

THE 2002 STUDENT ADVISORY BOARD ON EDUCATION
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Commendations 2

California High School Exit Exam 3

Health Issues Regarding Student-to-Nurse Ratio 6

Immersion Programs 8

Teacher Qualifications 11

Violence Prevention 15

COMMENDATIONS

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, would like to extend the following commendations:

The Student Advisory Board on Education commends the Honorable Delaine Eastin, California State Superintendent of Public Instruction, for eight years of service to the students of California, dedication to student input in the processes of education policy-making, and inspiration as a real and phenomenal leader in education reform. Though the students of California welcome her successor, Superintendent Eastin's tenure will always be remembered as one in which students were the first and only priority of California's education system. She will be missed here in Sacramento.

The Student Advisory Board on Education commends the California State Board of Education for working endlessly to implement a system of standards, accountability, and assessment that will serve as a stellar model of public education for all states.

The Student Advisory Board on Education commends Greg Geeting, Assistant Executive Director of the State Board of Education, for his continued support of youth involvement in education policy-making processes.

The Student Advisory Board on Education commends the California State Board of Education for annually setting aside a time for ample and meaningful dialogue with students about the critical questions facing decision-makers in education today.

Furthermore, the Student Advisory Board on Education congratulates Stephanie Lee, Student Member of the California State Board of Education, for her recent appointment and commends her for her enthusiasm for student involvement in the educational process.

California State Board of Education

Issue # _____

Wednesday, November 13, 2002 AGENDA

Topic: **California High School Exit Exam**
Speaker: Alexander Wong, Laguna Hills High School

I. RECOMMENDATION

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, recommends that the State Board of Education postpone the graduation requirement of passing the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) from the graduating class of 2004 to the graduating class of 2006.

II. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

A. Previous Student Advisory Board on Education Discussion and Action:

- This is the first year that the Student Advisory Board on Education has addressed this issue.

B. Present Pertinent Regulations and Policy:

- Senate Bill 2
 - Assembly Bill 1609
 - Chapter 8, Section 60850 of the California Education Code
 - Section 60851
 - Section 1200 (j & k)
 - Section 1218.5
-

III. SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The students of the class of 2004 have failed the CAHSEE, a requirement for graduation, at an alarming rate of 52%. This figure is indicative of the lack of time that California schools have had to adequately prepare students for the test.

- The CAHSEE was created to hold all students accountable to a single set of California content standards that have been adopted by the State Board of Education.
- The State Board began to adopt these standards in the late 1990s, yet 75% of principals report that their districts are still in the process of implementing those standards. It is evident that alignment to the standards is a gradual process that still has not been completed.
- It is therefore also clear that the standards were not fully implemented by school districts at the time that the students of the Class of 2004 began their freshman year.

- Making the test a graduation requirement for the Class of 2004 thus has the potential to penalize students for failing to learn standards that were never taught to them.

IV. FISCAL ANALYSIS

There would be no additional cost to delay the inclusion of the test as a high school graduation requirement. If anything, postponement would defer the cost and possibly save money for taxpayers.

V. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The Student Advisory Board on Education recommends that the State Board of Education exercise the power granted to it in Assembly Bill 1609 to delay the date by which students are required to pass the exam in order to graduate and receive a diploma.

B. FIELD INVOLVEMENT

Every aspect of this plan relies solely upon the decision of the State Board, so no outside contribution is necessary.

C. ALTERNATIVES

As an alternative or supplement to the above recommendation, the State Board may also consider serving as a catalyst for the dissemination of information by schools with high passing rates. This would allow schools with low passing rates to gain fresh ideas from schools with higher passing rates and may help to raise the percentage of students who pass the test.

D. RATIONALE

In order to ensure that no child is left behind, the State Board should give each student the opportunity to learn the content of the state standards included in the CAHSEE. Students fail the CAHSEE at the current rate because the material taught in classrooms is not yet fully aligned to statewide content standards. By requiring the Class of 2004 to pass the CAHSEE, the state is essentially certifying that every student in the Class of 2004 has had adequate and equal opportunity to prepare for the test. Any lesser standard for implementing the test as a graduation requirement risks letting some students fall through the cracks due to the transition to a new accountability system.

Every student in the Class of 2004 has not had ample opportunity to prepare for the CAHSEE; therefore, it is not fair to hold them accountable to it. It is more accurate to estimate that the incoming class of 2006 will be the first graduating class with the opportunity to learn all that they need to pass the CAHSEE. It therefore makes sense for this to be the first class required to pass the CAHSEE to graduate.

Our future lies in the hands of our youth. With this in mind, we urge the State to carefully consider its implementation of the California High School Exit Exam and remember the immense impact that a mis-aligned graduation requirement can have upon hundreds of thousands of California students for years to come.

California State Board of Education

Issue # _____

Wednesday, November 13, 2002 AGENDA

Topic: **Health Issues Regarding Student to Nurse Ratio**

Speaker: Thu Tran, Milpitas High School

I. RECOMMENDATION

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, recommends that the State Board of Education make school districts aware of the benefits of on-campus school nurses and create incentives for California schools to hire more school nurses.

II. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

A. Previous Student Advisory Board on Education Discussion and Action:

- This is the first year that the Student Advisory Board on Education has specifically addressed this issue.

B. Present Pertinent Regulations and Policy:

- Sec. 49900
- Sec. 49402

III. SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The lack of on-campus nurses in California public schools limits the extent to which students can receive physical, emotional, and mental health care on campus, where they spend at least 30% of their time on weekdays. This lack of proper care for students has adversely affected both attendance and academic performance in California public schools.

The need for quality health care in schools is evidenced by statistics from a recent PTA survey, which found that, amongst California students,

- 94% suffer from asthma.
- 45% are diabetic.
- 19% suffer from allergies that require an injection of medicine to be administered.

Other figures show that schools are not meeting this demand:

- Only 7% of all California schools have a full time nurse.
- On any given day, 57% of all schools do not have a nurse on site.
- A full 18% of California schools never have a nurse available.

The consequences are grave and significant. In the last three years, there have been thirteen student deaths due to asthma attacks—deaths that might have been

averted with the proper care of a school nurse. Students are required to be in school for approximately seven hours a day. It is therefore unacceptable that the education system allow even one student's life to be threatened during school hours when the situation is easily preventable.

IV. FISCAL ANALYSIS

The cost of this program would vary based on the type of incentive that the State Board chooses to offer for schools to hire additional nurses.

V. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The plan to get more school nurses in California schools entails the following:

- Identification of schools that are in need of school nurses.
- Sponsorship of legislation to back the hiring of additional school nurses.
- The creation of incentives for identified schools to hire more nurses. These incentives can include salary subsidies, grant money to start health education programs under newly hired school nurses.

B. FIELD INVOLVEMENT

This program will only require the support of local school district officials, who must collaborate with the State Board of Education to hire new school nurses.

C. ALTERNATIVES

The Board may wish to consider the following alternatives in addition to the above recommendations.

- Gauge the opinions of students by polling all public schools to see if the students feel they would benefit from having a fulltime on-campus nurse.
- Help teachers to educate students on health related issues through the organization of seminars and district programs that establish better standards of health education.

D. RATIONALE

The lack of school nurses in California constitutes a health risk for students. All students do not have access to an on campus nurse who can address even their basic physical needs. Though the issue has been overlooked, the problem has persisted, especially given a dramatic increase in the number of students in California schools over the last few years. The students of California deserve to have access to this basic health care, not only because students themselves need this attention, but because it will also add to the improved well-being of students in general and the improved performance of students in our schools.

California State Board of Education

Issue # _____

Wednesday, November 13, 2002 AGENDA

Topic: **Immersion Programs**

Speaker: Martha Alvarez, Lompoc High School

I. **RECOMMENDATION**

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, recommends that the State Board of Education create a network of support systems outside the classroom for English Language Learners (ELL). This network would include bilingual peer tutors, bilingual counseling staff, and an ELL Resolution Council made up of district personnel, school administrators, teachers, parents, and students, whose purpose is to work with all issues regarding ELL students. The council would address, but not be limited to, issues relating to ELL classroom performance, interaction with the parents of English learners, test scores, suspension rates, and any other issues pertaining to equality and student needs.

II. **SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION**

A. **Previous Student Advisory Board on Education Discussion and Action:**

This is the first time that the Student Advisory Board on Education has addressed this specific issue.

B. **Present Pertinent Regulations and Policy:**

- Proposition 227 is the law that currently governs programs dealing with ELL students. Under Proposition 227, a new ELL student may only be in a bilingual program for a limited amount of time; then, the student must be placed into an English-only “immersion” environment.

III. **SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

- In 2001, there were 1.8 million identified ELL students in California—roughly 25% of all California students. This number is increasing daily.
- The implementation of Proposition 227 effectively ended bilingual education as we know it and substituted immersion programs as the model of choice for ELL students
- Students in immersion programs often feel alienated from the rest of the student population. Though the debate over bilingual education versus immersion programs has ostensibly ended, the fact remains that immersion programs can have a significantly negative impact on the

ELL students in them because of the frustration and lack of confidence that such programs engender in students.

- Many schools face major obstacles in communicating with their ELL students. When language barriers inhibit the most basic communication between school and student, it is difficult to set the student up for success, academically or emotionally.
- A lack of self-esteem generates a whole host of difficulties in students, from depressed academic achievement to violent behavior.

IV. FISCAL ANALYSIS

The establishment of a support network for ELL students would incur negligible costs at the district level. The State Board may choose to offer an incentive program that encourages schools to make sure that proficiency in a foreign language is a criterion when guidance counselors are hired. This incentive could include, for example, a salary subsidy for bilingual counselors hired. The State Board can also encourage schools to make knowledge of a second language criteria in hiring counselors. The cost to the state would depend on which of these programs is implemented; they could range from virtually nothing to \$20 million for a salary subsidy program. Our other recommendations will incur no costs, except perhaps the administrative costs of setting up the ELL Resolution Council.

V. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The Student Advisory Board on Education recommends the following action to implement its recommendations:

- A State Board mandate to establish the English Language Learner Resolution Councils (ELLRCs) at the district level.
- A monitoring requirement that includes State Board oversight of the ELLRCs. Communication will be achieved through newsletters, memos, and a monthly progress report from schools on ELL issues.
- The creation of a task force that will determine 1) the type of incentive that should be given to schools to encourage the hiring of bilingual counselors, and 2) the type of non-monetary incentives (academic credit, community service hours) that can be offered to bilingual students who wish to become ELL tutors.

B. FIELD INVOLVEMENT

- School Districts will be responsible for creating strong and successful ELLRCs.
- Schools add proficiency in a foreign language as an important criterion for selection of school guidance counselors.
- Schools inform the student population of the incentives and advantages afforded them to counsel and tutor ELL students.
- Through involvement with the ELLRCs, parents actively participate and encourage their ELL students to achieve success. They attend

informational meetings and build positive relationships with their children's teachers.

- Students create student government positions that focus on cultural awareness and diversity.
- Bilingual students use the language skills they possess to help and encourage their ELL peers through activities such as tutoring or overall cultural mentorship.

C. ALTERNATIVES

The Board may wish to consider the following alternatives in addition to the above recommendations:

- Have all printed materials in all of the alternative languages available to ELL students and their parents; this includes, permission slips, newsletters, and other informational documents.
- Design a placement test in all subjects for ELL students which will allow their relative abilities to be assessed on an equivalent scale with English speakers.

D. RATIONALE

California is the most diverse state in the nation. It has become a “majority-minority” state whose ELL population continues to grow. ELL students, like all others, are part of the generation responsible for the success of California in years to come. Yet their destiny has been snatched from them by an immersion process that leaves them to fend for themselves, without support, mentorship, or dignity. It is our duty to give ELL students the skills they need and overcome the complacency that has allowed them to be left by the wayside. The status quo has produced frustrated students who feel isolated from the rest of the student body and surrounding community. This lack of support results in an above average drop-out rate for English learners and contributes to the increase of negative and violent behaviors. Many teachers and students feel frustrated with the program. Teachers are unable to communicate and relay their ideas to ELL students effectively because they are not allowed to use alternative languages to help students in the classroom.

While we understand the constraints established by Proposition 227, we want the State Board to recognize the fundamental human needs of ELL students—needs exacerbated by immersion programs that lack the proper support structures. English learners deserve the same educational opportunities as every other student. By establishing support networks out of the classroom—and therefore out of the purview of Proposition 227—the dual goals of English language immersion and bilingual accommodation can be achieved simultaneously, and ELL students will make the transition to a new language more smoothly than ever before.

California State Board of Education

Issue # _____

Wednesday, November 13, 2002 AGENDA

Topic: **Teacher Quality**

Speaker: Corey Uhalde, Montgomery High School

I. RECOMMENDATION

The Student Advisory Board on Education, a program of the California Association of Student Councils, recommends that the State Board of Education adopt a goal of having no teachers on emergency credentials in California classrooms by the 2005-2006 school year.

II. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

A. Previous Student Advisory Board on Education Discussion and Action:

- This is the first year that the Student Advisory Board on Education has addressed this issue.

B. Present Pertinent Regulations and Policy:

There are numerous laws and policies that deal with teacher quality, standards, recruitment, and retention. What follows is an abbreviated list of the most important laws.

- SB 2042 established broad and sweeping guidelines for the issuing of California teaching credentials.
- AB 1620 provided for the credentialing of out-of-state teachers.
- The California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) are the standards applied when issuing teaching credentials.
- The most recent re-authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, known as the “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB) act, required that every teacher in every classroom be “highly qualified” as defined by each state by the 2005-2006 school year.
- SB 1422 established the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program.
- SB 57 provided for accelerated credentialing of teachers from private schools.
- SB 1666 established the Teacher Recruitment Incentive Program.
- AB 1X established the Peer Assistance and Review Program.
- AB 2X and AB 2881 provided for professional development institutes.

III. SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

Studies have consistently shown that, by almost any measure, high quality teachers are the single most important determinant of student achievement. It is

widely acknowledged that there is a teacher shortage throughout the United States, but it is especially acute in California:

- Demand is growing. Last year, there were 301,361 public school teachers in California, 50 percent more teachers than there were a decade earlier.
- Demand is not being met. Of these teachers, 42,427 (approximately 14%) had not earned a preliminary credential, the minimum that is required by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to allow a person to teach in a California public school.
- These symptoms are the result of a greater root problem: there are less people willing and able to enter the teaching profession than there are slots to fill. The state fills this gap by issuing emergency credentials to individuals with significantly fewer qualifications than those required for a preliminary credential.
- The problem is getting worse. The percentage of underprepared teachers in California is expected to grow in the decade to come, as California's aging teaching force retires.
- The problem disproportionately affects the students that need quality teachers most. In the 2000-2001 school year, 25% of teachers in the lowest achievement quartile (based on the API) were on emergency credentials, compared to 5% in schools in the highest achievement quartile.

IV. FISCAL ANALYSIS

If the State Board of Education adopts the recommended goal, it would incur no cost at the state level. However, if the State Board of Education chooses to sponsor legislation subsidizing the credentialing of teachers who currently hold emergency credentials, the total cost of a 100% subsidy would be approximately \$600 million over the next three years. Depending on the level of subsidy that the State Board chooses, the cost will vary.

V. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The first step that the State Board of Education should take is to define a "highly qualified" teacher (as required by the No Child Left Behind Act) as an individual possessing a preliminary or professional clear California State teaching credential. In order to meet the expectations set by this definition, the State Board should work with the CTC and the Legislature to accomplish the following:

- A reduction in the maximum number of times an emergency credential can be issued from five times to two times.
- An immediate requirement that all teachers holding emergency credentials be enrolled in a credentialing program which will lead to a preliminary credential in a maximum of two years.
- Appropriation of grants to provide funding for teachers holding emergency credentials to gain these preliminary credentials.
- Establishment of a credentialing program similar to that outlined in SB 1646: an undergraduate education major in the CSU system that

complies with the NCLB definition of “highly qualified” and serves as an additional source of credentialed K-8 teachers.

- The establishment of a monetary incentive for teachers holding emergency credentials who receive their preliminary credential within a year.

B. FIELD INVOLVEMENT

In order to establish an effective elementary credentialing program and reduce the number of teachers holding emergency credentials to zero by the 2005-2006 school year, support and assistance will be necessary from the following organizations:

- The California State University system, for its implementation of the elementary education undergraduate major.
- The teachers holding emergency credentials, for the classes they must take and the program they must complete.

C. ALTERNATIVES

The Student Advisory Board on Education recommends that the State Board of Education work with the CTC to accomplish the following as alternatives or supplements to its main recommendation:

- State Board work with the CTC and CalTeach to establish a teacher assistant program that involves potential teachers in the process of teaching earlier than current programs allow. This program has the added advantage of relieving the stress on current teachers through the provision of assistants.

D. RATIONALE

The Student Advisory Board on Education, as the representative of over six million California students, urges the State Board to recognize the severity of the teacher shortage crisis. California students are shaped by the teachers in this state’s classrooms. The need to have model citizens in these roles during a student’s formative years is becoming increasingly important. To what extent can the system provide both academic and life skills to students when it fails to provide educators who are capable of teaching? By placing California’s students in inadequately managed classrooms, existing laws and policies do a great disservice to the future of society. For students with limited opportunities to develop emotionally and intellectually—students for whom education is the one key to success and social mobility—this is simply unacceptable.

Congress recently recognized this when, in the “No Child Left Behind” act, they required all states to have only “highly qualified” teachers in all classrooms by 2005. The Student Advisory Board on Education is concerned by the State Board’s recent attempt to define “highly qualified” in a manner that preserved the status quo with respect to teachers on emergency credentials. Such a definition is

a clear violation of both the letter and the spirit of the new federal law; it perpetuates the existing problem and does not accomplish anything in terms of raising the quality of teachers. The costs may be high and the timeline short, but the intent of the law is clear: it is meant to force the allocation of resources such that teacher quality has significantly improved by 2005. The State Board has a unique opportunity, in fulfilling its requirements under the new law, to set a standard that forces the coordination of the education bureaucracy behind this important goal. The Student Advisory Board on Education encourages the State Board to take a bold leap and commit to this goal; then and only then can we move closer to the unfulfilled promise of a caring and qualified teacher for every student in California—a promise that has significant implications for the equal opportunity that any society should provide to all of its citizens.

California State Board Education

Issue # _____

Wednesday, November 13, 2002 AGENDA

Topic: **Violence Prevention**

Speaker: Harshith Reddy Avula, Clovis High School

I. RECOMMENDATION

The Student Advisory Board on Education (SABE), a program of the California Association of Student Councils (CASC), recommends that the State Board of Education identify and study the effectiveness of programs designed to create a violence-free environment on school campuses. SABE further recommends that the Board make its findings available to all schools in the state so that effective programs can be replicated and implemented.

II. SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

C. Previous Student Advisory Board on Education Discussion and Action:

- A 1999 proposal dealt with the subject of violence prevention in the wake of numerous school shootings.

D. Present Pertinent Regulations and Policy:

- SB 1667
- AB 1113
- AB 819
- AB 804

III. SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

Students deal with violence on school campuses every day:

- Untrained in nonviolent communication, students deal with their differences in a negative way, which can ultimately escalate to violence.
 - Schools today are more segregated than they have ever been before. As a result, major tensions exist between students of different cultural, socio-economic, religious, and ethnic backgrounds—tensions that make the formation of an on-campus community nearly impossible via conventional methods.
 - Programs exist which have been proven to diffuse these kinds of tensions and teach students to understand, appreciate, and celebrate their respective differences. However, these programs are not a significant focus of most schools and school districts in curricular planning.
 - Schools have traditionally favored disciplinary measures—confiscation of weapons, searches, and metal detectors—to address school violence. These measures address the symptoms, rather than the root causes, of the problem. Most schools take no steps to deal with the anger, isolation, and misunderstandings that lie at the core of school violence.
-

IV. FISCAL ANALYSIS

Currently, there are already funds allocated for violence prevention programs in SB 1667, which “establishes the School Safety and Violence Prevention Act to provide funds to school districts serving pupils in grades 8 to 12, inclusive, for the purpose of promoting school safety and reducing school site violence.”

The bill calls for a School Safety Plan, and provides that, when a school site council “updates its school safety plan, and to the extent it implements its plan, the school site council is encouraged to recognize that assuring each pupil a safe physical environment and a safe respectful, accepting and emotionally nurturing environment and that providing each child’s resiliency skills are essential components of a comprehensive strategic program for preventing school violence and to consider incorporating these components in its plan.” Therefore, if a program evaluated by the State Board fulfills this criterion, it qualifies for state funding.

AB 1113 also allocates a minimum of five thousand dollars per public school to be specifically used for endeavors in violence prevention. The bill states that “it is the intent of the Legislature that public schools serving pupils in grades 8 to 12, inclusive, have access to supplemental resources to establish programs and strategies that promote school safety and emphasize violence prevention among children and youth in the public schools. It is further the intent of the Legislature that school sites receiving funds pursuant to this article accomplish all of the following goals: teach pupils techniques for resolving conflicts without violence, train school staff and administrators to support and promote conflict resolution and mediation techniques for resolving conflicts between and among pupils, and reduce incidents of violence at the school site.”

The costs of the proposed data collection will be fairly small, but more importantly, the schools’ use of the information gathered to create violence prevention programs on campus will be facilitated by the funding that these two bills provide.

V. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. CRITERIA FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The Student Advisory Board on Education recommends that the following steps be taken to implement its recommendation:

- The selection of program designs that have the flexibility to meet the needs of individual schools.
- The identification of programs with the potential to reduce the number of violent acts in California schools.
- The requirement that the selected programs include peer-to-peer instruction.
- The requirement that each program provide students with the skills they need to deal with conflict in a nonviolent manner and create an

atmosphere that is not merely a work environment, but a fully interactive community.

B. FIELD INVOLVEMENT

Organizations like the California Association of Student Councils, Link Crew, Teen Court, Human Relations Day, Challenge Day, and The Multicultural Advisory Committee have programs with proven track records of providing safe environments that allow discussion of differences, resulting in a reduction in school violence. Successful implementation of the proposal requires the involvement of the following groups in the field:

- The State Board of Education, the districts selected for the “pilot programs”, and the coordinators of the programs themselves, for their work in selecting a program design that fits the needs of California schools.
- Schools throughout California, especially those for which violence is a salient issue on campus, for their utilization of the programs recommended by the State Board’s comprehensive study.

C. ALTERNATIVES

The Board may wish to consider the following alternatives in addition to the above recommendations:

- Facilitate the creation of peer mentoring programs, in which older students counsel, aid, and act as mediators for younger students
- Provide an alternative to gangs and street violence by supporting extracurricular and after-school programs that have the potential to significantly decrease the amount of violence before and after school.
- Sponsor legislation to fund diversity awareness training for teachers and counselors which allows them to be cognizant of the cultural and socio-economic differences between students and enables them to act as mediators in conflict resolution processes.

D. RATIONALE

In an age of shattered innocence, where no environment is truly safe any more, it is important that the State Board of Education identify best practices amongst programs that deal with violence prevention and disseminate the information to schools in the California system. The State Board has recently adopted statewide content standards in the four core academic disciplines. The State Board did this with an understanding that these disciplines were important. It is the position of the Student Advisory Board on Education that effective violence prevention and conflict resolution curricula have never been more important or critical than in the present day. For this reason, the State Board of Education should become involved with the curriculum regarding violence-prevention programs in order to ensure that it meets the needs of students of the state of California.

It is also important that the State Board be proactive in addressing school violence. As the one organization with the “ear” of schools throughout

California, it is in a unique position to disseminate information to schools within the state of California about successful violence prevention programs that these schools can utilize.

Our children are dying every day because of school violence. Millions more live in fear that they will be next. The problem must be addressed at its root, and the State Board is in a very critical position to facilitate that discussion. This proposal is meant as a guideline for effective State Board action in addressing school violence. If implemented, it will go a long way towards making California schools safer for all students.