

ILLINOIS STATE TEACHER CERTIFICATION BOARD

**Illinois State Board of Education
Springfield, Illinois**

Friday, November 7, 2003

MINUTES

Call to Order / Roll Call:

Mr. Dennis Williams, Interim Secretary, Illinois State Teacher Certification Board, called the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. Mr. Williams announced that Dr. Schiller would not be present. Mr. Williams proceeded to call the roll. A quorum was present.

Members Present:

Mr. Dennis Williams, Interim
Secretary

Kay Acklin
Andrew Brulle
Roger Chamberlain
Deidre Dare
Nina Dorsch

Connee Fitch-Blanks
Brenda Humphrey
Elliott Lessen
Laura Lipe
Linda Malone
Mary Jane Morris
Denise Williams
Eugene Zalewski

Members Absent:

Dr. Robert E. Schiller, Chairman

Marsha Allen
William Briggs

Bruce Dennison
Barbara Eason-Watkins
Nan Giblin
Linda Tafel

Others Present:

Laura Barwegen
Bob Bigham
Wendy L. Black
Laurel Borgia
Lucille Buscher
Deborah Curtis
Mike Ellerman
Paul Frank

Phyliss Jones
Susan Lenski
Linda McElroy
Carol S. Owles
Lee Patton
Paula Purdue
Lou Ann Reichle
Susan Shea

Lynn Rhoades
Larry Sondler
Frances Steward
Brenda Stonecipher
Sandra Westbrooks
Marti Woelfle

Mr. Williams provided a “walk through” of the meeting packet presented to the State Teacher Certification Board members. Regarding the “Proposals for Induction and Mentoring Programs to Meet the Requirements for the Standard Certificate”, members were asked to add the following: #51 – CCSD 62 Des Plaines (Cook County).

Approval of Minutes:

The minutes of the October 3, 2003 Illinois State Teacher Certification Board meeting were presented for consideration. Dr. Eugene Zalewski moved that the October 3, 2003 minutes be approved with the following change:

At the request of Ms. Denise Williams, On Page 5, Third Paragraph, that the minutes reflect Ms. Williams initiated the questions pertaining to the APT test due to the fact of having questions raised from a student teacher.

Ms. Denise Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Public Participation:

- Dr. Susan Lenski, Illinois State University, Center for Reading and Literacy

Dr. Lenski spoke about the discussion draft rules for reading teachers and reading specialists. She indicated that she believes that candidates for certification and endorsement need to have a full certification program at the graduate level including clinical hours in schools that are supervised by supervisors (i.e., professors and others). In order to have highly qualified people in reading, it is necessary to combine study about effective teaching of reading with structured experiences in schools. She noted that she believes that the Illinois State Board of Education is very concerned about having highly qualified teachers in Illinois and she hopes the final rules will reflect this, particularly in the area of reading. A handout was distributed regarding reading preparation in universities and colleges in Illinois.

- Dr. Laurel Borgia, Western Illinois University, Reading and Literacy

Dr. Borgia indicated she supported the statements by Dr. Susan Lenski. She feels that an advanced degree in reading and supervised clinical practice with professors are crucial components in assuring good reading teachers in the State of Illinois.

- Dr. Susan Shea, Education Policy Director, Illinois Education Association

Dr. Susan Shea provided a synopsis of recent discussions in the General Assembly about the requirements for moving from the Initial to the Standard Teaching Certificate. She reminded the Board that at last month's State Teacher Certification Board meeting, members had directed the staff of the Illinois State Board of Education to seek a waiver for the Class of 2004 (those who are going from the Initial to the Standard Certificate). The State Board of Education approved this proposal but members of the General Assembly indicated that such a waiver was not feasible because they considered it to be a reduction in the qualifications of this group of teachers.

She indicated that the discussion between various educational organizations, legislators and legislative staff had resulted in a proposal to substitute a one-year induction and mentoring program for the current two-year requirement. The proposal would also eliminate the requirement for the "X" Type CPDUs and allow teachers to meet the prorated CPDU requirements with "Y" Type activities.

Dr. Shea asked that the State Teacher Certification Board members endorse the proposal as presented and initiate a motion to the State Board of Education indicating they are agreeable with that kind of movement. She emphasized that it was critical that a decision be made as soon as possible so that teachers, especially those initial teachers who are in districts with no mentoring programs, could be notified about changes to the CPDU requirements.

Dr. Eugene Zalewski and Dr. Nina Dorsch asked several questions regarding the information provided by Dr. Shea.

- Dr. Frances Steward, Reading Specialist, Assistant Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, Western Illinois University

Dr. Steward indicated that she supported the statements by Dr. Susan Lenski and Dr. Laurel Borgia. She indicated that Reading Specialists work with students who are struggling with reading. They need to have the best preparation available.

- Mr. Mike Ellerman, Illinois Reading Council

Mr. Ellerman shared concerns regarding certification for Reading Specialists. The members of that organization believe certification should require

completion of a full program at the graduate level, recommendation by the institution passing the appropriate APT test and passing the appropriate content test. This is consistent not only with the Standards of Illinois, but with the Standards of the International Reading Association and NCATE, both of which call for Reading Specialists to have advanced degrees. The organization also believes that the certification rules should require prior teaching experience and include clinical teaching as part of the requirement.

Facilitation Committee's Report:

Dr. Elliott Lessen reported that Dr. Linda Tafel, Chair, Facilitation Committee, had participated in that morning's Committee meeting via conference call but would not be able to attend the full Board meeting. He would therefore provide the report from the Facilitation Committee.

Dr. Lessen indicated that the Certification Board may need to go into Executive Session later today regarding the Certification Board hearings scheduled next week (November 13 and 14). Given the comments presented by Dr. Susan Shea, Illinois Education Association, Dr. Lessen also suggested that the agenda be changed to include a discussion of the Class of 2004 issues. This item will be placed on the agenda under Discussion Items.

Dr. Lessen asked that Ms. Lee Patton be prepared to speak to the Certification Board regarding "Proposals for Activities that Meet Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility" listed under Items for Immediate Action.

Dr. Lessen distributed a memorandum from the Facilitation Committee to the State Teacher Certification Board members regarding suggestions for future projects regarding evaluation of Teacher Recertification Process. He reported that the Facilitation Committee met via teleconference on October 22, 2003, and they agreed that the second-year evaluation study presented clear and compelling findings. They also agreed that the topics of recertification and teacher professional development would be fruitful areas for further research either by the Illinois State Board of Education, teacher organizations, higher education faculty, researchers or graduate students. The State Teacher Certification Board will consider proposals at its May 2004 meeting. Guidelines for these proposals will be issued by January 15, 2004 and be available on the Illinois State Board of Education website. Dr. Lessen requested that the memorandum be added to the official agenda for today's meeting. (See Attachment)

Dr. Lessen reported that there will be two audit committees working on institutional reviews during the December meeting. They will meet on Thursday, December 4, 2003.

Dr. Elliott Lessen motioned to amend the agenda that would include two areas. Under Discussion Items: Add #4 – Legislation and Current Legislative Proposals and under Information Items: Add #5 – Open Meetings Act and the Impact on LPDCs after January 1, 2004. Ms. Denise Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Item(s) for Immediate Action:

Proposals for Activities that Meet the Requirements for Standard Certificate Eligibility

Ms. Lee Patton introduced the following State Board of Education staff who had worked on the Initial to Standard project: Linda McElroy, Phyliss Jones, Brenda Stonecipher and Lynn Rhoades.

She then indicated that the Certification Board was being asked to approve the rubrics used for review of “Initial to Standard” proposals, as well as the proposals that had been reviewed against the rubrics and were now ready for final action.

She noted that the Certification Board had received the rubrics and a preliminary list of recommended proposals in advance of the meeting. They also had access to the actual proposals on-line. The final list of proposals, distributed and updated at the meeting, included the following:

- 3 Proposals for Self-Assessment Coursework;
- 3 Proposals for NBPTS-Related Coursework;
- 27 Proposals for X-Type Programs and Activities; and
- 51 Proposals for Induction and Mentoring Programs

The organizations and/or institutions whose proposals were being recommended for approval in each area are provided in the attachment to these minutes.

Dr. Andrew Brulle asked for the definition of “accreditation” as used in the rubrics. Staff indicated that accreditation refers to “regional” accreditation.

Dr. Elliott Lessen moved that the Certification Board approve all of the rubrics for use in evaluating “Initial to Standard” proposals. Ms. Brenda Humphrey seconded the motion. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Ms. Patton asked those members who had voted no on the rubrics to provide her with any suggestions they might have for improving the rubrics in a way that would address their concerns.

Dr. Elliott Lessen then moved that the Certification Board approve the recommended providers for coursework and other activities that would allow teachers to move from Initial to Standard certification. He emphasized that all of the proposals had been reviewed in relation to the rubrics. Ms. Mary Jane Morris seconded the motion. The motion passed by roll call vote.

Ms. Patton noted that the Certification Board had originally planned to revisit the adopted procedures for their review of the “Initial to Standard” proposals; however, she suggested that that discussion be deferred pending potential action in the General Assembly. The topic could then be revisited at the December State Teacher Certification Board meeting. This was acceptable to the members of the Board.

Ms. Patton then asked that the following statement be placed in the record: “The staff recommendation that the State Teacher Certification Board approve “Initial to Standard” providers at this meeting in no way invalidated the State Board’s support for the agreement regarding changes to the “Initial to Standard” requirements made during the recent meeting with legislators, legislative staff and representatives of educational organizations.”

Proposed Rulemaking

Part 27 – Standards for Certification in Specific Teaching Fields

Staff indicated that the proposed rulemaking would result in two technical corrections, one in the common core of standards for science (Section 27.140) and the other in the common core of standards for social science (Section 27.200).

- Include “state, national and global” language to the standard of “the competent science teacher evaluates the efficacy of criteria for determining the effect of policies on local scientific, environmental, and technological issues”; and
- Change from “CE” to “AD”. This was a request from JCAR.

Dr. Elliott Lessen commented that “AD” is more of a Christian reference and “CE” is a secular reference. Dr. Lessen suggested that “CE” be used throughout the entire document and not “AD” – due to the separation of church and state.

Ms. Lee Patton asked that this item be tabled until Lou Ann Reichle, Assistant Legal Advisor, could be present to address.

**** Item Revisited w/ Ms. Lou Ann Reichle Present ****

Following discussion with Ms. Reichle, Dr. Elliott Lessen moved that the Certification Board approve the Part 27 rules for initial review, contingent upon the change of “AD” to “CE” throughout all Part 27 and any other places that it might appear. Dr. Nina Dorsch seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote. Staff indicated that if this change could not be easily accomplished, or if there were issues that indicated the need for further discussion by the Certification Board, the Part 27 rules would be returned to the Certification Board for consideration in December.

Part 29 – Standards for Administrative Certification

Staff indicated that the proposed amendments cover three aspects of the rules and are all basically technical in nature:

- The revision in Section 29.100 corresponds to revisions that have been made in other sets of the rules to state October 1 as the date when the new examinations are required.
- The addition of a reference to the “general administrative endorsement” at the beginning of Section 29.120 acknowledges that Section 21-7.1 of the School Code gives this title to the endorsement that is required for principals and certain other administrators in similar positions.
- The changes in Section 29.140 (Director of Special Education) and the repeal of Section 29.150 correspond to the insertion of new material into Part 25 (Certification) that is presented for initial review.

Dr. Nina Dorsch asked about the specific reference of “principal”. Since the general administrative endorsement is used for a number of positions including principal, but is not confined to principal, she thought it might be appropriate to use a more generic term.

Ms. Lee Patton asked that this item also be tabled until Lou Ann Reichle is present to address the issues raised by discussion.

**** Item Revisited w/ Ms. Lou Ann Reichle Present ****

Following discussion with Ms. Reichle, Dr. Elliott Lessen moved that the Certification Board approve Part 29 – Standards for Administrative Certification contingent upon the change of the word “principal” throughout the document to “general administrator”. Ms. Denise Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Staff reiterated that the proposed rules would not be forwarded to the State Board of Education until the issues raised by the Certification Board were resolved. As necessary, the Part 29 rules would be returned to the Certification Board for consideration in December.

Discussion Item(s):

No Child Left Behind – New Federal Guidance and Implications for Illinois

Ms. Lee Patton commented on the need to revisit the criteria adopted by the State Board for determining whether veteran teachers are highly qualified in relation to NCLB. She indicated that the discussion at this meeting was intended to lay the groundwork for that change and for consideration of related issues in subsequent agenda items – i.e., streamlining teacher certificate renewal and the rules for certification and endorsement. She then distributed a preliminary draft of potential changes to the criteria for highly qualified veteran teachers (“HOUSSE”) and a draft matrix that was designed to show how the potential changes to the HOUSSE criteria and the discussion draft rules will fit together and affect veteran and newly-certified teachers.

Ms. Patton shared with the Certification Board members a copy of a document used in Ohio to collect data about veteran teachers so they can be identified as highly qualified. She indicated that many details would need to be discussed, but it is the best approach she has seen to collecting the data needed to meet federal requirements.

Dr. Eugene Zalewski asked who is going to keep track of all of these items because they are significantly complex. Mr. Bob Bigham, Principal Consultant, Certification and Professional Development at the State Board of Education, stated that when people want to receive an endorsement, the university would report that to us. The veteran teachers would report on their own qualifications in relation to the criteria. Dr. Zalewski stressed the importance of accurately identifying those teachers who are highly qualified for their teaching assignments because local school districts are responsible for notifying parents when students are being taught by teachers who are not highly qualified.

Dr. Elliott Lessen asked for clarification about statements regarding middle grade certification and endorsements. Ms. Patton indicated that the NCLB requirements for middle grade teachers are, along with the requirements for special education, presenting the most challenging issues in the development of certification and endorsement requirements for Illinois. She reported that the statements in the current discussion draft are considered to be a placeholder for discussion and there is still a significant amount of work to be done before a final proposal can be presented.

Ms. Kay Acklin stated that from her standpoint, and from that of the people that she represents, the “grandfathering” of middle school teachers is an issue. Ms. Acklin further stated that this entire process is very complicated for teachers, and the process must be simplified. She also asked for and received confirmation from Ms. Patton that these documents were for discussion only and that no action would be taken at this meeting.

Ms. Mary Jane Morris had the following concerns about the potential data collection related to “highly qualified” teachers: (1) the evaluation method and if this would be another task for a committee of teachers; and (2) regularity of the process.

Ms. Patton indicated that although there were no definite plans in place, she believed that if Illinois uses the Ohio model or something similar to it, individual teachers would be responsible for completing the forms on coursework and experiences. There would be a one time submission.

She also indicated that local districts will be held accountable for continuous increases in the percentage of “highly qualified” teachers.

Ms. Linda Malone shared several concerns regarding middle grades and special education.

Ms. Brenda Humphrey stated that she is very pleased with the documents presented in draft form. Also, in thinking ahead to the future, Ms. Humphrey suggested that there be some sort of matrix with data of districts and the percentages of highly qualified teachers, etc. She also stressed the importance of notifying teachers about the requirements and make it clear that they should complete the data-collection surveys.

Dr. Elliott Lessen asked for clarification that completion of an approved program major in the subject does not require passage of the subject matter test to be considered highly qualified. Ms. Patton affirmed that the Illinois HOUSSE provisions indicate that these are separate options.

Dr. Andrew Brulle asked clarification for several items in the HOUSSE document. Staff responded to his questions and general discussion ensued.

Ms. Patton restated that this was a preliminary discussion and that revised HOUSSE requirements would be brought back to the State Teacher Certification Board for further consideration in the future.

Ms. Kay Acklin confirmed that Ms. Patton planned to bring a new draft of these documents back to the Certification Board in December for action. Ms. Acklin requested that these documents be sent to Certification Board members as soon as possible so they can digest all of the material.

Break / Re-Convene at 11:10 a.m.

Teacher Certificate Renewal – Issues and Potential Solutions

Ms. Lee Patton stated that there are two parts to this discussion: (1) system improvements; and (2) additional research initiatives developed by the Facilitation Committee. Since the second issue had been addressed by Dr. Lessen in the report of the Facilitation Committee, this discussion would focus on the issues identified by staff and the potential strategies for streamlining the system.

Staff reported that the list of issues and concerns about the teacher certificate renewal system was drawn from the various evaluation reports, as well as conversations with Certification Board members, teachers, LPDC members, and representatives of the teacher associations. It is organized in four sections: teacher concerns, LPDC concerns, professional development activities and system concerns.

The document, “Potential Strategies for Streamlining and Improving the Teacher Certificate Renewal System,” was developed in response to these issues and took a comprehensive approach to reforming the current system.

Certification Board members voiced the following comments and concerns in relation to these documents.

- An issue not addressed in the chart is the lack of administrative support for recertification activities. Ms. Patton was asked if there was any accountability for administrative support and Board members commented that many teachers are told to deal with this on their own time. Ms. Patton agreed that this was not specifically identified as an issue but the strategies, particularly #13 (“Clarify the roles and relationships between LPDCs and local districts ...”) implicitly recognized the problem. She acknowledged that this did not provide a specific response and that further work on this issue would be needed. However, she pointed out that answers to these teacher concerns would need to reflect the overall changes to the system.
- Concern regarding #6 - Potential Strategies Document – Certification Board members indicated that this strategy had some merit, because there can be a variety of problems with LPDC decision making (e.g., personality conflicts with teachers, arbitrariness, remoteness from teachers – especially in very large schools or districts). However, there was concern about the potential for conflicts or abuse of this option. Ms. Patton explained that the thinking behind this strategy was that it would keep decision making in the hands of the LPDC, but allow someone closer

to the teacher to verify the connection between the activity and the teacher's assignment. More work is needed to consider the implications of this idea.

- Concern regarding #3 – “Eliminate the need to allocate professional development credits among the authorized purposes” Ms. Patton indicated that the proposal would add a fifth purpose (meeting NCLB criteria as necessary) but, with this exception and the requirements related to special education, there would be no required allocation of credits between and among the priorities. This had a great deal of appeal, but members wanted more information about how it might work.
- Concern regarding #4 – “Eliminate requirement for continuous submission and approval of claims for credit; instead, require a one-time submission of evidence that the requirements for certificate renewal have been met.” Certification Board members liked the idea of eliminating some of the paperwork associated with the current requirement but were concerned about how teachers would know if their activities are appropriate and sufficient? Ms. Patton suggested that the teacher could keep track and/or consult with their LPDC members.
- Concern regarding #10 – “Eliminate requirement for State Teacher Certification Board and State Board approval of providers and review of workshops, or require registration of providers only.” This elicited a number of questions about the quality of the providers and workshops and how this could (or could not) be assured by state oversight. In response to the concerns expressed by some members, Ms. Patton noted that an alternative would be to require registration by providers and/or to establish regional approval of providers. However, Ms. Patton pointed out that by having an approved provider list, it gives an erroneous impression regarding the degree of State Board control over the quality of the professional development. Board members had differing views on how to address this issue and suggested that further exploration of options be considered.

Ms. Patton stated that State Board staff will do additional work on this document and, as appropriate, Certification Board members will be asked to respond to emerging ideas.

Closed Session

Dr. Elliott Lessen moved that the State Teacher Certification Board go into closed session to discuss litigation pending before the Board under the exception set forth in Section 2(c)(11) of the Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/2(c)). Dr. Lessen also moved that Lou Ann Reichle, Assistant Legal Advisor, be present at the closed session. Ms. Linda Malone seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Dr. Elliott Lessen moved that the Illinois State Teacher Certification Board return to open session. Ms. Deidre Dare seconded the motion. The motion passed by unanimous vote.

Re-Convened After Closed Session

Dr. Elliott Lessen moved that the Certification Board accept the proposal regarding modification of the requirements for moving from the Initial to Standard Certificate and that any rubrics and proposals for “X” CPDUs would be dissolved and folded into CPDU activities in general. Ms. Denise Williams seconded the motion. Motion passed by unanimous roll call vote.

Discussion Draft – Proposed Rulemaking – Part 25: Certification

Discussion of the draft of Part 25 rules for certification began with consideration of administrative certification. Dr. Nina Dorsch pointed out that the document indicated that only two years of full-time teaching was required prior to obtaining administrative certification. She stated that there may have been an oversight to have a two-year requirement for administrative endorsement with administrative certification without even having received a standard teaching certificate yet. (Staff later explained that this is state law but the issue is being considered by a special task force on educational leadership and the recommendations are expected to include modification of this law.)

Dr. Dorsch further noted that on Page 69, the words “general supervisory” are included. The “general supervisory” certificate is no longer available. Mr. Bob Bigham stated that there are still individuals who hold this certificate.

In regard to Certification for School Counselors, Ms. Lee Patton stated that this “draft document” responds to new law eliminating requirement for teaching degree if candidate meets requirements established in rule by the State Board of Education. As set forth in the discussion draft, the rules:

- Require that all in-state candidates complete approved master’s level program in school counseling, complete an internship, and either hold or

be eligible for a teaching certificate or complete coursework related to four topical areas related to working in schools.

- Establish an Interim Certificate for School Counselor Interns that will allow the candidate who meets requirements to be employed in a school during the supervised internship.
- Allow approved school counseling programs to design a “focused program” for school counseling candidates who hold a master’s degree in another area of counseling and to recommend certification by entitlement upon completion of that program.
- Allow certification of out-of-state candidates who have completed a school counseling program and a school-based internship without additional coursework related to schools.
- Allow certification of out-of-state candidates who hold a school counseling certificate and have two years of full-time experience as a school counselor without requiring an internship in the schools or additional coursework related to schools.

In regard to requirements for paraprofessionals, the “draft document”:

- Responds to new law requiring the State Board of Education to define “life experiences” and authorize their use for determining whether the paraprofessional in a program funded by Title I meets the federal requirements. (Definition combines current approval for teacher aides – generally 30 semester hours – with experience as a paraprofessional and evidence of relevant professional development.)
- Adds passage of ParaPro or WorkKeys tests (as used in Illinois for NCLB purposes) to the options for receiving teacher aide approval for paraprofessionals not working in Title I programs. (Paraprofessionals will now have four options instead of two.)
- Requires future issuance by the State Board of an approval for all paraprofessionals who meet the respective requirements.
- Establishes conditions and procedures for revocation of an approval for a paraprofessional.

Dr. Andrew Brulle indicated that he thought it might be appropriate to establish standards for the credit hours required for this approval.

Dr. Eugene Zalewski asked about the statement requiring annual evidence of freedom from tuberculosis and indicated that he believed this was required only for initial employment. Staff indicated that this would be clarified and a revision made as appropriate.

Dr. Andrew Brulle raised questions in regard to Page 37, (e) – “The review team shall visit the institution and verify the degree to which the educational unit and its program(s) meet the standards referred to in Section 25.115 (b) of this Part.” He stated that institutions need to have the SPA program reports available, but this rule makes it seem as if the program review team will need to review all of the programs and make decisions. Dr. Elliott Lessen remarked that the intent of what is needed must be reflected in the language and not be left for interpretation by a team leader, etc. Ms. Patton will ask staff to review the language to determine whether further clarification is needed.

Dr. Brulle referred to Section 25.37 – Acquisition of Subsequent Teaching Certificates (Page 15-16). He raised concerns about whether someone could receive a subsequent certificate without passing tests. Ms. Patton indicated that was not the intent and modifications would be made.

Dr. Brulle expressed concern about the “focused” program and the potential problems with implementation of this concept. Again, Ms. Patton indicated that staff would attempt to strengthen and clarify this section.

Also, Dr. Brulle had questions regarding endorsements in the middle grades, specifically, “completed 24 hours of coursework that include 18 hours in the content area of the assignment and six hours addressing middle-grade philosophy ...” He indicated that many schools have integrated the six required hours of middle-grade philosophy into other courses. Ms. Patton stated that this will be addressed.

Information Items:

Secretary’s Report

Mr. Dennis Williams reported that the Certification office is now reviewing applications for May 20th and the staff are expected to move into June today.

Plans and Materials for December Accreditation

Ms. Marti Woelfle was asked to discuss the plans for the December accreditation. She indicated that there are two Certification Board members who

have not received training at this time, and she offered her assistance to these members.

She reported that the audit committees will meet on December 4. One of the committees (A) has one institution to review, and the other committee (B) has two. The Board indicated that if any of the new program reviews are ready in time for advance review by the members, they could be added to the work of the committee with just one review.

Legislative Update

Ms. Kay Acklin requested that when Ms. Patton submits a set of legislative proposals regarding certification to the State Board of Education's Legislative Office, that the State Teacher Certification Board members receive a copy as well. Ms. Patton agreed.

Miscellaneous Announcements

Ms. Lee Patton reported that the plan for the second phase of OTIS is moving along very rapidly. This phase will put all of the other applications on-line.

Impact of Open Meetings Act Upon LPDCs

Dr. Elliott Lessen asked Ms. Lou Ann Reichle to discuss the effect of changes to the Open Meetings Act on LPDCs. Dr. Eugene Zalewski stated that the LPDCs should receive notification of the January 1 obligation of the Open Meetings Act. Ms. Reichle stated that State Board of Education staff will give notification to the LPDCs on the new law and the requirements. She also provided the Certification Board members with a copy of the new law.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

APPROVED

Chairman

Secretary

ATTACHMENT

Memorandum

November 7, 2003

To: State Teacher Certification Board

From: Facilitation Committee

**Subject: Suggestions for Future Projects Regarding
Evaluation of Teacher Recertification Process**

At the September meeting of the State Teacher Certification Board, we agreed that ISBE staff would prepare an analysis of the Recertification process evaluation and gather additional data "from the field" regarding "process" issues.

We also agreed that the Facilitation Committee would meet consider how larger questions/issues/topics might be explored. We felt that this was appropriate since the third year of the evaluation contract has been cancelled due to budgetary constraints.

The Facilitation Committee met via teleconference on October 22, 2003. We agreed that the evaluation study presented clear and compelling findings. We also agreed that the topics of recertification and teacher professional development would be fruitful areas for further research, either by ISBE, teacher organizations, higher education faculty, researchers or graduate students. The STCB will consider proposals at its May 2004 meeting. Guidelines for these proposals will be issued by January 15, 2004 and be available on the ISBE website.

Those interested in exploring the topics further might begin by reading the evaluation study and using the issues addressed there as a beginning point. The following is a list possible questions was generated by the Facilitation Committee as possible areas for further study. These suggestions are meant to spur interest, illuminate possibilities.

- What is the relationship of teacher recertification to increased student achievement? Studies of efforts to link recertification with other school improvement areas may yield important information.
- In light of the requirements of No Child Left Behind, how are teachers using the recertification process to improve their ability to meet the needs of low-achieving students?
- What models for collaboration between various players in the recertification process might be used to create systems for instructional improvement within school districts?

ATTACHMENT

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

Recommended for Approval
By State Board Staff
November 3, 2003

1. Concordia University – River Forest – Cook County
2. Argosy University (Kathy McCarville) – Rolling Meadows – Cook County
3. Illinois State University Conferencing Unit – Normal – McLean County

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

Recommended for Approval
By State Board Staff
October 31, 2003

1. Concordia University (Kalani Beyer) – River Forest – Cook County
2. Northern Illinois University – DeKalb – DeKalb County
3. National Board Resource Center (Lynne Gaddis) – Illinois State University
– Normal – McLean County

ATTACHMENT

PROPOSALS FOR X-TYPE PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES TO MEET REQUIREMENTS FOR THE STANDARD CERTIFICATE

Recommended for Approval
By State Board Staff
November 6, 2003

1. Area Instruction Office 22 -- Chicago -- Cook County
2. Washington Irving School – Chicago – Cook County
3. William P. Gray Elementary School – Chicago – Cook County (441)
4. William P. Gray Elementary School – Chicago – Cook County (566)
5. Maggie M. Hoover (individual) – Chicago – Cook County
6. Argo Community HSD #217 – Cook County
7. West 40 Intermediate Service Center #2 – Cook County
8. South Berwyn School District 100 – Cook County
9. Results Through Alignment – Palatine – Cook County
10. Glenbard School District 87 – Glen Ellyn – DuPage County
11. Carmel High School (Mundelein) – Lake County
12. West Aurora School District #129 – Kane County (335)
13. West Aurora School District #129 – Kane County (972)
14. West Aurora School District #129 – Kane County (577)
15. West Aurora School District #129 – Kane County (562)
16. West Aurora School District #129 – Kane County (843)
17. Central Community Unit School District #301 – Kane County
18. Special Education Services (Aurora) – Kane County
19. Plainfield CCSD 202 – Will County
20. Northwestern Illinois Association (Sycamore) – DeKalb County
21. Whiteside Regional Office of Education – Whiteside County
22. Rock Island County Regional Office #49 – Rock Island County
23. Malden C.C. School District #84 – Bureau County
24. Riverton CUSD #14 – Sangamon County
25. Pikeland Unit 10 School District – Pike County
26. St. Clair Regional Office of Education – St. Clair County
27. Community Consolidated School District 59 – Cook County

ATTACHMENT

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

Recommended for Approval
By State Board Staff
November 6, 2003

1. Rockton School District #140 – Winnebago County
2. Crystal Lake School District #47 – McHenry County
3. Unit School District #300 – Kane County
4. Adlai E. Stevenson HSD #125 – Lake County
5. South Berwyn School District #100 – Cook County
6. District #227 – Rich Township – Cook County
7. Downers Grove Grade School District #58 – Cook County
8. CHSD #218 – Oak Lawn – Cook County
9. Township High School #211 (Palatine) – Cook County
10. North Palos Elementary School District #1 – Cook County
11. Palos CCSD #118 – Cook County
12. Schaumburg Township School District #54 – Cook County
13. East Prairie School District #73 – Cook County
14. West Northfield School District #31 – Cook County
15. Community Consolidated School District #59 (Arlington Heights) – Cook County
16. Cass School District #63 – DuPage County
17. Bourbonnais Elementary District #53 – Kankakee County
18. Troy School District 30-C – Will County
19. Valley View School District – Will County
20. Kendall County Special Education Cooperative – Kendall County
21. Urbana Schools #116 – Champaign County
22. Litchfield CUSD #12 – Montgomery County
23. Williamson County School Districts (cooperative of five districts) – Williamson County
24. Hutsonville CUSD #1 – Crawford County
25. Lake Zurich CUSD #95 – Lake County
26. Elmhurst CUSD #205 – DuPage County
27. Winnetka District #36 – Cook County
28. Quality Induction Mentoring Partnership – Will County
29. Carmel High School – Lake County
30. McLean County USD #5 – McLean County
31. Pleasantdale SD #107 – Cook County
32. Nashville CCSD #49 – Washington County
33. Midlothian SD #143 – Cook County

ATTACHMENT

34. Minook CCSD #201 – Grundy County
35. Western Springs SD #101 – Cook County
36. Chicago Ridge SD #127.5 – Cook County
37. Waukegan CUD #60 – Lake County
38. Lisle CUSD #202 – DuPage County
39. Community HSD #128 (Libertyville) – Lake County
40. McHenry Elementary SD – McHenry County
41. Riverside Brookfield HSD #208 – Cook County
42. New Lenox SD #122 – Will County
43. Park Forest SD #163 – Cook County
44. Orland SD #135 – Cook County
45. Egyptian CUSD #5 – Alexander County
46. CPS Teachers Academy – Cook County
47. McHenry HSD #156 – McHenry County
48. Lyons Township HSD #204 – Cook County
49. School District U-46 (Elgin) – Kane County
50. Northern Suburban Special Ed. District – Lake County
51. CCSD #62 Des Plaines (Cook County)