

ILLINOIS STATE TEACHER CERTIFICATION BOARD

Illinois State Board of Education
State Board Room, Fourth Floor
Springfield, Illinois

Friday, November 5, 2004

MINUTES

Call to Order / Roll Call:

Randy J. Dunn, Chairman, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board, called the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board meeting to order at 9:35 a.m. Dr. Dunn asked Linda Jamali, filling in for Dennis Williams, Interim Secretary, to call the roll. A quorum was present.

Members Present:

Dr. Randy J. Dunn, Chairman
Ms. Linda Jamali

Muhammad Abdullah	Roger Chamberlain	Linda Malone
Kay Acklin	Deborah J. Curtis	Dave Marshall
Marsha Allen	Nina Dorsch	Linda Tafel
Amy Alsop	Ascencion Juarez	Denise Williams
William Briggs	Elliott Lessen	Eugene Zalewski
Andrew Brulle	Laura Lipe	

Members Absent:

Dennis Williams, Interim Secretary
(Note: Two teacher member positions remain vacant.)

Others Present:

Richard Ammentorp	Phyliss Jones	Brenda Stonecipher
Bob Bigham	James Kahn	Barbara Swanson
Ann Caton	Cathy Main	Joy Taylor-Ankenbrandt
Debra Dew	Linda McElroy	Linda Tomlinson
Jonathan Furr	Lou Ann Reichle	Sally Vogl
Pat Glenn	Lynn Rhoades	Karen Williams
Tom Hannon	Susan Shea	Marti Woelfle
Mitch Hopper	Lynn Stafford	
Rajesh Iyer	Lynn Steffen	

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the October 1, 2004, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board meeting were presented for consideration. Linda Tafel moved that the October 1, 2004 minutes be approved. Eugene Zalewski seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Public Participation:

➤ *Dr. Susan Shea, Education Policy Director, Illinois Education Association*

Dr. Shea provided a detailed summary of three issues that pose concern to the Illinois Education Association with regard to Part 25 - Certification Rules. These issues included: (1) the effective date for reductions in requirements for teachers with advanced degrees or master certificates; (2) special education (definition of highly qualified); and (3) the March 1 carryover date.

Facilitation Committee's Report:

Kay Acklin, Chair of the Facilitation Committee, reported the Facilitation Committee met at 8:00 a.m. and asks that particular attention be given to the agenda. Item G-2 (2004 Title II State Report) will be postponed until the December meeting of the State Teacher Certification Board.

Item(s) for Immediate Action:

Facilitation Committee Meeting Time

Kay Acklin stated the Facilitation Committee discussed this item and decided the State Teacher Certification Board meetings will begin at 9:00 a.m. This time will not waiver unless there is need for extra discussion due to the December and June meetings with regard to Institution Reviews and Program Approvals. The Facilitation Committee meetings will either begin at 8:00 a.m. or 7:30 a.m. / 7:45 a.m. The decision for the Facilitation Committee meeting times will be left up to the Secretary and Committee depending on particular issues that may arise.

Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility

Linda Tafel moved that the "Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility" dated November 4, 2004, be approved. Elliott

Lessen seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote. (See Attachment)

Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates

Denise Williams moved that the list of “Renewal of Standard / Master Certificates” be approved. Linda Malone seconded the motion. Kay Acklin confirmed there are 13 recommendations for approval. The motion passed by unanimous vote. (See Attachment)

With regard to the September meeting of the State Teacher Certification Board, Denise Williams inquired about the individual who was not recommended by their Local Professional Development Committee. Nina Dorsch indicated this item was discussed during the October 1 phone conference, and Dennis Williams clarified it had been resolved. State Board staff will affirm that was the case.

New Program Proposal(s) –

Rockford College – Learning Behavior Specialist I (LBS I)

Brenda Stonecipher, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from Rockford College: Dr. Ann Caton, Chair of the Education Department and Associate Professor; Dr. Debra Dew, Associate Professor and Certification Officer; Ms. Lynn Stafford, Program Director and Assistant Professor in Special Education; and Ms. Barbara Swanson, Director of Elementary Education and Assistant Professor.

Eugene Zalewski inquired if the previous program at Rockford College was dropped due to lack of enrollment. Dr. Caton indicated the program was dropped due to staff turnover that resulted in the lack of the timely submission of the required State Board of Education special education matrices.

Elliott Lessen asked that given this is a proposal for a LBS I program, which is cross categorical, across all disabilities exclusive of speech language pathology, deaf and hard of hearing, and vision, page 18 of the proposal indicates courses in LD, EMH/TMH, etc. There are no courses in physical disabilities, health impairments, autism, TBI, multiple disabilities or severe profound disabilities. Given the LBS I program is to cover all disabilities, there is concern the courses listed are a categorical which are counter to the ruling of Corey H, and all of the disabilities are not indicated.

After Dr. Dew explained the premise that staff at Rockford College worked from, Elliott Lessen stated all students who graduate with a LBS I can be hired in any capacity to deal with all disabilities in all LBS I programs.

Ms. Stafford shared some of the course content areas are requiring students to do both the elementary field experience and the special education experience. She believes those topics and issues would be included within the course content not necessarily a specific course on that disability.

Elliott Lessen expressed his concern that the program is a program that deals with primarily mild disabilities (LD, EMH, BD, SED with some TMH) and none of the other disabilities in terms of assessment issues, methodological issues, and structural strategy issues.

Nina Dorsch noted several pages where there is reference to elementary and secondary and not special education. She expressed concern with the illusion that this is a dual program for graduates and undergraduates. When looking through the syllabi, there are a couple of courses where the graduate students have to complete an additional paper, pre-classroom presentation, etc. Otherwise, within a stream of coursework, there did not seem to be any other difference between the undergraduate program and the master's program. What is the value added for a master's program that is going to make a school district willing to pay the extra money for a master's graduate when the difference in their coursework does not seem to be in depth or breadth, but a few papers and a few courses?

Dr. Dew explained all master degrees have a series of three foundation courses. The "Introduction to Research" course is a 600 level course. Linda Malone shared her concerns and asked for specifics with regard to the courses for graduate students.

William Briggs asked how this program is different from the original program, and how was Corey H used in making changes to the new program.

Dr. Caton explained the courses have broadened and there were very few undergraduates in the program. It is primarily focused for graduate students. Staff are looking for students who double major.

Andrew Brulle referred to page 11 of the proposal. In the Admission to Teacher Education section of the proposal, there is indication that candidates can be admitted to teacher education without passing the Basic Skills test. Also, the proposal indicates the candidates will seek certification at either the elementary or secondary level.

With regard to the portfolio, Andrew Brulle asked if Rockford College representatives could expand on that topic because it is a valued criterion.

Ms. Swanson spoke to elementary education. In the elementary education program, there is a portfolio which is prepared during the sixteen weeks of student teaching. The students use artifacts from their student teaching to address the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. Students gather their artifacts in a developmental portfolio, and toward the end of the semester they put it together into a showcase portfolio and then present that item. Elementary student teachers present it twice, first to their governing teacher and then to their peers within the building. As a final assessment, they come on campus and present it to two supervisors in the Education Department. There is a rubric as well.

Elliott Lessen asked if students are being evaluated on the Standards throughout the program as part of their portfolio. Dr. Dew indicated the portfolio is completed during the student teaching semester. It is an end-of-the-semester showcase portfolio that incorporates artifacts addressing the Standards.

Elliott Lessen raised a concern with regard to page 1 of the Core Technology Standards. Under assessment activities tests and quizzes are listed as well as course numbers. Dr. Lessen asked how the course numbers are assessment activities, and how are tests and quizzes used rather than performance outcomes in technology.

Dr. Caton explained the course numbers listed are the student teaching itself where the students are actually out using the technology in the classroom. Barbara Swanson shared that in the elementary program part of what is needed in the portfolio is the technology product. As far as a rubric, there is none.

Elliott Lessen asked if a person is in a school where there is no technology, and someone else is in a school where there is lots of technology, how is the student where there is no technology going to address the technology standards. Ms. Stafford indicated that in the base coursework a student has to have one to three credits of technology within their curriculum before they would be in the performance of their student teaching.

Elliott Lessen referred to page 12 of the proposal with regard to needing a cumulative GPA of 2.5 and major GPA of 3.0 or higher required. Dr. Lessen expressed his understanding that 2.5 is the minimum for everyone in the state of Illinois because we are a NCATE partner state. And yet, the proposal indicates undergraduate candidates who have a cumulative GPA between 2.25 and 2.5 or a major GPA between 2.75 and 3.0 may petition the application committee of the Education Department for a special review of their applications.

Andrew Brulle asked if candidates can graduate or be entitled without reaching 2.5. Ann Caton stated a candidate could not graduate unless something needed to be looked at on an individual basis. Dr. Brulle expressed concern with regard

to the 2.25 range because sometimes when a student gets 100 hours with the 2.25 there is no way they can bring it up to a 2.5 in that amount of time.

Elliott Lessen referred to page 14 with regard to faculty and organizational structure and expressed concern with regard to faculty capacity and using as many full-time faculty to teach. Also, on page 29 regarding the student teacher evaluation rubric, Dr. Lessen asked if student dispositions are being assessed throughout the program. Ms. Swanson stated dispositions are being assessed across the program. There is a form professors are able to access and then prepare for the individual student. Dr. Caton indicated the dispositions checklist also appears in the education handbook.

Eugene Zalewski shared that he is not clear this proposal covers all of the areas that are supposed be covered with regard to LBS I. Ms. Stafford stated the survey class of the exceptional child details all of the thirteen federal categories in terms of characteristics. The survey class is not offered at the 100 or 200 level. It is a 300 level course, and is more extensive because the students are required to look at the chapter and do more in-depth research and presentations on accommodations and interventions in the classroom. And, also in terms of the methods that are used with each disability. That is the first junior level course in terms of looking at different disabilities and characteristics. With the MR population, it goes from the mild to severe encompassing each from the least restrictive environment to the self-contained and residential and facility related programs. Rockford College representatives believe requiring 240 field experience hours strengthen the program. Because this program is built on the elementary program, candidates will have regular classroom experience, K-12 cross categorical classroom experience, and an inclusive classroom setting experience. These various classroom settings will provide collaborative as well as comparative experiences.

Eugene Zalewski indicated his concern as a school administrator is (at least in his particular area) the increase in the number of students who are autistic, and many of the teachers are not prepared for that situation.

Linda Tafel stated she is trying to put the pieces of the new program together in a way that would convince a person that this is consistent with the federal ruling and simply not a rearrangement of previous parts. Dr. Tafel summarized several issues. First, the two master course outlines or syllabi address a particular area and do not address any broader linkage as students move through the program. After the survey course, how are candidates exposed to methods and assessments across all special education categories including those multiply challenged? With regard to student teaching, would a student be able to work effectively in a cross categorical classroom? How would you respond to the notion that in fact the students do not see parts, but see the whole? They see they are working with classrooms of children, not individual children with individual disabilities.

Nina Dorsch provided methods as an example. Methods are not specific to any particular disability category, but are considered more holistically about how various methods might apply to a variety of disability categories. Similarly in thinking about how that curriculum and instruction for students with disabilities intercepts with general curriculum, where are students taught how to collaborate with regular education teachers in an inclusive setting outside of actually experiencing it? When is that process covered in the coursework in terms of making recommendations? Where is the transition planning component for students?

After hearing several responses from Rockford College representatives, Nina Dorsch expressed concern that the connections outlined were being made by the candidates rather than the connections being explicit within the program. Ms. Stafford indicated staff felt it had been embedded in the program and may not be explicitly written in course descriptions or the content area.

Elliott Lessen indicated there is nothing in the program that suggests students are learning skills in terms of transition to host school experiences, the transition planning. The courses are categorical courses and all disabilities are not covered in an overt way. Dr. Lessen also raised concern to the notion of a dual major.

Linda Malone asked for the percentage of minority students and staff. Ms. Malone also asked Rockford staff to elaborate on the set up of ethnic / minority staff as well as minority students and how minority students are recruited. Dr. Caton stated the president of Rockford College is working very hard with regard to a diversity plan for students and faculty.

With regard to the student teaching population, Linda Malone asked about the diversity of the students in collaborating schools.

Andrew Brulle referred to page 15 of the proposal with regard to personnel for teaching special education classes. Representatives from Rockford College indicated that particular information was listed on page 25 of the proposal.

Elliott Lessen asked if Rockford College is currently certifying or recommending individuals for entitlement. Institution representatives indicated that is not the case.

Kay Acklin moved that the State Teacher Certification Board table the new program proposal from Rockford College for Learning Behavior Specialist I (LBS I), and ask the college representatives go back and rework the proposal in light of the concerns and questions addressed. Rockford representatives will then bring the proposal back at a later time. Linda Malone seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Linda Tafel asked if Rockford College could be provided a transcript of the comments from today's meeting.

University of Illinois at Chicago –
Early Childhood Education with an Endorsement in Early Childhood Education
Special Education

Phylliss Jones, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, introduced the following representatives from the University of Illinois at Chicago: Dr. Catherine Main, Coordinator of the Early Childhood Education Program; and Dr. James Kahn, Professor and Chair of Special Education.

Nina Dorsch referred to page 10 of the proposal with regard to the description of the courses. When looking at Forging Collaborations with Families and Community, how much of that course is about working with families of children with disabilities, community agencies, etc. Dr. Main indicated about 100 percent is working with families from diverse cultures and settings.

Nina Dorsch raised another question regarding the Appendices, specifically the checklist for general education requirements. There seems to be a discrepancy to a reference of "six subject areas", but there is a sentence indicating a student has not completed these "four courses". Dr. Main stated that was a typing error; the sentence should read "six courses".

Andrew Brulle asked about page 7, General Content Knowledge Courses, and the definition of demonstrating content knowledge is a grade of C or better in the six major subject area courses. Dr. Brulle asked if a course grade of C indicates competence in those areas. Dr. Main indicated this is a master's degree program, and no one is admitted in the program unless they have a 2.75 on a 4.0 scale.

On page 16 of the proposal, Andrew Brulle inquired about the key performance indicators and why they seem to come rather late, and only with completion of student teaching as opposed to having certain levels of development as the students move along in the program.

Denise Williams raised a question pertaining to science and why no lab is required. Dr. Kahn indicated a lot of non-lab sciences are more relevant than some of the lab sciences. In some cases a non-lab science may be more pertinent to them being able to use what they have learned in a classroom than a lab science would because of the age group. Ms. Williams stated when there is an assumption, realizing this is a master's degree program in early childhood,

that they have had previous experience with something is lab orientated for a hands-on type activities in science for children at this age to relate to.

Elliott Lessen complimented staff on the variety of assessment activities within the matrices.

Andrew Brulle inquired about the student teaching evaluation form. He asked if there is a minimum level at which candidates must complete all of the elements in the student teaching evaluation form, and what would be the definition of an excellent performance versus a proficient performance, etc. With regard to the portfolio, what is the minimal level of performance and how is the portfolio used to assess competence.

With regard to student teaching, Linda Malone asked if representatives could elaborate on the remediation plan for students who may be struggling during this time. Ms. Malone complimented representatives that the conceptual framework is discussed with the mentor teacher.

Denise Williams asked if institution representatives could indicate how many staff faculty listed on page(s) 25-26 of the proposal are minorities.

Kay Acklin moved that the State Teacher Certification Board recommend to the State Board of Education approval of the proposal from the University of Illinois at Chicago for a new Early Childhood Special Education professional education program, recognizing that graduates of the program will qualify for a Type 4 certificate with an endorsement in early childhood special education. Elliott Lessen seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Break (10:55 a.m. – 11:10 a.m.)

Item(s) for Discussion:

Review of Certification Test Pass Rates

Dr. Dunn asked Pat Glenn, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, to report on this item.

Ms. Glenn stated the development and administration of all of the new certification tests require several specific activities be accomplished with the development and implementation of those new tests. One of the most important of those is the establishment of passing scores for the new tests, and a very prescriptive procedure is followed.

Last year when the State Teacher Certification Board recommended the passing scores for the new Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) and special education tests, the Board asked staff to report on the pass rates after a full-year administration of the new tests. Ms. Glenn shared that before the Board is pass rate data for the APT, the pass rate data for all of the new special education tests, and included in the data tables are the pass rate data for all of the tests administered as part of the teacher, administrator and school service personnel testing program for the 2003-2004 test year.

Elliott Lessen raised a question with regard to Table 3. The percentages of African American, Hispanic and Asian American/Pacific Islander are rather low. Dr. Lessen asked if there had been some discussion about any bias that may exist in the test that may reflect that. Dr. Lessen further asked if the sub-tests were broken down for reading, math, and writing. Ms. Glenn provided detailed information as required, explaining that the Bias Review Committee reviewed all of the test frameworks and test items for two major purposes. The first purpose is to ensure the exclusion of bias from the testing materials; the second is to ensure the tests are reflective of the diversity of the Illinois population. She further explained that because we now have a compensatory scoring model, we do not have passing rate information by sub-area, by reporting groups.

Andrew Brulle asked why the numbers are low for LBS II pass rate scores. Ms. Glenn noted one explanation might be that the programs are very new and some examinees may have taken the tests before completing a program. She also cautioned that the numbers of examinees were extremely low.

Marsha Allen inquired as to the make-up and diversity of the Bias Review Committee. Linda Malone further asked if any members of the Bias Review Committee are from the public school districts.

Deborah Curtis raised a question if one could see the ethnicity breakdown of the APT.

Linda Tafel returned to discussion of the Basic Skills. Dr. Tafel stressed we want as many of the minority candidates to enter the teaching field as possible. Now that the Basic Skills test is needed to be passed before a person can enter a program can we receive the detail of how many first attempters attempt again. There is a lot of detail that would be helpful to the Certification Board in terms of policy making.

Muhammad Abdullah asked if there are any test preps available for the Basic Skills. Ms. Glenn responded the members of the higher education community requested a Basic Skills test preparation be available for candidates.

Deborah Curtis shared that tutorials in other areas beyond the Basic Skills would be of interest. Students deserve what help they can get especially in the test-taking mode.

Roger Chamberlain inquired what consistencies and inconsistencies might a person see from the enhanced tests compared to the tests before 2001 with Basic Skills.

Also with regard to the APT piece, Deborah Curtis asked if this may be a piece of these options from moving from initial to standard.

When referring to the breakdowns with ethnicity and the pass rate attempts, Denise Williams asked if there is anything to show regional as far as the state is concerned areas within the state ... are there more pass rates in one part of the state and fewer in another part of the state regionally.

Regarding the Basic Skills Test, Linda Malone asked what type of educational programs the students are struggling with.

Kay Acklin summarized three items that members would like Ms. Glenn to provide to the Certification Board. They included the following: (1) With regard to the APT test, pass rate data by ethnic and minority groups; (2) details about how many minorities failed and then tried to pass the test a second, third, etc. times – how many did not try again; and (3) a comparison of the old and new Basic Skills test pass rates.

Update on Public Comment – Proposed Amendments to Part 25

Dr. Dunn asked Sally Vogl, Rules Coordinator, to provide a summary of the public comments received on the pending amendments to Part 25. They are as follows:

- **Renewal of Administrative Certificates**

Among the evidence of completion, an administrator must prepare an analysis for at least one of the activities completed that discusses the implications of that activity for service to children with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. That is not a requirement imposed under any order in Corey H, but was placed in the rules when the administrative certificate renewal process was changed in 2003. As a voluntary measure by administrators to show they have a commitment to appropriate services to students with disabilities, the requirement will not be deleted.

Eugene Zalewski asked if he is correct that there is no corresponding requirement in the law. Ms. Vogl stated that there is no requirement for

administrators. Dr. Zalewski thought we were intending to move in a direction where we are not proposing rules that are not in the law. He further asked why are rules being made that go beyond what the law requires. Ms. Vogl stated that before making the recommendation to the Board that State Board staff could check with administrator associations to determine whether they continue to view that favorably and want to have it on record as a matter of state policy or not.

- Requirements for Out-of-State Applicants in Section 25.425

Section 25.425 must be read in conjunction with the other sections that apply to specific certificates. These sections work together to establish the requirements that will apply.

Elliott Lessen asked if it will be apparent to Regional Offices of Education and others who are looking at this rule that indeed someone from out of state must meet all Illinois requirements. His particular concern related to individuals who are certified via the ABCTE.

- Short-Term Authorization

William Briggs made an inquiry with regard to hard-to-fill positions and what determines if you don't want someone who comes walking in that door.

- Reduction in the Number of CPDUs or CEUs Required for Certificate Renewal for Individuals Who Hold Advanced Degrees or Master Certificates

There are several places in the rules where additional specificity can be added indicating that those reductions apply to individuals whose applications are received or processed on or after July 1, 2004.

Linda Tafel asked Sally Vogl to restate what the effect of the adding July 1, 2004 would do. Ms. Vogl stated it means that for an individual who is or was ready to apply for certificate renewal at any time beginning July 1, 2004, those reductions will apply based upon the advanced degree or master certificate held by that individual as opposed to completing the cycle that the person is in now and having it in effect for the subsequent cycle.

William Briggs asked for clarification with regard to this item, and if Ms. Vogl foresees the State Board of Education rejecting this. Ms. Vogl indicated she has no reason to foresee that. Mr. Briggs also asked how this information will be forwarded to everyone in the field.

Kay Acklin indicated this is essential because it now brings the initial-to-standard requirements with regard to masters or advanced degrees in alignment with the standard to standard.

Denise Williams stressed how important it is that everyone be informed of the current information.

William Briggs raised another concern with regard to districts that no longer have working Local Professional Development Committees. The unions will need to work extra hard in informing the field of current information.

Dave Marshall stated this is a really good example of how this process works. The public comments submitted in the rule review session can make a difference.

- Teacher Certificate Renewal – Proportionate Reductions

Ms. Vogl explained that we are restoring a different version of the rule indicating that the individual needs to notify the regional superintendent for the period of time that he or she believes constitutes periods of exemption.

Dave Marshall indicated he does not see another option.

Richard Ammentorp asked how teachers will be notified that they have to fill out the form. He further shared that teachers are unaware of certain forms that they are expected to complete.

Eugene Zalewski asked why the Teacher Service Record can't be started at the end of the school year instead of the beginning of the school year.

Dr. Dunn suggested perhaps a "Quick Fact" sheet or guidelines could be disseminated.

- Carryover of Activities

Sally Vogl discussed the portion of the rule on application for certificate renewal and the carryover of activities completed after April 1 instead of March 1.

William Briggs raised a question with regard to the April 1 deadline. Ms. Vogl stated the rule relates to when the individual should initiate the application process, and that is any time between September 1 and April 1 of the final year of certification once the person has completed the requirements.

With regard to the Statement of Assurance, Kay Acklin asked when finalized if the form can be sent via email to each member of the State Teacher Certification Board. Linda Jamali indicated staff would do so as soon as the form is finalized.

Dave Marshall asked for clarification with regard to the carryover of activities. Ms. Vogl stated that credit for an activity that is either completed on or after April 1 of the final year of the certificate's period of validity or for which the individual receives the applicable evidence of completion, if not used to meet the requirements for that cycle, may be carried over to the subsequent cycle if it continues to be appropriate for the teacher.

To move from initial to standard, there is a requirement for a letter from the school district verifying four years of full-time teaching experience. Dave Marshall asked when the regional offices of education can accept the forms. A May 1 date was suggested. Dr. Dunn indicated State Board staff will review and see if guidelines can be issued to make things more workable.

- Professional Development Certificate

Sally Vogl asked if the following language was appropriate, "The required evidence of completion for this certificate, if not issued by the institution or its certification officer as a separate identifiable document bearing the institution's seal, is a notation on the transcript." Certification Board members agreed this statement was acceptable.

With regard to the Certificate of Assurance, Richard Ammentorp asked if this new form can be downloaded onto an individual's own system so it can be an ongoing record. He recommended all forms be user friendly on the website.

State Board staff recommend teachers and administrators use the online CeRTS system.

- Highly Qualified Status of Special Education Teachers

Ms. Vogl noted the Illinois Education Association's recommendation not to state criteria for special education teachers at this time since information from the federal government is pending and the reauthorization of IDEA is pending. She explained why the State Board of Education staff do recommend the inclusion of these criteria.

There is a possibility of serving as a special education teacher without certification in special education with certification in elementary grades or another type of certificate to which special education teaching approval is added. To be complete, the criteria for special education teachers need to address this situation as well.

Lunch (12:45 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.)

Item(s) for Information:

Update on June 2004 State Teacher Certification Board Program Approval Decisions

Phyliss Jones stated the only school that continues to have programs needing to have approval decisions made is DePaul. Ms. Jones shared a status report on the following three programs: (1) English Language Arts; (2) Social Science; and (3) Visual Arts.

Nina Dorsch moved that State Board staff use the current Art panel to review the DePaul Visual Arts Program. Linda Tafel seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Kay Acklin confirmed that Certification Board members may be reviewing at the December meeting the English Language Arts program as well as the Social Science program at DePaul University.

Secretary's Report:

Latin Certification Test Update

Before discussion of the Latin Certification Test Update, Pat Glenn provided members of the State Teacher Certification Board with the three data reports requested earlier today regarding passing rates.

Pat Glenn provided an overview and summary of the meeting State Board staff held on October 19, 2004 with ten members who served on the Content Advisory Committee for Latin.

After a general review of the process, members of the Content Advisory Committee indicated they did not think what they were doing was final. They also felt the Latin test was too difficult, particularly the vocabulary and the length of the reading passages.

Two examinees have taken the new test. Both examinees passed the test. To that end data does not support the fact that the test is too difficult. State Board staff suggest pointing individuals to the website where the Illinois Latin vocabulary list is located, as well as keep an eye on the data for the coming year and provide a report next year.

Elliott Lessen thanked staff for meeting with this group. If there is no difference in how the Latin test was constructed from the other foreign language tests, and the issues have been addressed, the Certification Board should move forward.

Andrew Brulle asked if Ms. Glenn could describe the reaction of the Latin teachers.

Linda Tafel suggested that when the State Board of Education engages people in an advisory capacity it is important that their advisory role be written down so people do not assume that their role goes beyond whatever it is. It is important to clarify the role as either being a “decision maker” or an “advice giver”.

Pat Glenn stated that the members who serve on the Content Advisory Committees with regard to testing are the “decision makers” with respect to the content of the test items.

William Briggs shared that very few schools offer Latin in Illinois. Perhaps that played a role in this situation.

Denise Williams asked Pat Glenn if retired teachers serve on the Bias Review Committee. Ms. Glenn indicated several retired teachers do serve on the Bias Review Committee.

Distribution of December Audit Committee Materials

Marti Woelfle, Principal Education Consultant, Department of Certification and Professional Development, provided an overview of the December Audit Committee process. One institution will be present for unit accreditation and program approval. Two institutions will be coming back following focused visits.

The Facilitation Committee agreed that the Certification Board will meet on Thursday, December 2, 2004 from 8:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. to engage in training. This will be a walk through for both new and experienced members. Discussion will then begin with National-Louis University from 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. Lunch will also be provided. Late in the afternoon new program proposals will be presented. Members should be prepared to stay until 5:00 p.m.

For the December meeting, Kay Acklin strongly recommended Board members bring their Resource Guides which contains the Standards booklet.

Marti Woelfle shared copies of the Directory of Approved Programs with Board members. She also provided a brief summary of the information contained in the document.

Other

Laura Lipe asked for an update and clarification with regard to the Middle School report that was recommended to the State Board of Education. Dr. Dunn anticipates a recommendation will be made at the December meeting of the State Board.

Linda Jamali read a message from Connee Fitch-Blanks announcing her resignation as a member of the State Teacher Certification Board. Dr. Fitch-Blanks thanked her fellow colleagues and State Board staff for their support during her service on the Certification Board.

Linda Jamali introduced Richard Ammentorp who is being recommended to the State Board of Education to complete the term of Mary Jane Morris.

With regard to Denise Williams' question pertaining to the teacher who had not been recommended by the Local Professional Development Committee, Ms. Jamali was informed by Rajesh Iyer that this had been handled.

A draft document of the "Operating Procedures" for the State Teacher Certification Board was disseminated to Board members. This item will be on the December meeting agenda for discussion. Action will then be taken at the January meeting.

Adjournment:

The State Teacher Certification Board meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

APPROVED

Chairman

Secretary

ATTACHMENT

**PROPOSALS FOR SELF-ASSESSMENT COURSEWORK
TO MEET REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE STANDARD CERTIFICATE**

Recommended for Approval
by State Board Staff
November 2004

(None)

**PROPOSALS FOR NBPTS-RELATED COURSEWORK
TO MEET REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE STANDARD CERTIFICATE**

Recommended for Approval
by State Board Staff
November 2004

(None)

ATTACHMENT

**PROPOSALS FOR INDUCTION AND MENTORING PROGRAMS
TO MEET REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE STANDARD CERTIFICATE**

Recommended for Approval
by State Board Staff
November 2004

Morrison Community Unit District 6 – Whiteside County
East Dubuque School District 119 – Jo Daviess County
Crescent City Grade School 275 – Iroquois County
Zion Elementary Schools – Lake County
Pekin Public Schools District 108 – Tazewell County

**Districts that Adopted Approved Programs
November 2004**

(None)

* Denotes a comparable two-year program since 2002 or prior per provider contact person.

**PROPOSALS FOR X-TYPE CPDU ACTIVITIES
TO MEET REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE STANDARD CERTIFICATE**

Recommended for Approval
by State Board Staff
November 2004

(None)

ATTACHMENT

**Illinois State Board of Education**
Governor Rod Blagojevich Jesse Ruiz, Board Chair
Dr. Randy J. Dunn, Superintendent (Interim)

* indicates required fields [Home](#) [Help](#) [Feedback](#)

Pending Recommendations (Standard/Master)

Click on the Application ID number to review the application.

Group A: Recommended Renewal by LPDC & ROE

Application ID	Teacher Name	STCB Recd. Date
Region 14 : COOK ROE		
800	Jessica Budz	10/8/2004
929	Tiffany Chavez	10/26/2004
Region 30 : JACKSON/PERRY ROE		
925	Julie Pierce	10/18/2004
928	Margaret Collins	10/22/2004
Region 31 : KANE ROE		
901	Craig Recchia	10/15/2004
871	Karen Saccomando	10/13/2004
Region 34 : LAKE ROE		
721	Andrea Dalinka	10/2/2004
917	Danette Franklin	10/17/2004
270	Pamela Plewiak	10/2/2004
852	Patricia Saer	10/12/2004
292	Paul Chodak	10/2/2004
208	Rachel Laks	10/28/2004
Region 44 : MC HENRY ROE		
931	Jody Dahlseng	10/27/2004

[Home](#)