

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

Wednesday, February 6, 2002

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

Members Present

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

Members Absent

None

Principal Staff to the State Board of Education

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

Call to Order

President Hastings called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

Salute to the Flag

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

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

Approval of Minutes (January 2002 Meeting)

- ACTION: Mr. Abernethy moved that the State Board approve the Minutes of the January 2002 Meeting with minor corrections. Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present and voting. Ms. Reynolds did not vote on the motion and Mrs. Joseph was not present when the vote was taken.

Announcements/Communications

Special Presentations

President Hastings informed the audience that at 11:00 a.m. there would be a special presentation on the model curriculum on the life and work of César Chávez. After a short break for photos, the United States Senate Youth Awards would be presented. This presentation would also be followed by a brief photo session.

Agenda Changes

President Hastings announced that Item 9, Seminar on the Arts, would be heard at approximately 12:00 noon, and that Item 13, Science Framework, would be heard at approximately 1:30 p.m. Item 10, Report of the Curriculum Commission, would be heard after Item 13. President Hastings added that the Board would be working through lunch.

[NOTE: The items were heard in the following order: 1 through 5, 7, 8, 6 (partial), 9, 13, 6 (continued), 10, 12, 11, 16, 15. Item 14 was heard on Thursday, February 7, 2002.]

Report of Superintendent

Report deferred until Thursday, February 7. (See minutes for Thursday, February 7, 2002)

ITEM 1	STATE BOARD PROJECTS. Including future meeting plans; agenda items; State Board office budget, staffing, staff 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
--------	--	--------------------

Upcoming Seminars

President Hastings reported that the seminar in March, which Ms. Tacheney has arranged, would be on communicating about assessment to the field and the public. The seminar topic in April will be technology in instruction, which comes out of the January meeting discussion on technology-based instructional materials and was requested by Mrs. Joseph.

March Meeting Highlights

President Hastings noted that some of the major issues on the March agenda include the adoption of the Health Framework Addendum and Criteria and the first requests for determination of funding for charter schools under SB 740.

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

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

The following individuals addressed the Board:
 Rosalyn Turnbull, California State Parent Teacher Association
 Curtis Washington and Judy Hart, California Teachers Association
 Teresa Pina, parent, Indio Charter School
 Ruben Elizalde, teacher, Sweetwater Union High School District
 David Patterson, California Network of Educational Charters

ITEM 3	Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program: Including, but not limited to, Request to Submit for the Implementation of the STAR Program as Authorized by Senate Bill 233.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

President Hastings set the context for the discussion on the contract and noted that the STAR test contract is for over \$130 million over a three-year period. He stated that the last contract designation process had been complicated by the Board and Superintendent Eastin each having a different review process. This time, the Board and the Department are working together. He thanked the Department for their efforts to work cooperatively. It is his hope that the Board can “buy into” the review process. He asked Board members with concerns about the process or the review criteria to work through the Department staff.

Superintendent Eastin stated her opinion that it is important that individual Board members do not contact publishers. Mrs. Joseph asked if there was a legal window for Board members to talk to test publishers. Mr. Mockler replied that there is no legal restriction. He added that Superintendent Eastin will make her recommendation to the Board on April 9, 2001. The submitting publishers will present information at the April meeting. Each will have one-half hour for their presentation, and then there will be time for Board questions.

Mr. Mockler stated that the hope is to reach consensus on how to review the submissions. The testing liaisons will be involved throughout the process, so the Board will have ongoing information. Superintendent Eastin stated that while Board members are not forbidden from talking to submitters, she cautioned individual members from speaking as individuals to test publishers. Superintendent Eastin noted that the Board’s counsel had worked with the Department on the request for submission. Mr. Abernethy commented that the Board should be together on the review criteria as a matter of best practices.

Paul Warren, Deputy Superintendent, reported that the request to submit had gone out and a meeting was held for potential submitters. Six companies have informed the Department that they are interested in submitting proposals. March 11 is the date the submissions are due to the Department. By April 9, Superintendent Eastin will make her recommendation to the Board. Mr. Warren explained that panels

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

would be reviewing different components of the submissions and that the Department is in the final stages of putting those panels together, including people suggested by the Board. The evaluation criteria included in the request to submit materials will inform potential submitters. Mr. Warren added that the Department did get a memo from one of the Board's testing liaisons and did take one of the member's suggestions, but is unable to change the submission requirements at this time.

Mr. Mockler clarified that this is not a bidding process. The statute gives the Board sole authority to designate a contractor. It is not a case of having to go with the lowest bidder, and it is not an RFP process. The Board does not legally need to follow those procedures.

Ms. Tacheny stated that in her memo she just wanted to express the content of prior Board discussions. She remarked that Mr. Warren is right; many things in the memo are in the request for submission. Ms. Tacheny added that the problem was how to signal to publishers Board priorities. Ms. Reynolds commented that the Board needs more timely opportunity to discuss issues. This is a critical contract. The Board needs lead time for important policy discussions.

President Hastings noted that the memo tried to communicate to publishers what the Board's priorities will be when the Board makes the designation decision. Better communication to parents is not an issue; we all agree on the need for that. The issue is the collaboration of the different test vendors and the importance of that collaboration to the Board. The Board and the Superintendent discussed the need to achieve balance between the Superintendent's authority and the communication of the Board's priorities.

President Hastings stated his desire that the discussion focus on the content of the memo with the goal of reaching consensus on the issues of coordination and collaboration between test publishers and improved communication to parents. The memo is not part of the Request for Submissions. That document stands as it is. It is a complete document. President Hastings asked if there was consensus about the importance of coordination and communication to parents. He asked for a motion to reflect the Board's desire for coordination beyond just the STAR test, but between all tests, with effective parental communication.

- **ACTION:** Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board adopt a general statement to the effect that, within the context of reviewing submissions to become the STAR Program contractor, it will be interested in the ability of a potential STAR Program contractor to provide (1) accurate and effective communication of assessment results to parents (guardians) and (2) advice on the coordination of the STAR Program with all other state assessments. [This general statement does not formally change the content of the Request to Submit as released by the California Department of Education. However, it is to be made known to all of the potential STAR Program contractors.] Mrs. Ichinaga seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members.

President Hastings thanked Mr. Warren and his staff for doing a great job on the invitation to submit. Mr. Mockler asked Mr. Warren if the Department was clear on the process that would be followed in April. Mr. Warren replied that by April 9 the Superintendent would make her recommendation to the

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

Board. At the April meeting, the submitters will make presentations to the Board. The Board will designate a contractor at the April meeting, and the Department will develop a contract in negotiation with the publisher. The contract will come to the Board for approval. Mr. Mockler commented that it will be the most collaborative process we can accomplish. The Department will work with the Board's testing liaisons. Mrs. Joseph asked for the names of the individuals named to the submission review panels. Mr. Warren replied that the Board would receive the names shortly. Mr. Mockler noted that the order of presentations in April would be determined by random draw.

- By consensus, the State Board agreed with the process outlined in the agenda item for the review of submissions, presentation of a recommendation by the State Superintendent, and presentations of submissions by the prospective contractors (including the determination by random draw of the order in which the presentations will be made to the State Board).

ITEM 4	California English Language Development Test (CELDT): Including, but not limited to, Status Report, Recommendations, and Options for Test Administration and Scoring.	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	---	--------------------

President Hastings stated that the Board was honored and fortunate to have Senator Escutia, the author of the bill that created the California English Language Development Test (CELDT), here today.

Senator Escutia thanked Mr. Warren and his office for keeping her informed about the CELDT. She noted that she is hearing now that the CELDT test has value for teachers. She stated that the story retelling and essay sections are the most important parts of the test. Today, she is here representing the Latino Caucus and requesting that the Board make every effort to keep those sections of the test. Senator Escutia made several suggestions on streamlining the test. Senator Escutia stated that she is proud of progress California has made on the CELDT and looks forward to the day when all children in California speak English.

President Hastings thanked Senator Escutia for her comments. Superintendent Eastin thanked Senator Escutia for her efforts in this area and also her efforts on behalf of children in other areas, such as nutrition and preschool. Phil Spears, Standards and Assessment Division, commented that he appreciated Senator Escutia's comments.

Mr. Spears noted that the Board had before it options for the test in memos from the Department and from Mr. Mockler. In addition, there is a last minute memo on blue paper. [Attachment 1, 2002 Proposed CELDT Improvement Plan, Agreed to by CDE and CTB/Mcgraw-Hill] Mr. Spears reported that he test publisher, CTB/McGraw-Hill, and the Department have reached an agreement on streamlined test administration and scoring, timely return of test results, and test design.

Mr. Mockler noted that Senator Escutia mentioned some of the issues in the attachment and inquired if the Board needed to act on these changes. Mr. Spears replied that no action was necessary on the agreement but a motion would be needed if the Board wants to act on the changes suggested in the writing and storytelling component.

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

Ms. Hammer thanked Senator Escutia. Ms. Hammer remarked that she had received lots of letters on the test with many good suggestions and asked that some of the suggestions be considered. Mr. Spears replied that the Department has really tried to be responsive to concerns and suggestions from the field. The Department has a list of improvements it would like to accomplish. Mr. Nuñez stated that he supports Option 2 in the Department’s option document with the addition of Senator Escutia’s suggestions on stop points.

Mr. Fisher asked if other changes would be made in the test. Mr. Hill replied that procedural changes had already been agreed to and would be made. Mrs. Joseph remarked that Senator Escutia had mentioned stop points for both the listening and speaking component of the test and the writing component. Her example was having a stop point in the essay for a child who could not even write a sentence. Mr. Spears noted that the Department had not discussed stop points with the contractor. Mr. Mockler stated that the consensus of the Board is to use stop points to the extent that it does not interfere with the test.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

- Jeanne Herrick, CABE
- Alice Petrossian, ACSA
- Curtis Washington, CTA
- Geno Flores, Long Beach USD
- Linda MacDonell, Orange County Department of Education
- Lisa Ramer, CATESOL

- ACTION: Mr. Nuñez moved that the State Board approve Option #2 for the 2002-03 administration of the CELDT (exemption of students who achieved the Early Advanced or Advanced level in the listening and speaking portion of the CELDT in 2001-02 from re-taking that portion of the CELDT in 2002-03, provided they are still in the same grade span), and approve the inclusion in the CELDT instrument of “stop points” at which the test will be terminated once it becomes obvious that a student is essentially monolingual, to the extent that these changes do not compromise the integrity of the CELDT. Ms. Hammer seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members.

ITEM 5	California High School Exit Examination (CAHSEE): Including, but not Limited to, Independent Evaluation of the CAHSEE, Analysis of the 2001 Administration (HumRRO).	INFORMATION ACTION
--------	--	--------------------

Mr. Spears introduced Laurie Wise from HumRRO, the independent evaluator of the test. Mr. Wise informed the Board that the full report is posted on the Department's website. [Attachment 2, HumRRO Report – Independent Evaluation of the CAHSEE: Analysis of 2001 Administration] Mr. Wise summarized the main points of the evaluation report. [Attachment 3, The High School Exist Exam: Independent Evaluation Presentation] Mr. Wise reported that a high quality exam had been administered on time, without major problems. The passing results were what they were expected to be. HumRRO concluded that it is still too soon to gauge the impact of the test.

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

Ms. Reynolds stated that she wanted to draw attention to the needs of economically disadvantaged students, as well as English learner and special education students. President Hastings remarked that for all students the goal is to identify students who need additional help to pass the exam. That is why we test in 10th grade. The right question to ask is how do districts prepare students. Mr. Mockler commented that Governor Davis and the Legislature have provided funding, essentially without a cap, for remediation.

Superintendent Eastin reported on a recent study showing improvements for students who participate in after-school programs. This is good news for California and means that we are on the right path. Mr. Jenkins remarked that much of the course information was missing and asked if students completed that information. He stated that the lack of information could effect the conclusions being drawn. Mr. Wise replied that students do complete that box and that the lack of complete information on courses taken is why the report separated out the results of those students. Mr. Jenkins inquired if HumRRO had observed test administrations. Mr. Wise responded that HumRRO did very little observation and that the test contractor will do more observations in next test administration. Mr. Jenkins asked about the oversight of test administration. Mr. Wise answered that HumRRO asked district test administrators and sat in on focus groups discussing test administration problems. Mrs. Joseph reminded the Board that last month it adopted very fine instructional materials. If teachers use those materials, the students will be prepared for the test.

Ms. Hammer thanked Mr. Wise for the report. She noted that the Board has the option of extending the date when students must pass the exit exam. The statute calls for a study to help the Board with this decision. She asked what steps were being taken regarding the study. Mr. Spears replied that as early as the next day, Department staff would begin discussions with the Board staff and the test evaluators. The report from the study is due by May 2003. Mr. Mockler commented that what the law envisions is a report that is an expansion of the HumRRO report. The Board's decision is to be based on the opportunity to learn and test development. Mr. Wise added that this year's test administration will provide more information, as will as the 2003 administration.

Mrs. Ichinaga observed that as policy makers, the Board needs to be aware of the number of students who do not pass the exam. Some of them were in elementary school when whole language was taught. She stated that the Department's Compensatory Education Division should be totally involved in helping our older kids achieve. Superintendent Eastin said that she does not disagree with what Mrs. Ichinaga has said. She added that she supports the Department having a bigger role in helping districts but that the Department needs more staff. Superintendent Eastin stated that we have to build a system that can help districts and schools.

President Hastings thanked Mr. Wise for his report.

Item 6 was heard, in part, after Item 8 and continued after Item 13.

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

ITEM 7	Draft Model Curriculum on the Life and Work of César E. Chávez.	ACTION
--------	---	--------

President Hastings welcomed and briefly introduced the Board's special guests: Fernando Chávez, the eldest son of César Chávez; Senator Polanco, who authored the bill requiring the development of this curriculum; and César Chávez Elementary School Principal Norm Takana and students.

President Hastings stated that he spoke for the entire Davis administration in saying that the Board is privileged and honored to take action that will allow generations of California school children to learn about the life, values, sacrifices, and contributions that César Chávez made to his community, his state, and his country. His non-violent movement to bring justice to farm workers touched the nation's conscious and forever etched his place in our nation's social history. In his life, there are lessons for all of us. President Hastings asked the Department to present the model curriculum.

Tom Adams, Curriculum Development and Instructional Resources Division, presented a quick survey of what students will learn about the life and work of César Chávez.

President Hastings thanked Senator Polanco for his legislation. Senator Polanco thanked Superintendent Eastin and her staff and Mr. Mockler and his staff for quickly bringing forth this curriculum. Senator Polanco stated that Chávez's principles of peace and nonviolence must certainly be included in our children's education.

President Hastings stated that it was a great honor to have Fernando Chávez here today. Mr. Chávez recalled that when the César Chávez Day legislation was first being discussed, the Chávez family insisted that the model curriculum and public service focus be included as a way to honor their father's legacy.

Mr. Tanaka introduced the students from César Chávez Elementary School: Jeffrey Phalom, Ashneil Kumar, Jose Munoz, and Yesenia Raya-Pantoja. Ms. Raya-Pantoja gave a short biography of César Chávez.

President Hastings remarked that all of the Board members work hard on issues of justice and equality, but none of us has worked as long and hard as Mrs. Joseph. He asked Mrs. Joseph to tell of her involvement in the famous march from Delano and to have the honor of making the motion to approve the curriculum.

Mrs. Joseph recalled how she had marched with her husband on the last day of the march and provided housing for marchers. She said that it was one of the most inspiring moments in her life, to join the march. It was an honor to be part of it. Ms. Hammer commented that many lives have been made better by the work of César Chávez. She said that her meeting with César Chávez at the end of one of his fasts was one of the greatest memories of her life. She also remembered when César Chávez came to speak at her temple.

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

Superintendent Eastin said that she wanted to say to Fernando Chávez, the César Chávez family, Senator Polanco, and children that César Chávez left an incredible legacy. It teaches us that not all leaders are elected, not all warriors are violent. She stated that she believes equality of opportunity is best achieved by equal education.

- ACTION: Mrs. Joseph moved that the State Board approve the Model Curriculum on the Life and Work of César E. Chávez as presented in the agenda item. Ms. Hammer seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members.

ITEM 8	United States Senate Youth Program Awards.	INFORMATION
--------	--	-------------

Superintendent Eastin and President Hastings presented the United States Senate Youth Program Awards to four outstanding high school students.

The honored students were:

Nathaniel Smith, 1st Delegate, Claremont Unified School District
 SoniaPreet Samagh, 2nd Delegate, Poway Unified School District
 Kathryn Sowell, 1st Alternate, San Leandro Unified School District
 Jesse Arreguin, 2nd Alternate, San Francisco County

ITEM 6	Results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Year 2000 Science Assessment.	INFORMATION
--------	---	-------------

Mr. Spears informed the Board that there would be three presenters under this item: Eric Zilbert and Diane Hernandez, Standards and Assessment Division, and Jack Hawkins, a science teacher from Fullerton and a 2000 Teacher of the Year. [Attachment 4, Analysis of California Students Performance on Constructed Response vs. Multiple Choice Items]

Mr. Zilbert reported on the NAEP science test results for California. He informed the Board that only a sample of California students take NAEP. He noted that NAEP is now required as part of federal Title I funding.

President Hastings asked the presenters to continue Item 6 after the seminar and the science framework discussion. (See below.)

ITEM 9	Seminar Session on Visual and Performing Arts.	INFORMATION
--------	--	-------------

Ms. Reynolds introduced the seminar on visual and performing arts with remarks about the importance of arts education. The arts are important, not an add-on. Ms. Reynolds then introduced Laura Zucker, Executive Director of the Los Angeles County Arts Commission. Ms. Reynolds said that Ms. Zucker has had a tremendous impact on arts in the schools, not only in Los Angeles County but also at the national level.

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

Ms. Zucker reported that the Arts in Focus study was the first comprehensive study of arts in public schools in Los Angeles County and was undertaken because baseline research was needed. She noted that one difficulty in analyzing the study data was finding patterns – there were none. She added that there was unanimous agreement that arts were important in education. Ms. Zucker informed the Board that the full report was available online at www.lacountvarts.org.

President Hastings thanked Ms. Zucker for her presentation. Mr. Fisher asked Ms. Zucker if she thought there are any particular types of arts that should be taught. Ms. Zucker replied that this question is already answered by the state adopted standards, which were developed by art educators and teachers. Mr. Fisher asked how the arts could be tested. Ms. Zucker responded that this is a controversial topic in the arts community and that she does not have the answer. For her the important question is how will schools be held accountable for the arts standards. Don Doyle, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Materials Division, noted that some districts are currently piloting constructed response questions for tests in the arts.

Dana Powell, Cultural Initiatives Silicon Valley, thanked Ms. Reynolds and Ms. Hammer for arranging for this presentation. She introduced her co-presenters, Aimeé Ipson and Lilia Agüero. Ms. Powell stated that arts in schools is a high priority in the Silicon Valley communities. She and her co-presenters provided information about the goals and programs of the initiative, which was started in 1998. The initiative 1) provides matching school grants; 2) offers technical assistance, professional development and leadership and networking components; 3) advocates for the arts in schools; and 4) will evaluate the program's impact. Ms. Powell thanked Ms. Hammer for helping make possible the city of San Jose's support for the Cultural Initiative. Ms. Reynolds acknowledged Ms. Hammer's leadership in helping develop this public-private partnership.

Mr. Jenkins asked Ms. Powell and her colleagues if they have seen programs in arts education that help incorporate arts into life skills – something that students think is of value to them, something that is unique to the arts. Ms. Powell replied that these programs currently are seen in after-school or community arts programs. It is hoped that as the arts return to the schools, we will see this kind of impact on more students.

Ms. Hammer thanked Ms. Reynolds for bringing this seminar to the Board. Mrs. Joseph thanked Ms. Reynolds for her leadership. Ms. Tacheny commented that there is a myth that students who do art are not good students. The arts benefit all students and students who take art do well in school. Ms. Goncalves thanked the presenters. She expressed her interest in the arts and her concerns about getting students who take arts as an “easy” class more involved in the arts.

Mr. Doyle reported on the work of the Arts Task Force and its recommendations in the following areas: standards and assessment, art careers, access for all students, and support for arts programs. Stacy Sinclair, Curriculum Frameworks and Instructional Resources Division, outlined the process for the development of the framework and adoption criteria for visual and performing arts. She informed that Board that February 13th would be the first meeting of the committee working on the framework and

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

Martha Schwartz, Earth Scientist
Bob Lucas, Delta Education
Lawrence Woolf, Science Education Foundation
Stan Metzenberg, California State University,
Northridge
Jacki Fox Ruby, California Federation of
Teachers
Diane Carnahan, K-12 Alliance
Nancy Taylor, San Diego County Office of
Education
Ceci Babota, Vista USD teacher

Art Sussman, WestEd
Rollie Otto, Lawrence Berkeley National
Laboratory
Richard Philson, California Science Teachers'
Association
Carol Balfe, Science Literacy for All Children
Jerry Valadez, Central California Leadership
Association
Ze've Wurman, Engineer
Leonard Tramiel, Physicist

President Hastings thanked the speakers for their comments and asked Mr. Abernethy for his comments. Mr. Abernethy stated that he would like to be charged with assisting with technical changes, including the suggestions from Mr. Otto. He said that we ought to continue to examine the document for science content mistakes and make technical changes. This journey we are on has been a long one, involving many hours of work by the Curriculum Commission, the Department, and the Board staff.

President Hastings commented that technical changes to the framework would include eliminating ambiguity and factual science errors. The only other change would be on the 17 lines that Mr. Otto suggested, which Mr. Abernethy would work with Mr. Otto to include in the framework.

Mr. Jenkins asked for clarification on the earth science issue mentioned by some of the speakers. Mr. Abernethy asked Mr. Geeting to explain. Mr. Geeting informed the Board that misinformation started a wildfire over the weekend and the concerns expressed by the speakers are based on erroneous information. The language in the draft framework is nearly verbatim the language from the UC and CSU requirements for college-credit courses.

Mrs. Joseph remarked that there is earth science content throughout the standards, stronger than it has ever been before. Ms. Tacheny noted that this document is not the only tool for the teaching of science. Ms. Tacheny asked for clarification on the purposes of framework and for the process for determining if there were scientific errors in the framework. Mr. Abernethy again asked Mr. Geeting to respond. Mr. Geeting explained that the errors that were mentioned at the last meeting had been reviewed. Dr. Munger reviewed those for the Board, as an independent reviewer, and all the corrections he recommended were made. Mr. Geeting read the second paragraph of the introduction, which states the purpose of framework.

Ms. Tacheny commented that the written purpose is much more specific than some of the comments made today. Mrs. Joseph noted that the next step is the creation of criteria for adoption and that the Board will also approve the criteria. Mrs. Ichinaga stated that she was concerned about comments made by some speakers that students will be bored with reading science materials. She remarked that the poor scores in the NAEP science test are due to the last science adoption, which was all hands-on science materials. Mrs. Joseph said that every document goes through technical review, which takes a very long

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

time. We have many trainings for teachers this summer, and we need to adopt this framework so we can use it in the trainings. She added that we ought to get this framework going.

- ACTION: Mr. Abernethy moved that the State Board approve the draft Science Framework with the refinements he proposed (posted on the Web on Friday, January 25, 2002) and with the understanding that he would (1) be empowered to revise the opening of Chapter 3 in keeping with suggestions made by Dr. Rollie Otto and (2) supervise the process by which the document is subjected to technical editing (including resolution of science errors and ambiguities) in preparation for printing. Mrs. Ichinaga seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present and participating in the vote. Ms. Reynolds was not present. Ms. Hammer recused herself from participation in the discussion and vote.

ITEM 6	Results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Year 2000 Science Assessment.	INFORMATION
--------	---	-------------

(Continued from earlier in the day. See above.)

(Vice President Nuñez presided over the remainder of the day's session.)

Mr. Spears informed the Board that Diane Hernandez, Standards and Assessment Division, and Jack Hawkins would make their presentations now. Ms. Tacheny reported that she had looked at the NAEP results on the website and discovered that up to three hours of science instruction did not seem to have an impact on student test scores. She commented that it seems there is both a quality and a quantity issue.

Ms. Hernandez walked the Board through the comparison of the NAEP science framework and California science content standards. Her analysis illustrates both similarities and differences. Mr. Mockler stated that NAEP is, in some cases, asking students questions on material not covered by our standards – material they have not yet been taught. This, understandably, affects their test scores.

Mr. Hawkins, a 2000 Teacher of the Year, said that when news stories broke on test results, teachers were concerned. Educators know that special steps must be taken to assist English learners. In comparing our standards and NAEP standards, we do not teach the same thing at the same time. Our standards are more specific and in a different order than NAEP standards. If the rest of the nation was tested on California standards, how would they do? Testing students in science in 5th grade means students will receive science instruction in elementary grades. Mr. Hawkins concluded that, overall, the future of science in California K-12 education is promising.

Mr. Hill noted that Ms. Tacheny had brought up a question about instruction in science. He commented that we have spent a lot of time and effort ensuring that students master fundamental skills, especially in reading and math in K-3. Once students achieve mastery of the fundamental skills, we should discuss science. Mrs. Joseph suggested that science teachers look at the adoption criteria for K-3 reading textbooks, which require coverage of the K-3 science standards in the reading texts. Mrs. Joseph asked Mr. Otto and Mr. Metzenberg, who had both been involved in developing the science standards, to

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

explain why choices were made on science standards and why the state’s science standards are not the same as the national science standards. Mr. Metzenberg and Mr. Otto each gave a brief history of the development of the science standards. They both stated that the California standards covered the same content as the national standards, but at different grade levels.

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

Vice President Nuñez informed the audience that the next three items would be heard in the following order to accommodate the presenter’s schedule: Item 10, Item 12, and Item 11

Curriculum Commission Chair Sue Stickel stated that the Curriculum Commission was requesting one action from the Board, to appoint four additional members to the Visual and Performing Arts Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee. [Attachment 6, Visual and Performing Arts Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee Members and Applicants]

Ms. Stickel reported that in January, new officers were elected and the new commissioners were assigned to committees. The January Commission meeting included an orientation for the new commissioners. Ms. Stickel thanked Mr. Mockler, Mr. Hill, and Deputy Superintendent Joanne Mendoza for welcoming new commissioners, and also Doug Stone, Communications Office, and Mr. Garcia for giving the commissioners tips on dealing with the media.

- ACTION: Mrs. Ichinaga moved that the State Board appoint candidates 268, 276, 288, and 290 to the Visual and Performing Arts Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee in accordance with the recommendation of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission. Mr. Fisher seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. Ms. Hammer, Mr. Hastings, and Ms. Reynolds were not present when the vote was taken.

ITEM 12	Draft Health Framework Addendum and Criteria for Evaluating K-8 Health Instructional Materials.	INFORMATION PUBLIC HEARING
---------	---	----------------------------

Ms. Stickel reported on the process for the development of the addendum to complement the health framework. She noted that the “Scope and Sequence for Health Instruction,” one of 17 addendum topics, is especially important for teachers. The framework will be presented next month for action.

Veronica Norris, Chair of the Health Subject Matter Committee, stated that the addendum before the Board is the new aspect of the health framework. The addendum reflects new research and current education code. A grade level emphasis chart is included in framework. Ms. Norris thanked Caroline Roberts and Jeri Day, School Health Connections, for their assistance in writing the addendum. Ms. Norris noted that there are two versions of the section on strategies to address the needs of special populations. One version includes proposed changes regarding special education students.

Vice President Nuñez opened the Public Hearing at 4:10 p.m. There were no speakers.

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

Vice President Nuñez closed Public Hearing at 4:10 pm.

ITEM 11	Grade 9-12 Standards Map Templates for Core Subjects, Pursuant to Assembly Bill 699 (Canciamilla), Chapter 591, Statutes of 2001.	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

Ms. Stickel informed the Board that AB 699 requires publishers of grades 9 through 12 instructional materials to submit standards maps to districts prior to districts' purchase of instructional materials considered to be aligned with grade-level content standards. The bill required that standards map templates be developed and approved by the Board. Sherry Griffith, Curriculum Framework and Instructional Resources Division (CFIR), drew the Board's attention to the templates and the instruction sheets for each of the four content areas.

Ms. Stickel commented that the standards maps are a blueprint for districts to use when evaluating instructional materials for grades 9 through 12. She explained the terms "introduced," "practiced," and "taught to mastery," which are used in the templates. She stated that the local governing board makes the decision about the alignment of the instructional materials to the standards.

Mr. Mockler said that some publishers have asked for clarification from the Commission and CFIR staff, especially on history-social science. Ms. Stickel indicated that the Commission and CFIR staff would be willing to discuss the templates with publishers to ensure that they had the clarification they sought.

Ms. Tacheny thanked the Commission for its work on the standards maps. Vice President Nuñez thanked the Commission and congratulated the new officers.

The following individual addressed the Board:
Steve Rust, on behalf of Dale Shimasaki

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve the Grade 9-12 Standards Map Templates for Core Subjects as recommended by the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission with the understanding that technical edits and clarifications noted by Ms. Stickel would be made by CDE staff in consultation with the Curriculum Commission Chair. Mrs. Joseph seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. Mr. Hastings and Ms. Reynolds were not present when the vote was taken.

Vice President Nuñez informed the audience that the Board would proceed to Item 16 and Item 15, in that order, and defer Item 14 until Thursday.

ITEM 14	Definition of "significant growth" for II/USP schools failing to meet annual API growth targets (Education Code Section 52055.5).	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	---	--------------------

This item was deferred to Thursday morning. (See minutes for Thursday, February 7, 2002.)

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

ITEM 16	Implementation of Principal Training Program (AB 75, Steinberg).	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

Elk Grove Unified School District Superintendent Dave Gordon, Chair of the AB 75 Advisory Group, reported on the role of advisory group, the process for development of the criteria, and the modules in the training program. He thanked Alice Furry, Sacramento County Office of Education, and her staff for their assistance and acknowledged Ms. Tacheny, who attended each advisory group meeting. Mr. Gordon expressed deep appreciation for the staff, especially Mr. Mockler, Ms. Esch, Ms. Franklin, Tom Lugo, Bill Vasey, and the members of the advisory group. [Attachment 7, Proposed Edits and Clarifications to Item 16 and Advisory Group list]

Ms. Hammer inquired about comments the Board had received on redundancy and that the criteria that does not address needs for different levels. Mr. Gordon stated if principals do not learn the curriculum they cannot evaluate teachers or provide instructional leadership. He added that there is flexibility in the criteria. Mr. Mockler commented that Governor Davis wanted this training to be focused on instruction and management. The statute is narrow. He added that the edits and clarifications address the issues brought up by Ms. Hammer.

The following individuals addressed the Board:

Eric Premack, Charter Schools Development Center

Tom Zack, Principal of Ben Franklin School and ACSA Middle Grades Committee Chair,

Ms. Hammer said that she had two questions: 1) Does AB 75 allow charter schools to be treated differently than other schools? 2) Did the charter school community have input in the process? Mr. Premack responded that they did submit comments on the criteria, but they would disagree about the interpretation of the statute. Mr. Mockler noted that AB 75 requires principals to receive training in all six areas.

Ms. Tacheny thanked Mr. Gordon for his leadership. She stated that at every advisory group meeting there was considerable public input. These training dollars are offered, without apology, to help principals function in a standards-based system of accountability. She added that it is appropriate that the program be specific, but that specificity does not preclude creativity. Mr. Fisher asked about the charter schools. Mrs. Joseph remarked that she appreciates the modifications. This training is something that gives the districts capacity to improve student achievement. The districts will have to pick providers that meet their needs. Ms. Fausset stated that Superintendent Eastin appreciates the work of Mr. Gordon and the advisory group.

- ACTION: Ms. Tacheny moved that the State Board approve the criteria for evaluation and approval of training providers for the Principal Training Program, as recommended by staff, including the amendments discussed at the meeting. Mrs. Ichinaga seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. Mr. Hastings and Ms. Reynolds were not present when the vote was taken.

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

ITEM 15	Implementation of the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program (AB 466, Strom-Martin).	INFORMATION ACTION
---------	--	--------------------

Vice President Nuñez thanked Dan Holt, Specialized Program Division, for posting the criteria on website.

Ms. Furry informed the Board that the criteria document is a guide for providers to develop training curriculum. Once the Board approves the training criteria and then approves the training curriculum, districts will be assured that the programs will thoroughly prepare teachers to use instructional materials. Ms. Furry explained the sections of the guidelines and criteria.

Mr. Mockler noted that there is an errata sheet that clarifies some issues. [Attachment 8, Proposed Edits and Clarifications to Item 15] Mr. Mockler stated that we have a lot of experience with professional development for teachers, more than we have for administrators. We have had the Professional Development Institutes for three years.

The following individual addressed the Board:
Jai Sookprasert, California School Employees Association

Vice President Nuñez asked about changing the regulations regarding the training hours for paraprofessional training. Mr. Mockler replied that it was a procedural matter that would be done next month.

- **ACTION:** Mr. Abernethy moved that the State Board approve the criteria for evaluation and approval of training providers for the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program, as recommended by staff, including the amendments discussed at the meeting. Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the members present. Ms. Reynolds was not present when the vote was taken.

Adjournment of the Day's Session: Vice President Nuñez adjourned the day's session at 5:05 p.m.