning English learners.

President Hastings commented that as we get better at mainstreaming kids into English, the gap may be an artifact of how quickly students move from an English learner classification to fluent English proficient.

Mrs. Joseph said that she would like the message to go out that the Board wants as many providers as possible—the door is wide open. The July 25th Board meeting is one example of how the Board is working to ensure that potential providers have every opportunity to be approved providers.

ITEM 14	AB 466 (Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program) Regulations – Proposed Changes from Public Hearing of May 30, 2002	ACTION
---------	--	--------

President Hastings called for a motion on the regulations.

- ACTION: Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board approve the regulations as presented in the agenda item. Ms. Tacheney seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 15	AB 466 (Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program) Approval of Local Educational Agency Applications.	ACTION
---------	--	--------

Mr. Vasey requested approval of the applying local educational agencies, but not the funding amounts. The actual funding will depend on the number of teachers trained and the funding available. He informed that Board that July 1st is the deadline for districts to submit applications for 2002-03 funding.

Mrs. Joseph commented that these districts have purchased the newly adopted instructional materials and are ready for training. Mr. Vasey noted that the districts are signing assurances that they have the instructional materials and will use an approved provider. These conditions for AB 466 funding are subject to audit. The audit penalty is the loss of funding.

- ACTION: Mr. Abernethy moved that the State Board approve the list of local educational agency applications, in accordance with the recommendation of CDE staff, with the understanding that CDE, staff pursuant to applicable provisions of law, will determine

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

final funding amounts. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 16	Approval of Local Educational Agencies (LEA) program funding for AB 75, The Principal Training Program.	ACTION
---------	---	--------

Mr. Vasey requested approval of the local education agencies, noting again that the Board would not be approving the dollar amounts. As with AB 466, the actual funding depends on the number of principals and vice principals trained and the funding available.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the list of local educational agencies as presented by CDE staff with the understanding that the final funding amounts will be determined by CDE staff pursuant to applicable provisions of law. Mr. Nuñez seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 17	Approval of Training Providers for AB 75, The Principal Training Program.	ACTION
---------	---	--------

Mr. Vasey reminded the Board that the AB 75 training is divided into the three modules. Module 1 focuses on curriculum and instructional leadership. Module 2 covers fiscal and human services. Module 3 is the technology module. He noted that there were two conditional approvals in the recommendation. [Attachment 7: Principal Training Program Provisional Applications.] The necessary changes are doable, but not frivolous. He informed the Board that the provider materials for Module 1 have been reviewed and recommended at the program level.

Ms. Franklin suggested that the Board consider approving the providers of Module 1 AB 75 training at the high school level by subject area based on the submission of a training curriculum for one instructional materials program in that subject. This could be termed an example model for approval. This approval model would be different than the approval for trainings at the elementary and middle school level, which would be specific to the adopted instructional materials program. Using this approval model would mean that Stanislaus County Office of Education, which submitted training curriculum for both a math and an English text, would be approved to provide AB 75 training at the high school level in mathematics and English-language arts.

President Hastings noted that there are two models for AB 75. In K-8, the State Board has statutory adoption authority and the training materials submitted by potential providers are reviewed and approved at the program level. For review at the high school level, the example model is appropriate. Approvals at the high school would be for a core subject area.

Mrs. Joseph noted that where 8th grade material is being taught in high school, the training should be on adopted materials.

FINAL MINUTES
State Board of Education
June 26- 27 2002

- **ACTION:** Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board approve training providers for AB 75 in accordance with the recommendation of CDE staff, with the modification of the recommendation for approval of Stanislaus County Office of Education for training at the high school level in the subject areas of mathematics and English-language arts. Ms. Tacheny seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken.

Mr. Vasey stated that information would be made available to local educational agencies that would indicate the specific instructional materials/programs that were submitted for review and were the basis of their approval to provide high school level AB 75 training.

ITEM 18	Approve selection of a statewide list of Supplemental Education Service Providers pursuant to Section 1116(e) of No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Hanna Walker, Specialized Programs Division, presented the item to the Board.

- **ACTION:** Mr. Abernethy moved that the State Board approve the list of Supplemental Education Service Providers pursuant to Section 1116(e) of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in accordance with the recommendation of CDE staff. Ms. Goncalves seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. In addition to the absent members, Mr. Fisher was not present when the vote was taken.
- On the following day, a subsequent action was taken that amended this action to clarify the approval status of the organizations on the list. (See minutes for Thursday, June 27, 2002.)

ITEM 19	Review and Update: Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1994 Timeline Waiver	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Mr. Warren outlined the issues that would be addressed in the quarterly progress report that would be submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. Most of the issues are related to assessment and accountability in the Improving American Schools Act (IASA).

No action was taken on this item.

ITEM 20	Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Induction Programs.	ACTION
---------	---	--------

This item was deferred until the September meeting.

Adjournment of the Day's Session: President Hastings announced that the Board would meet in Closed Session at 8:00 a.m. the next day. He adjourned the day's session at 4:59 p.m.